Introduction: masters and masterworks in the study of Classical sculpture

J. J. POLLITT

This volume of essays appears only slightly more than a century after the publication of Adolf Furtwängler's *Meisterwerke der griechischen Plastik* (Leipzig–Berlin 1893), and it pays homage to Furtwängler by carrying on the type of research that he made famous in Classical scholarship. Furtwängler was not the first archaeologist to attempt to reconstruct the personal styles of Greek sculptors whose names and reputations are perpetuated in Classical literature, but some of his reconstructions were so impressive that they became models for other scholars, and under their influence similar studies soon became a familiar genre in Classical art history.

Resurrecting a particular sculptor's style through the use of literary sources, inscriptions, and illustrations on coins and gems in combination with sculptures that are supposedly Roman copies of Greek originals has now become such a familiar activity that it is easy to forget the extent to which the *Meisterwerke* was a highly innovative book in its time. The twentieth century has seen the appearance of hundreds of articles on the works and styles of individual sculptors; summary entries on most artists can be found in standard reference works like Thieme-Becker's *Allgemeines Lexicon der bildenden Künstler* and the *Enciclopedia dell' arte antica*, dozens of "standard monographs" on single artists have been published; and the essence of these studies has been enshrined in summary works like Lippold's *Die Griechische Plastik*, Picard's *Manuel d'archéologie grecque: La sculpture*, and Richter's *Sculpture and Sculptors of the Greeks* that have been read by generations of students.[1] When the *Meisterwerke* was published, however, serious attempts to reconstruct the personal styles and oeuvres of individual Greek sculptors were still a relatively new enterprise, with a history extending back only about forty years. A brief sketch of how the study of Classical sculpture arrived at this point will serve to put both the present volume and its distinguished ancestor into perspective.

In order to undertake analyses like those contained in the *Meisterwerke* art historians need three things:

1. The means to study a large corpus of sculptures in detail, both through direct examination in museums and collections and through illustrated publications.
2. Systematic and comprehensive knowledge of the literary sources.
3. A coherent historical picture of the stylistic development of Greek art based on archaeological evidence.

1 Not yet read by generations but partly in the same tradition is Andrew Stewart's recent *Greek Sculpture; An Exploration* (New Haven 1990).

The *Meisterwerke* appeared at a time when a new level of sophistication had been reached in each of these categories. It was, of course, a product of Furtwängler's own brilliance, but it can be argued that it was also a work that the study of Greek sculpture from the mid-sixteenth century to the second half of the nineteenth century had made, at some point, in one form or another, inevitable.

Serious study of Classical sculpture after the end of Antiquity, or at least the opportunity for such study, began in Rome at the beginning of the sixteenth century and was made possible by the Papacy. A number of ancient sculptures had either survived throughout or been rediscovered during the Middle Ages, and when the resources of the Popes came to the service of Renaissance taste, these sculptures became the basis for the first public, or partially public, collections of ancient sculpture. In the late fifteenth century Pope Sixtus IV (1471–84) had donated a number of ancient bronzes from the Lateran Palace, among them the *Spinario* and the Capitoline Wolf, to the city of Rome, and they eventually went on display in the Palazzo dei Conservatori, where they remain today. A few years later, in 1503, Pope Julius II commissioned Bramante to connect the Papal villa in the Vatican known as the Belvedere with the Vatican palace itself and in doing so to design a courtyard for the display of sculpture. Into the courtyard went not only the Apollo Belvedere, which the Pope already owned, but also, after its dramatic discovery in 1506, the Laocoon. The appeal of these displays (which were, of course, the ancestral establishments behind today's Musei Capitolini and Musei Vaticani) not only led to their being expanded but also stimulated the formation of private collections, again for the most part by high-ranking members of the church, in the sixteenth and early seventeenth century, e.g. the collections of the Farnese, Medici, Ludovisi, Giustiniani, and Borghese families.

