

SABINE ROGGE, *Die Attischen Sarkophage. Achill und Hippolytos*. Die antiken Sarkophagreliefs, Band 9, Teil 1, Faszikel 1. Gebr. Mann Verlag, Berlin 1995. 170 Seiten, 334 Abbildungen.

This is an authoritative catalogue, which, with its comprehensive bibliographic apparatus and photographic documentation, stands as a significant contribution to scholarship. It follows the format of the recently produced volumes in the ASR series, and thus includes discussion of the individual monuments with their often standardized, at times unique, narrative presentations of the myths here treated; analysis of their chronological and typological relationships; and a survey of their art historical models. In addition, the author's excellent treatment of the sarcophagi's architectonic detail extends her discussion to that aspect of Attic style that lies beyond the conventional boundary of iconography.

The book has five sections: 1) The Achilles sarcophagi are divided chronologically between the second and third centuries, and within each grouping the individual subjects of the depicted scenes are surveyed and compared. 2) A short chapter is devoted to the problems posed by an unusual Metropolitan style sarcophagus from Ostia, a monument of great significance and high quality, which is inexplicably not illustrated (nor are any of the other Metropolitan examples cited throughout the volume as comparanda – one of the few shortcomings of the volume; this is now alleviated by the publication of ASR XII 1 by D. GRASSINGER). 3) The discussion of the Hippolytus sarcophagi follows the model established for those of Achilles (chronological division and survey of themes depicted). 4) The "Vorbilder" for each represented scene are discussed and typological parallels are adduced. 5) Finally there is the Catalogue itself – concise, yet exemplary. One nevertheless wishes the author had included a simple chart that would have suggested the relative chronology of each myth's surviving examples (such as that given for the Endymion sarcophagi in ASR XII 2, p. 103).

While the volume admirably fulfils the basic requirements of the ASR series, it must be said that scholarly works such as this are, by their nature, essentially descriptive. Thus materials are collected but often not explicated, and conventional lines of enquiry are seldom augmented. It is all too symptomatic of this kind of scholarship that the primary evidence is merely assembled, rather than weighed and evaluated critically. In certain important respects, the present volume, despite the author's erudition, is no exception: contradictory opinions are articulated in what at times seems a perfunctory tone, and conclusions introduced as both inevitable and obvious, often without strong arguments for the solution adopted. These criticisms are not meant to detract from the author's considerable achievement, but rather to suggest its limits; the discussion that follows is intended as both a complement and a compliment to the author's suggestive presentation of these very rich materials, for which all future scholars in the field will owe her a great debt.

The composition of the Attic mythological sarcophagi, and their manner of storytelling, have a distinctiveness all their own. Certain aspects of this character emerge from the first group of reliefs treated in the author's volume (Kat. 1, 7 and 12), those second century works depicting Achilles' Dragging of Hektor's body and its Ransom. Here, as the author points out (pp. 21 f.), the various elements of the mythic cycle are not combined according to the recognizable formula associated with 'continuous narrative.'

Yet the character of these reliefs may be described more effectively. The artificiality of this composition's rendering of the Achilles tale appears to suggest the complexity of the mythic whole, as the disparate scenes are presented in the manner of a synoptic amalgam. Their temporal relationships are visibly diminished by the physical overlapping of elements and the compression of scenes – necessitated by the varying demands these images made on the long, horizontal relief format.

From left to right the three compressed vignettes represent: (C) the unloading of the ransom goods in the Greeks' camp; next (A¹), the dragging of Hektor's body now completed, the drivers unharness the horses (A²); and at the far right (B), the scene of Priam beseeching Achilles for the body of his son. The temporal sequence (C – A¹, by implication – A² – B) has been reorganized, and the foci of the scene accentuated by the visual properties of the relief form. The chariot-driving Achilles is given special prominence, as his head breaks the upper frame of the relief – a factor enhanced by the presentation of the chariot on which he is elevated 'out of sequence' as the central element of the three that constitute the image. This scene's placement was, of course, necessitated by the need to allow space for the body of Hektor that trails behind. The dramatic highpoint of the tale, not, however, its conclusion – the encounter between Priam and Achilles – becomes the culmination of the visual narrative, as one scans the relief, following the depicted movement of its figures, from left to right.