While the existence of these collections served to heighten enthusiasm for ancient sculpture and helped to develop an aristocratic sub-culture in which connoisseurship became an increasingly important intellectual attainment, they were essentially a local, Roman phenomenon, and before they could have a wider impact on the scholarship and artistic taste of Europe, their contents had to become more widely known through the media of engravings and, to a lesser extent, plaster casts. This process began toward the middle of the sixteenth century with two influential series of engravings, the *Antiquae Statuae Urbis Romae* of Giovanni Battista de' Cavalieri, who is usually simply called "Cavaleriis," (editions from 1561 to 1594) and the *Speculum Romanae Magnificentiae* of Antonio Lafreri (1540–84). These, like the unpublished sketchbooks of the period, may in part have been designed to provide visitors to Rome, as well as budding local connoisseurs, with "visual support" as they read through the comprehensive list of all the ancient statues in Rome that was prepared around 1550 by the naturalist Ulisse Aldrovandi and published in the guide to Rome of Lucio Fauno and Lucio Mauro (1556). Lafreri's plates were in some respects ancestors of the later popular engravings of Piranesi in that they were designed to convey the magnificence of ancient Rome, and their illustrations of sculpture (mainly produced in the 1570s) were an incidental aspect of a larger plan. Cavaleriis, on the other hand, set out to illustrate all the major holdings of the great collections in Rome, and his illustrations became the principal tool through

which European antiquarians who did not have direct access to the Roman collections could study ancient sculpture.[2]

Neither Cavaleriis nor Lafreri, however, undertook to pass judgment on the aesthetic merits of the sculptures that they illustrated or to separate out what might be regarded as masterpieces from works of indifferent quality that had been collected simply because they had survived. This task of putting together anthologies of what were thought to be the finest works in the great Roman collections was left to a group of artists in the next century. The earliest of them was the French artist François Perrier whose *Segmenta Nobilium Signorum* (1638) presented a hundred plates of engravings illustrating seventy-six of the most impressive ancient sculptures in Rome (plus the Moses of Michelangelo). Later in the century Joachim de Sandrart's *Sculpturae Veteris Admiranda* (1680) expanded on the model established by Perrier; and in 1704 the culminating and most discriminating publication of selections from the great Roman collections, the *Raccolta di Statue antiche e moderne*, with text by Paolo Alessandro Maffei, was published by Domenico de Rossi.[3] These anthologies were not, of course, archaeological or art-historical studies in any methodological sense. All of them were intended to be appealing as engravings, and hence the artists felt free to follow in the tradition of Lafreri and make additions to the statues, set them against imaginative backgrounds, and sometimes even to create narrative contexts for them.

In looking through these early publications one finds virtually no analysis of sculptural style, generic or personal, and relatively few attempts to correlate particular monuments with the literary sources. A few ties between extant monuments and references in Pliny, it is true, were so obvious that they had been propounded either from the moment when the sculptures were discovered or not long thereafter. The association of the Laocoon with Hagesandros, Athenodoros, and Polydoros (Pliny, *NH* 36.37), for example, had been recognized by Giuliano da Sangallo on the very day of its discovery in 1506;[4] and the identification of the Farnese Bull with the group by Apollonios and Tauriskos of Rhodes (*NH* 36.33–34) was generally accepted within a few decades after its discovery in 1545.[5] Aside from these, however, there were very few examples of what we now call "attributions."

One of the factors that clearly limited speculation about attributions was the fact that the idea of "originals" and "Roman copies" in Greek sculpture, which the Richardsons, Winckelmann, and others in the eighteenth century would come to take for granted, had not yet emerged in any serious form in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Lafreri, Perrier, and De Rossi-Maffei, for example, all of whom illustrated the Farnese Bull group and ascribed it to Apollonios and Tauriskos, apparently had no doubts that the extant

2 For a more detailed discussion about the formation and publication of the first collections of Classical sculpture in Italy see F. Haskell and N. Penny, *Taste and the Antique* (New Haven and London 1981), hereafter cited as "Haskell and Penny."

3 As a publication Pietro Santi Bartoli's *Admiranda Romanarum Antiquitatum Vestigia* (1693) also belongs in the same category, but it dealt mainly with Roman historical reliefs and sarcophagi. Bartoli's only reference to a Greek sculpture is his passing observation that a Neo-Attic marble vase in Rome seemed to be ". . . arte Phidiaca anaglyphice sculptum" (p. 19).

4 On the details of the discovery and identification see G. Daltrop, *Die Laokoongruppe im Vatikan* (*Xenia*, Heft 5) (Konstanz 1982) 9–12.

5 Haskell and Penny, 165–67.

group found in the Baths of Caracalla was the original. Likewise, when they encountered the signatures of sculptors who today, if they are paid any attention at all, are relegated to the lowly category of copyists – for example, Glykon of Athens who signed the Herakles Farnese; Agathias, son of Dositheos, whose name appears on the Borghese Gladiator; and Kleomenes, son of Apollodoros, the sculptor of the Medici Aphrodite – they usually accepted them as the original creators of the works on which their names appear.[6]

Probably the most popular attribution of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was the identification of the "horse tamers" of the Quirinal, figures originally made for the Baths of Constantine, as works of Pheidias and Praxiteles. This was what one might call a "folk attribution," one that had originated in late Antiquity and that continued to enjoy a certain popularity up until the nineteenth century, although as time went on, it is interesting to note, confidence in the attribution seemed to waver. Lafreri in 1584 had written confidently of these sculptures as ". . . absolutissima, Praxitelis et Fidiae, manu," while somewhat more than a century later, De Rossi's caption referred to them more guardedly as ". . . attribuita à Fidia . . . altra simile stimata di Prassitele . . ." Maffei, a well informed and cautious scholar, adhered in his commentary on De Rossi's plate to the attribution to Pheidias and Praxiteles because he was convinced that there had once been a single ancient base for both figures that bore their signatures. He was aware, however, that both sculptors had lived before the time of Alexander and that the popular identification of the figures as Alexander taming Bucephalus was therefore problematical. Not wanting to depart "dall' invecchiata tradizione," he proposed that the horse tamers had been brought to Alexandria from some earlier location, rededicated to Alexander, and finally, centuries later, transported to Rome by Constantine.[7]

A few of the anthologists' attempts at attributions, however, offhand and unexplained as they may have been, can be said to have prepared the way for lines of thought that were to mature in the nineteenth century and continue to be an important concern for Classical art historians in the twentieth. Perrier's *Segmenta*, for example, contains four attributions. Two of them were the standard attributions of the Laocoon and the Farnese Bull.[8] The other two, however, were based on more speculative associations with works mentioned by Pliny. One involved a group of figures of Niobids, then in the Medici Gardens and now in Florence, to which several plates were devoted, including one which offered an imaginative recreation of the group (complete with Apollo and Artemis in the sky) and bore the caption: *haesitatio est Nioben cum liberis morientem Scopas an Praxiteles fecerit*

6 Lafreri, *Speculum*, pl. 68, speaks of "Herculis signum Gliconis Atheniensis peritissimi artificis manu . . ." See also De Rossi-Maffei, *Raccolta*, plates XXVII, XLIX, and LXXVI. Sandrart, *Sculpturae Veteris Admiranda*, 16, however, could not resist associating the Medici Aphrodite ("Venus de Medici") with Pheidias, in spite of the signature of Kleomenes. (The signature now visible on the base of the Aphrodite is modern but seems to have been incised to replace an original one. See E. Loewy, *Inschriften griechischer Bildhauer* [Leipzig 1885] no. 513.)

7 See Lafreri, *Speculum*, caption to pl. 66; De Rossi-Maffei, *Raccolta*, pl. 11 and Maffei's commentary, cols. 13–14. On the vicissitudes of opinion concerning the horse tamers see Haskell and Penny, 136–41. Although no one nowadays would attribute the actual statues on the Quirinal to Pheidias or Praxiteles, they are still sometimes thought to echo figures from the pediments of the Parthenon and thus still have a respectable, if tenuous, connection with Pheidias. See, for example, Rhys Carpenter, *Greek Sculpture* (Chicago 1960) 44; F. Brommer, *Die Skulpturen der Parthenon-Giebel* (Mainz 1963) 106; Martin Robertson, *A History of Greek Art* (Cambridge 1975) 304; O. Palagia, *The Pediments of the Parthenon* (Leiden 1993) 47.