Of the four story elements, all are shown *in medias res* – with the exception of the Dragging of Hektor, which appears as having already taken place. Thus the Achilles relief seems as if to give pictorial form to a compound utterance, one in which a series of actions have been acknowledged as accomplished so that others subsequent may logically follow. This conjunction of disparate temporal moments, and the flexibility of the visualized sequence of events displayed from left to right, is striking – all the more so as these qualities recall those of the languages of antiquity. The classical texts' facility for retrospective narration and their clarity of temporal relationships despite flexible word order, were made possible by the case system and the elaborate means of subordination it allowed (cf. e.g., HOM. IL. 18 ff.; PROP. II 8a, 29 ff.). Thus, in antiquity, one was accustomed to the sort of chronological inversion the sarcophagus reliefs present; so Virgil, in his description of this very scene – depicted on the doors of the Temple of Juno – could recount the series of events in much the same sequence (VERG. AEN. 1, 483–87): *ter circum Iliacos raptaverat Hectora muros / exanimumque auro corpus vendebat Achilles. / tum vero ingentem gemitum dat pectore ab imo, / ut spolia, ut currus, utque ipsum corpus amici / tendentemque manus Priamum conspexit inermis.*

Here metrical concerns seem to have demanded such diction; Virgil's response to them corresponds to those pictorial demands the image made on the sarcophagus designers that were outlined above (sufficient space for Hektor's body behind the chariot, the central placement of the hero, etc.). The passage from the Aeneid is not to be understood as an immediate 'source' for the reliefs, but as an example of how correspondences between the relative means of both verbalization and pictorialization might depend on similar habits of understanding – habits that legitimated such complex modes of expression.

The manner in which disparate aspects of the tale are unified within the second-century Achilles reliefs may be contrasted to what appears on the early Hippolytos sarcophagi (Kat. 56 and 59). The latter are divided into two sections, neither a 'snapshot' moment (p. 75), nor a sequence, and the division contrasts the male and female 'realms' of the two protagonists (p. 74). This strict separation is maintained even on the Istanbul sarcophagus (Kat. 59), where the introduction of a nude figure destroys the symmetry, as it compels the sculptor to shift the Artemis shrine from the established composition's central axis (Theseus? So the author, p. 74; but why should the nude on the Istanbul relief be Theseus? P. LINANT DE BELLEFONDS, LIMC V [1990] 448 suggests "un compagnon d'H". Why not Herakles, whose recognizable pose and type is adopted here, as the author points out? Cf. PLUT. THES. 29, 3 ["a second Herakles"]; 6, 9 [Theseus's desire to emulate Herakles]. Does he not correspond, within the symmetrical organization, to the figure of Aphrodite? Or, is this Theseus, the follower of Herakles, of Seneca's version [HIPPOL. 849]?). The two spheres are bridged by the opposed glances of the Nurse and Hippolytos – not an encounter between the hero and Phaedra. The author's description of their two poses ("die in einem fast spiegelsymmetrischen Sitzmotiv begegnen", p. 74) is rather an exaggeration, for they are clearly different, and suggest the antithetical character of the protagonists: she, bent, head lowered, arm clutching her breast, withdrawn; he, head proudly erect, attentive.

Unlike the third-century sarcophagi that give prominence to Hippolytos on the front panels and relegate Phaedra to those on the ends (cf. p. 114), these reliefs present the two protagonists in antithesis,