8 Perrier, *Segmenta*, pls. 1 and 100.

Pliny L. 36. c. 5 in Ortis Mediceis (fig. 1).[9] The other was directed at an Aphrodite, accompanied by an Eros riding a dolphin, in the Borghese Gardens, which is listed in Perrier's index as: *Venus emergens e mari. Praxitelis opus in Hortis Burghesianis.*[10] While neither of these identifications was accompanied by any analysis or justification, they did introduce problems of attribution and reconstruction that are still under discussion today. Although the attribution of the Florentine Niobids to Skopas or Praxiteles has been abandoned by most scholars, the various Niobids are still usually recognized as copies derived from a single group (probably a Hellenistic work that may have been set up later in the temple of Apollo Sosianus in Rome).[11] Perrier's reference to a *Venus emergens e mari* by Praxiteles seems to stem from confusion of the Aphrodite of Knidos with the Aphrodite *Anadyomene* by the painter Apelles.[12] It can be said, however, that Perrier's attribution stimulated speculation on the Aphrodite of Knidos and opened the way to the correct identification of copies of it by the Jonathan Richardsons (see below) in 1728.[13]

The main value of the anthologies of the seventeenth century in the development of Classical archaeology lay not so much in their specific ideas as in the role they played in helping to make the study of ancient sculpture less parochial. Through their engravings an appreciation for the sculptural treasures of Rome, and with it an interest in ancient sculpture in general, spread throughout Europe. A symptom of this was that an interest in acquiring ancient sculpture began to spread beyond the great families of Rome and that a few prestigious foreigners, like Queen Christina of Sweden, who acquired the "Ildefonso group" in 1678, and Thomas Howard, the Earl of Arundel, even managed to start collections of their own by buying antiquities in Rome with Papal approval.[14] But for the most part those who were interested in forming collections and in exhibiting Classical sculpture elsewhere in Europe had to be content with plaster or bronze casts.

If there were limits on their ability to acquire Greek sculpture, however, it had become

9 *Ibid.*, pl. 99; for the individual Niobids, pls. 33, 34 and 57–60. The more modern form of the reference to Pliny is *NH* 36.28.

10 *Ibid.*, pl. 84 and index. I have been unable to identify this work with certainty among surviving sculptures. It may be lost, but it is also possible that Perrier has so embellished and transformed the appearance of the statue as to make it unrecognizable. The combination of features in Perrier's engraving – a nude Aphrodite who holds out a piece of drapery with one arm and is accompanied by Eros riding on a dolphin – relates most closely to the "Venus Felix" type (*LIMC*, s.v. "Aphrodite," nos. 696–706). It may be significant that one version of this type, now in the Louvre (MA 280), was at one time in the Palazzo Borghese (*LIMC*, no. 698).

11 A date for the original of the group in the third century BC is argued by, among others, G. Lippold, *Die griechische Plastik* (*Handbuch der Archäologie*, Munich 1950) 308–9 and M. Bieber, *The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age* (revised edition, New York 1961) 74–77. A late Hellenistic date (first century BC) is argued by M. Weber, "Zur Zeitbestimmung der Florentiner Niobiden," *JdI* 75 (1960) 112–32. The attribution to Skopas has been defended by W. Geominy, *Die Florentiner Niobiden* (Bonn 1984) and criticized by B. S. Ridgway, *Hellenistic Sculpture I* (Madison 1990) 82–84, who also supports a late Hellenistic date.

12 Overbeck, *SQ*, 1227–45 (Knidia) and 1847–63 (Anadyomene).

13 Jonathan Richardson, father and son, *Traité de la Peinture et de la Sculpture* (Amsterdam 1728) 3.2, pp. 520–21. It is noteworthy that Maffei, more learned and discriminating than Perrier and perhaps more aware of the complexity of the subject, declined to follow Perrier's lead in identifying the Aphrodite of Knidos, even though De Rossi included nude figures of Aphrodite in the *Raccolta* (pls. IV, the well-known version of the "Knidia" once in the Belvedere of the Vatican, and XXVII, the Medici Aphrodite in Florence).

14 On the Ildefonso group see P. Zanker, *Klassisistische Statuen* (Mainz 1974) 28–30, pls. 30–31; Haskell and Penny, 173–75. Most of the Arundel collection, it should be noted, was formed not with purchases in Rome but with antiquities acquired in Asia Minor and the Aegean islands by Arundel's energetic agent, William Petty. See D. E. L. Haynes, *The Arundel Marbles* (Oxford 1975).

much easier, by the beginning of the eighteenth century, for the growing corps of admirers of Classical Antiquity outside of Italy both to pursue their interest through books and also, as public museums developed and private collections became more accessible, to examine ancient sculptures at first hand. The most far-reaching result of this new availability of information was that, although Rome continued to be a place of pilgrimage for lovers of "the antique," as the century progressed much of the most progressive and influential thought about ancient sculpture began to be produced by writers outside of Italy, like Bernard de Montfaucon and the Comte de Caylus in France; the Jonathan Richardsons (father and son) and, later, James Stewart and Nicholas Revett in England; and, of course, Winckelmann, first in Germany and later as an emigré in Italy. By the second half of the eighteenth century what had begun as a sophisticated mania in late-Renaissance Rome had become the subject of an international scholarly dialogue.

The great task and goal of serious archaeologists throughout most of the eighteenth century was to begin to sort out and achieve a more scientific understanding, from both an archaeological and historical point of view, of the substantial mass of sculpture that had become known since the late fifteenth century, and scholars in France, England, and Germany made important contributions to the process. Montfaucon's *L'Antiquité expliquée et representée en figures* (1719), for example, concentrated on explaining the true ancient meaning of various images, attributes, and objects under such diverse headings as the gods, priesthoods, temples and other buildings, facilities for recreation, modes of transportation, military equipment, and tombs; and Caylus, in the *Recueil d'Antiquités* (1752–67), was particularly interested in refuting fanciful interpretations of works of art, determining their real significance in the light of ancient literary sources, and also determining whether or not they were genuine. A similar growth in observant connoisseurship can be seen in the work of the Richardsons, but they, unlike Montfaucon and Caylus, had a particular interest in the historical role of artists. The Richardsons were the first writers on Greek sculpture to demonstrate a serious and incipiently systematic understanding of the fact that many of the sculptures which they saw were ancient copies and that these copies had sometimes been grouped together without careful discrimination. In their discussion of the Niobids in the Villa Medici, for example, they observe that the figures are not all done in one style, that they are made of different types of marble, and in the case of the figure of an old man associated with the group, ". . . his head, which appears to be *Roman* on all accounts, has also the Eye-balls mark'd, which the *Greeks* never did, nor is this done on any of the other figures," and in their listing of the sculptures in the "Gallery in the Garden" of the Villa, they give this typical entry: "Two Antique Copies of the *Venus* of *Medicis*; tolerably good. There are a great number, perhaps a hundred of these Antique Copies of this wonderful Statue in *Rome*, and *Florence*."[15] Such archaeological discernment was appreciated and later amplified by Winckelmann in his meticulous description of the details of anatomy and drapery in ancient sculpture[16] and in his often shrewd as well as caustic comments on restorations and copies.

15 Jonathan Richardson, senior and junior, *An Account of some of the Statues, Bas-Reliefs, Drawings, and Pictures in Italy* (London 1722) 125 and 127.

16 *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums* (1764) part 1, chap. 4, section 2. See the edition of W. Senff (Weimar 1964) 123–79.

That Winckelmann's main contribution to the sorting out of surviving ancient sculptures was his formulation of a historical framework within which their stylistic development could be arranged and understood, has long been appreciated. He usually, and rightly, gets credit for being the creator of art history as a discipline. Yet, interested as he was in the history of Greek sculpture, he seems not to have been particularly interested in the problem of identifying and defining the styles of individual artists. Since the main goal of his discussion of Greek art in the *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums* (1764) was to describe the single ideal of beauty, *die idealische Schönheit*,[17] that he found in Greek sculpture, his interest in the style of individual artists was aroused only to the extent that these artists seemed, on the basis of literary evidence, to have achieved, or failed to achieve, that ideal. Rather than being deduced from the formal qualities of surviving sculptures, the four-phase framework which he superimposed on Greek sculpture (the Older Style, the High or Grand Style, the Beautiful Style, and the Style of the Imitators) was, in fact, to a very great extent borrowed from ancient writers on Greek art, particularly the brief historical sketches of the development of Greek sculpture given by Cicero and Quintilian and the many analogies between rhetoric and the arts drawn by Dionysios of Halikarnassos.[18] As Alice Donohue has pointed out in a recent thorough review of Winckelmann's use of the ancient literary sources, Winckelmann knew the authors well long before he became familiar with ancient sculptures, and their outlook was already imprinted on his mind by the time he came to write the *Geschichte*.[19]