with equal emphasis (cf., e.g., QUINT. on comparatio: IX 2,100f., citing CIC. Mur. IX 22). In this mythic tragedy, neither will triumph, and it is this fact that the second-century reliefs appear to enunciate (Thus not conceived like those of Medea and Jason, emphasizing the heroic stature of one figure or the other [cf. M. KOORTBOJIAN, *Am. Journal Arch.* 100, 1996, 435 f.]). To effect this, the scene's specifically temporal dimension is structured differently from that on the second-century Achilles reliefs. Here Venus' son, Cupid, is wounding Phaedra, and Hippolytos is celebrating Artemis with the spoils of the hunt. Narrative time seems as if to stand still, frozen in a continuing 'presentness'; the mythic drama yet to unfold is merely evoked by the scene (the author, p. 113, rightly associates the image with the prologue of Euripides). Here too the ancient languages offer an analogous structure for this kind of statement – for example, in the continuous sense of the present indicative of Latin: *Veneri filius vulnat Phaedram, Hippolytos celebrat Artemidem*. It is only the beholder's recognition of the scene, and his ability to supplement what is depicted by the narration of the subsequent drama that fulfils the mythological representation. In this sense, the beholder's 'share' effectively transforms this present tense statement/image into the equivalent of an ablative form (*Cupide vulnante Phaedram et Hippolyte celebrante Artemidem...*) as we supply, in our imagination, the independent clause – the full mythic tragedy that is the image's true predicate.

The second century reliefs that depict the Discovery of Achilles on Skyros, with their accent on the revelation of the hero's identity and true character, presented the sculptors with both a distinctive set of compositional problems and, over time, a different role for the concepts of Motif and Type. On these early reliefs (Kat. 28 and 19), the upright diagonal figure of Achilles is placed at the center of a tripartite scheme and set in contrast to two seated figures that anchor the subsidiary groups to each side. Yet in neither Kat. 19 nor 28 is Achilles at the precise center of the frieze, and the doubling of the seated figures, without mirror reversal, suggests that balance was preferred here to outright symmetry. In fact, the flanking groups repeat one another, and on Kat. 28, the rhythm they impose dominates the whole of the composition: standing and seated, crouching and standing, standing and seated. But the tripartite clarity on Kat. 28 – which appears to have been followed on the fragmentary Kat. 15 – is undermined on Kat. 19 by the different role assigned Odysseus in the composition: here the disparate elements of the whole are unified, to a much greater degree, by compositional means, as the diagonal forms of Odysseus and Achilles now forge a new geometrical scheme that engages, rather than distinguishes, the relief's three figural groups.

While the composition of the London sarcophagus (Kat. 17) derives from same set of motifs, and the double, unreversed, seated figures reappear, they are employed for different characters, and rearranged both compositionally and thematically. The scene of self-revelation is abandoned, and along with it the emphasis on Achilles' dramatic act as the fulcrum for the tale's visualization. In this scene Achilles is recognized and seized, as if despite his disguise. On the London relief the hero no longer actively demonstrates that singular and defining loss of self-control which will ensure his fate, but sits passively as he succumbs to its inevitability.

The heroic tenor of the event has been subdued on this relief (which, as the author suggests, must be dated subsequent to Kat. 19 and 28 on stylistic grounds), in large part by the new identity of the double seated figures of the familiar motif: Achilles and Deidameia. Here Achilles is fused with the accompanying figures rather than distinguished from them. The difference of his posture from Deidameia's – he remaining nearly erect while she slumps in resignation – transforms the rhythmic organization of the relief as a whole, as this denies the scene either a centralized dramatic emphasis or a culminating focus at its right end (the same contrast of poses is similarly employed on the Villa Albani sarcophagus, of Metropolitan origin, ca 300: LIMC V [1990] cat. no. 72 s.v. Hippolytos I [P. LINANT DE BELLEFONDS]; not mentioned by the author).

Both the Naples and London reliefs (Kat. 19 and 17, respectively) may perhaps best be understood as experiments with an established scheme (that represented by Kat. 28), and in this sense they may be regarded as precursors to the third century transformations of the scene. The surviving third century reliefs (Kat. 14, 21, 22) reconfigure the Discovery scene with explicit attention to both symmetry and centrality, and these formal qualities of design highlight the dramatic character of the represented event. The motif of the double seated figures emerges as a framing device, now marked by mirror reversal, so that Achilles' centrality is enhanced by the symmetrically organized figural frieze. Here the revelation motif is no longer one motif among three, but the singular visualization of the hero's charisma set within a radiating spectacle of figures whose postures respond, as if physically, to the dramatic event in their midst.