Given the background and intention of his history, it is perhaps not surprising that it contains very few attempts to associate particular works mentioned in the ancient sources with extant sculptures. Most of Winckelmann's attributions appeared not in the *Geschichte* itself but in the *Anmerkungen über die Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* published in Dresden in 1767;[20] yet even in this work they are few in number, and of them only two, the attribution of the Apollo *Sauroktonos* and the Leaning Satyr (*Anapauomenos*) to Praxiteles, are taken seriously today.[21]

Although Winckelmann's advocacy of the idea that the Greeks had created a perfect sculptural style continued to have an effect on the way scholars evaluated Greek art into

17 Ed. Senff, 365.

18 For the relevant passages see my *The Art of Ancient Greece; Sources and Documents* (Cambridge 1990) 221–26.

19 A. A. Donohue, "Winckelmann's History of Art and Polyclitus," in W. Moon, ed., *Polykleitos, the Doryphoros, and Tradition* (Madison 1995) 327–53.

20 Cited here from the facsimile edition that appears in *Studien zur deutschen Kunstgeschichte*, Band 344 (Baden-Baden, Strasbourg 1966).

21 Winckelmann's attributions: (*a*) Apollo *Sauroktonos*: *Geschichte* (ed. Senff) 274; also *Monumenti Antichi Inediti*, cap. 17, pp. 46–55. (*b*) Leaning Satyr: see the Italian edition of Carlo Fea (*Storia delle arti del disegno presso gli antichi* [Rome 1783–84] vol. 1, p. 292). This attribution was argued more thoroughly by Visconti in his catalogue of the Museo Pio-Clementino (see infra), vol. II, pl. 30. (*c*) Muse by Ageladas: connected with a statue in the Palazzo Barberini. *Anmerkungen*, 81. (*d*) *Kanephoroi* of Polykleitos, in a terracotta once belonging to Cavaceppi. *Anmerkungen*, 91. (*e*) *Astragalizontes* of Polykleitos in a marble group found in Rome, once in the Palazzo Barberini, and now in the British Museum. *Anmerkungen*, 91. See B. F. Cook, *The Townley Marbles* (London, British Museum, 1985) 10–11, fig. 2. (*f*) Heifer of Myron associated with a work in the Villa Aldobrandini. *Anmerkungen*, 93. (*g*) Niobids of Skopas: *Anmerkungen*, 92, where he accepts an already established tradition which connected Skopas' work with the Niobid group in Florence. (*h*) *Symplegma* by sons of Praxiteles: possibly connected with the wrestlers in Florence: *Geschichte* (ed. Senff) 275. (*i*) Boy blowing on a fire, by Lykios, the pupil of Myron: connected with a group in the Villa Farnesina. *Anmerkungen*, 94.

the early nineteenth century (it pervades, for example, Karl Otfried Müller's *Handbuch der Archäologie der Kunst*, first published in 1830), there was during the years between ca. 1780 and 1820 a distinct shift of interest away from the search for a general ideal and toward the evaluation of the special stylistic characteristics of particular sculptures. The explanation for this is probably to be found in the expansion of public museums and in the publication of museum catalogues in the eighteenth century.[22] Authors who prepared catalogues were inclined to concentrate on the distinct and peculiar characteristics of individual pieces of Greek sculpture rather than on an overarching theoretical ideal. Their concentration on particular features of style and iconography also made them alert to the existence of groups of sculptures that could be said to constitute "types," and the increasing availability of catalogues made it easier than ever before to make the sort of comparisons that led to the recognition of types.

It was certainly not an accident that the scholar who first achieved a high level of sophistication in making attributions, Ennio Quirino Visconti (1751–1818), was also the author of one of the first major catalogues of ancient sculpture. Visconti's publication over a number of years of the sculptures in the Museo Pio-Clementino in the Vatican was a landmark not only in the publication of collections of ancient sculpture but also in the correlation of existing sculptures with the ancient writers on Greek art.[23] The sophistication of Visconti's judgment in many areas, when compared with those of the most learned of the anthologists, like Maffei, and even when compared with those of Winckelmann, represents a quantum leap in connoisseurship and makes him perhaps the major precursor of the modern era in Classical art history. In proposing and refuting identifications of sculptures and attributions to sculptors he was able to make telling comparisons by drawing upon a wide knowledge of the extant monuments; and he was also able to support his proposals with a steadily increasing understanding of the stylistic and iconographical conventions of Greek sculpture, a detailed familiarity with the editions of ancient texts that were available in his time, and even a respectable knowledge of Greek epigraphy.[24] Using these credentials he scrutinized, often with a certain acerbity, traditional ideas about well-known sculptures, and his demolition of them was often as influential as his new proposals. He dismissed the views of Winckelmann and others, for example, when he argued cogently that the "Sardanapalus" was a bearded Dionysos; that the "Cleopatra" was probably an Ariadne; that the "Phocion" and "Alcibiades" were not portraits; and that the "Belvedere Antinous" was a Hermes (Mercury). His mood as he did so is summed up in the first sentence of his discussion of the "Antinous": "Voici la première fois que cette belle statue est présentée au public sous une autre dénomina-

22 The collection of Classical sculptures in Dresden, which had an early influence on Winckelmann, was published in Dresden as early as 1733 (B. Leplat, *Recueil des marbres antiques qui se trouvent dans la galerie du Roy de Pologne à Dresden*). The earliest major museum catalogue of a public collection of Classical sculptures was Giovanni Gaetano Bottari's volume on the Capitoline Museum (1755).

23 I cite here the French language version of the major edition; *Musée Pie-Clémentin* (Milan 1818–22). Before his work in the Vatican Visconti had published a briefer catalogue of the sculptures in the Villa Borghese: *Sculture del Palazzo della Villa Borghese della Pinciana brevemente descritte* (Rome 1796).

24 In *Mus. Clem.* III.244, for example, he observes that the signature of Leochares on a base in the Villa Medici, thought by some to be the original base of the sculptor's Ganymede, could not be the original because both the letter forms and the spelling are inappropriate.

tion que celle qui lui fut donnée pendant près de deux siècles, par une foule de vulgaires érudits et de professeurs."[25]

When he made attributions he was careful not to be beguiled by the first associations that came to mind. He coolly dismissed his own association of a statue of Paris with the Paris of Euphranor, for example, because there was no real evidence for it. In the same vein, he accepted the under life-size group of Ganymede and the eagle as having some connection with the group by Leochares, but before he did so he rejected two other Ganymede types, explaining why they did not fit Pliny's description of the work. In identifying the Centocelle Eros type as the Thespian Eros of Praxiteles, he explained why it, and not the Eros bending the bow type (which he assigned to Lysippos), was Praxitelean. As part of his identification of the Diskobolos of Naukydes, he took pains to include an explanation of how it differed from the Diskobolos attributed to Myron. And in his mature discussion of the Apollo Belvedere, which in an early edition of the catalogue he had identified as the Apollo *Alexikakos* of Kalamis, he explained in some detail why his earlier view did not agree with the ancient sources and was probably wrong.[26] Even his relatively straightforward attributions were supported with detailed arguments that show his grasp of the complexity of the subjects he is dealing with. Coins and medals, as well as literary sources and other sculptures were brought into his discussion of the Venus Colonna as a Praxitelean work. (Visconti had helped to make this version of the "Knidia" famous. At the time it had been decorously draped by order of the papal authorities, a fact that he simply ignored.) He took pains to explain why it was reasonable to connect the style of the Leaning Satyr type with Praxiteles; and in identifying the Tyche of Eutychides he explained how the type had been varied and widely dispersed in Antiquity.[27] Although many of Visconti's attributions still, of course, have adherents, it may have been the example of his professional, competent, analytical tone, even more than his specific ideas, that influenced his successors in the nineteenth century.