Yet despite the fundamental similarity of their compositions, the three third-century reliefs show distinctly different figural arrangements and details. Achilles's pose is unique to each, and while the positions of the other figures within the frieze remains much the same throughout the three panels, their identity was clearly not fixed by convention. The dynamism evident in the forms of Kat. 14 (the earliest

of the three according to the author) disappears on Kat. 21 (according to the author, arguably the latest), where their poses are stiffer and the hierarchical effect of the enhanced symmetry more pronounced.

In this series of three reliefs one witnesses what might be termed the triumph of design over content. The author's analysis makes this clear (esp. p. 40, regarding Kat. 14), but her characterization of the process by means of which the constituent elements might be transformed within the established schema is not entirely convincing. Her analysis of how the well-known figural types are re-combined in „immer wieder neue Kombinationen“ (p. 39) is rooted in an unacknowledged assumption that it is the representation that is altered, not the represented; that the mythological themes of these reliefs, despite the formal transformations to which their schemata are subjected, remain the same.

Something more might be considered in the case of the Capitoline sarcophagus (Kat. 24). As the author points out (following P. Linant de Bellefonds and B. Andreae; see n. 180), the symmetry of the frieze's design was altered, as the horseman at the right was squeezed around the corner onto the end panel. Yet even allowing for this, it must be recognized that Achilles was never conceived on the central axis. Rather, the central group of three figures – Achilles, the female who raises her arms in surprise to the left, and the other one who holds his shoulders from behind – form a coherent unit at the center of the whole composition as it must originally have been designed. The woman who takes hold of the hero is not a comprehensible replacement for the figures of Odysseus and Diomedes (?) who often appear in similar guise, taking hold of the hero, as for example on Kat. 17; nor is she to be understood as Deidameia, who kneels on Kat. 28 and 15, or who takes hold of Achilles' arm on Kat. 19. The author doesn't attempt to identify Deidameia on any of these third-century reliefs, as if the formalization of the scene and the now drastically reduced cast of females precludes such specification; I shall return to the question of their identities shortly.

But what of the doubled seated figures of the old men who frame the scene? Why must one be Agammemnon? P. LINANT DE BELLEFONDS rightly questioned this assumption (*Sarcophages attiques de la necropole de Tyr. Une étude iconographique* [1985] 83). And if this is Agammemnon, why might he be here? Koch thought that the frieze combined the Discovery and the Arming scenes (G. KOCH, *Zur Neubearbeitung der mythologischen Sarkophage*. Marburger Winckelmann-Progr. 1984, 38). A similar argument might be made for a combination of the Discovery with the Departure from Lycomedes scene (cf. side panels of Kat. 24, 29, and perhaps the group at the left on the front of Kat. 42?): this would assume Lycomedes' appearance twice, on the grounds that there were originally two independent scenes from an Achilles cycle – in each of which he played a role – that were subsequently compressed. Indeed, all of these scenes appear on the surviving monuments, and there are parallels for such an amalgamation on other Attic mythological sarcophagi. The author's discussion of the synoptic character of second-century Achilles reliefs is relevant here (pp. 21 f.), as is her treatment of the rear panel of Kat. 45 where the Astyanax episode is conjoined with the Weighing and Ransom scenes. The Ostia sarcophagus (discussed, pp. 71 f.), with its two distinct episodes displayed side by side, provides yet another example of how different elements of the myth might be presented paratactically. Yet the Capitoline sarcophagus is distinguished by the way that these supposedly distinct episodes appear to have coalesced almost completely within the organization of the frieze as a whole; here one needs to speak not of combination, but of contamination (see R. TURCAN, *Déformations des modèles et confusions typologiques dans l'iconographie des sarcophages romains*. Ann. Scuola Normale Superiore Pisa, ser. III, XVII, 1987, 429–446).

There is a more likely origin for the second seated figure than either the unmotivated inclusion of Agammemnon in a scene to which he does not belong, or a duplication of Lycomedes – an origin that also explains the unusual treatment of the Capitoline relief's central group and the particular role of the two remaining women. This is to assume the contamination of the Discovery scene by that of the Wrath of Achilles (an observation I owe to my colleague J. Trimble). The correspondence with the mosaic from Pompeii's House of Apollo (VI 7, 23, paired, it should be recalled, with the scene of the Discovery) and especially with drawings of the now lost painting from the Temple of Apollo (VII 7, 32, where Minerva grasps Achilles about the shoulders just as this occurs on the Capitoline sarcophagus), provide a more comprehensible origin for the relief's reconfiguration of the tale. While this is not necessarily the intended significance of the Capitoline relief's composition (something which remains unknowable), this interpretation explains not only the work's unique imagery, but its derivation.