In addition to catalogues of individual collections like those of Visconti, there began to appear early in the nineteenth century large catalogue-like publications that brought together examples of ancient sculpture from a number of collections and illustrated them with drawings. Although usually too large to carry around, these nonetheless were the ancestors of the modern "handbooks," and they served as basic reference works for scholars like Johannes Overbeck who, after the middle of the century, began to write the first serious histories of Greek art. One of these, the *Specimens of Ancient Sculpture* (1809–10), prepared for the Society of Dilettanti by Richard Payne Knight, had the virtue of being the first major publication to attempt to present ancient sculptures in what was perceived to be their chronological order. The most extensive of the multi-collection catalogues, however, was the *Musée de sculpture antique et moderne* (Paris 1826–53) by the Comte de Clarac. Although it was based at first on the collection in the Louvre, it also included

25 *Mus. Clem.* I.80. On the "Sardanapalus": II.290–304; "Cleopatra": II.316–25; "Alcibiades" and "Phocion": II.304–16; and "Antinous": I.78–89.

26 Paris: *Mus. Clem.* II.253–58; Ganymede: III.241–47; the rejected Ganymedes: II.248–53; Eros of Centocelle; I.119–25; Diskobolos: III.130–36; Apollo Belvedere: I.132–55.

27 Knidian Aphrodite: *Mus. Clem.* I.112–19; Leaning Satyr: II.215–20; Tyche: III.224–30.

sculptures from other collections and eventually incorporated and illustrated more than 2,500 sculptures. Clarac's *Musée* later became the basis for Reinach's widely-used *Répertoire de la statuaire grecque et romaine* (Paris, 1897–1930), the first section of which was known as the "Clarac de poche." In Germany the *Denkmäler der alten Kunst* begun by Karl Otfried Müller in 1832, and later expanded, up until 1881, by Friedrich Wieseler was equally influential.

The chief limitation of all of these early reference works for the study of individual sculptor's styles was that, while the line drawings with which they were illustrated made it possible for students and the educated public to develop a basic familiarity with general appearance of many Classical sculptures, they were not sufficiently accurate and detailed to be used by scholars in making serious comparative judgments about stylistic details. In addition, the relevant ancient sources were presented haphazardly, and the chronological place of individual pieces in the development of Greek sculpture often remained vague. These collections occasionally repeated or proposed attributions of particular sculptures to individual artists, and by the 1856 edition of Müller–Wieseler's *Denkmäler* some now quite familiar attributions had been firmly enshrined,[28] but their technical limitations prevented them from significantly advancing the study of individual styles beyond where it had stood in Visconti's time.

The modern era in the study of Greek sculptors, and in a sense in the study of Greek art as a whole, can be said to have begun in the 1850s with the publication of Heinrich Brunn's *Geschichte der grieschische Künstler* (Braunschweig 1853) and the first edition of Johannes Overbeck's *Geschichte der griechischen Plastik* (Leipzig 1857). Brunn's monumental study, the nucleus of which was contained in his dissertation *Artificum Liberae Graeciae Tempora* (Bonn 1843), was the first comprehensive, systematic, and analytical study of all the surviving literary evidence about individual Greek artists. In its time it put the study of Greek sculptors on an entirely new footing, and even today it is still useful. Brunn was the first scholar to make a thorough critical evaluation of the ancient writers on Greek art to determine which passages deserved greater weight, how the texts about individual artists related to one another, and how one could resolve, or at least pass judgment on, their internal inconsistencies. Not only did this careful sifting and evaluation of the sources make great strides in clarifying what ancient critics saw as the distinctive stylistic features of individual sculptors but it also helped to sort out their chronological relationships.

Overbeck is best remembered today for his *Die antiken Schriftquellen zur Geschichte der bildenden Künste bei den Griechen* (Leipzig 1868), the comprehensive collection of ancient texts about Greek artists which, although it now needs to be supplemented by epigraph-

28 For example, familiar attributions going back to Winckelmann, Visconti, and others – such as the Palazzo Massimi Diskobolos to Myron; the Leaning Satyr type, Apollo Sauroktonos type, and the Vatican Aphrodite types et al. to Praxiteles; the Vatican Ganymede to Leochares (pls. XXXV–XXXVI); the Tyche type to Eutychides (XLIX) – were repeated. A copy of the Diadoumenos of Polykleitos had been identified (XXXI.136); an attempt to sort out the "five Amazon problem" had begun (XXXI.137–38); the Herakles Farnese and the Azara Herm were connected with Lysippos (XXXVIII and XXXIX); and copies of the Attalid sculptures in Pergamon were recognized, following the initial suggestion of Brunn, in the Ludovisi Gaul group and the "Dying Gladiator" (XLVIII).