The sort of *contaminatio* proposed for the Capitoline Achilles sarcophagus is confirmed by the author's analysis of both the Beirut and Woburn Abbey sarcophagi (Kat. 6 and 45). On both, two distinct scenes from the established repertory are brought together, only here their individual compositions dominate that of the newly fabricated whole. As the author points out with respect to Kat. 6, this method of composition explains the renunciation (“Verzicht”) of symmetry and its concomitant accent on the central axis of the frieze (p. 48).

Contaminatio also marks the unusual relief from Ostia to which the author devotes a brief discussion (pp. 71 f.). This work, of Metropolitan production, termed by G. Koch a "pasticcio" (n. 157), is presumed to derive from Attic models. Not only does it display two different scenes from the Achilles cycle in stark juxtaposition, but one of these is itself clearly an amalgam. Taken together, the Capitoline and Ostia reliefs suggest a series of questions about the Achilles repertory as it is represented on the surviving third century sarcophagi; these concern the story's codified motifs and their compression or extension, the possible role of model books in their dissemination, and – ultimately – why it is "daß ... kein Fries mit einem zweiten so genau übereinstimmt" (p. 39).

First, one must resolve the vexing question of precisely what constituted each individual motif, and distinguish "l'ecorce" from le "noyau" – that is, what was its "Kern"? As G. Koch reaffirmed, à propos of the Ostia relief, the imperial period was a late stage in the transmission of older mythological images that served as the "Kern einer breiteren Szene" depicted on the sarcophagi (Jahrb. Berliner Mus. 25, 1983, 22). In the case of the Ostia relief, he suggested that distinct scenes were abstracted from a series and brought together in a new composition with consequently unique significance. Similarly, P. Linant de Bellefonds has concluded that on the Attic mythological reliefs these pre-eminent figure groups must be derived from famous ancient works that established the iconography, "archetypes" that provided le noyau for the elaboration of the cartoons that were built up around them (LINANT DE BELLEFONDS, *op. cit.* 174 ff.). Both arguments recall a theory of such a "kompletives Verfahren" proposed long ago by C. Robert, who sought a motive for the elaboration of such "Kernen" and the introduction of "Nebenfiguren", "alle bei der Handlung beteiligten oder an ihr interessierten Personen auf dem Bilde angebracht werden." (C. ROBERT, *Archaeologische Hermeneutik* [1919] 137 ff.; quotation from p. 142).

But were "Kerne" ever employed without such embellishment, and how are they to be identified? The two basic alternatives that the use of motifs posed for the sarcophagus designers might best be elicited by a set of examples. On the one hand, does Kat. 12 display the "Kern" of the Death of Patroklos scene, and are Kat. 1, 7, and Ostia thus, to varying extents, elaborations? Or, on the other hand, is Kat. 12 a compressed, abbreviated version? (Other abbreviations: Phaedra group abbreviated on no. 57 ["auf drei reduziert", p. 79] and on no. 73). On both formal and philological grounds the latter solution must be correct as it allows for the hero's centrality and is consistent in three of the four variants that survive.

But then a subsequent problem emerges: should we distinguish this kind of elaboration from how either the Ostia frieze or, as suggested above, the Capitoline Achilles (Kat. 24) amalgamates disparate scenes? Here we might distinguish differing kinds of extension:

1) Complementary staffage and additional figures might be employed to enhance or extend the composition and its existing theme; in this sense, complementarity is essentially a matter of style. So, on the Copenhagen Achilles fragment, Kat. 15, a greater number of figures amplify the motif found on no. 28. Their secondary roles are self-evident, and their specific identities are subordinate to the general scheme, now more densely massed as a single composition and more dynamically plastic as a series of forms (cf. p. 29). Nevertheless, extension in the number of elements does not always have these effects; cf. the rendition of the Death of Hippolytos on the end panel of Kat. 68 with Kat. 47 and 64. Similarly, one might compare how in the Hippolytos series, the front panels (Kat. 47, 64, 68, 70) are transformed by the elimination of Phaedra from the scene, and dominated by the upright nude forms of Hippolytos and his now multiplied attendants (well-discussed by the author, pp. 80 ff.).

2) Motifs might be extracted from different scenes of the same mythological repertory and amalgamated, thus producing the effect found on the sarcophagus from Ostia. Vignettes such as those displayed on Kat. 42, 45 (and on the reconstruction of Kat. 23) would seem to provide the models that complemented the basic death-bed motif on the Ostia sarcophagus. The two mourners were taken from an Attic model depicting the Mourning over Patroklos, and added to the Death of Patroklos scene as a framing device.

3) Motifs extracted from one repertory might contaminate another, as on the Capitoline sarcophagus, Kat. 24: the original meaning of the 'borrowed' element has been lost as its role in the composition takes priority over its significance, and the sense of the whole eclipses the meaning of its constituent parts.

These different modes of elaboration, re-utilizing a recognizable set of figural motifs, suggest, *grosso modo*, certain conventional workshop procedures. The author rejects the well-known and much-debated arguments for the existence of "Musterbücher" and, following H. FRONING's suggestions (Jahrb. DAI 95, 1980, 322 ff.), believes "Gipsabgüsse" as a more likely means for the preservation and dissemination of workshop models (pp. 93 ff.). However the schemes were preserved, her argument (p. 94) – that sufficient detail would be lacking in illustrated books – would hold for any models that existed in merely summary form; exempla capable of providing models of style and iconography with any degree of specificity must have been works of art in their own right – whether full scale casts or drawings – and no identifiable evidence for anything of this sort survives. Whatever means of transmission existed, some specific

observations on their employment are suggested by the reliefs themselves, which display differing kinds of transformations effected with the basic repertory of compositions and motifs.

The most striking variations of the myth's repertory are to be found in the changes produced by the re-configuration of a composition's constituent figural motifs. The third-century Hippolytos sarcophagi offer a pertinent example. On Kat. 57, the conflict between the two protagonists is evoked by Phaedra's pose as her body faces away while her head turns toward Hippolytos, effecting a composition that epitomizes the drama as a whole. The equivocal character of the scene is heightened by the interposed figure of the Nurse; is it she or Hippolytos who appears to be the focus of Phaedra's attention? (cf. p. 78, the author suggesting an association of the depicted encounter with Seneca's version). The scene is transformed on Kat. 50, where Phaedra and Hippolytos turn to face one another, exchanging glances, rendering a distinctly more focused and unified image (the author: "eine durch Gesten und Blickkontakt eng verbundene Gruppe", p. 114); thus arguing even more forcefully for an association with Seneca (see below).

By contrast, on Kat. 49 and 73 we find a series of compositional variations effected by the re-assembly of the same motifs from which Kat. 57 was composed. On Kat. 73, the nude horseman to the right of the main group appears no longer to depict Hippolytos (cf. the author's suggested restoration of the fragments, p. 79 and Taf. 88, 3), and Phaedra and the Nurse, their colloquy interrupted, now turn to look over their shoulders, presumably towards the (now lost) hero. On Kat. 49, the composition was moved to the frieze's opposite end and the figure of Hippolytos repositioned so that here, in contrast to the other variants, Phaedra now appears to avoid their confrontation. As the author rightly points out (p. 81), a new group composition has been devised from well-known figural types, thus transforming their effect and significance. What must be stressed, however, is that the new placement of the figures wrenches apart the basic motif and destroys its essential message: here Phaedra turns away, and any equivocation vanishes as her dialogue with Hippolytos is abandoned and she focuses all her attention on the report of her Nurse. This reconception of the scene and its sense was only possible due to the sculptors' use of individuated cartoons for the separate figures, which allowed the segments to be employed, piece-by-piece, in the formation of new compositions from these stock models.

The significance of the Phaedra figure's reuse is evident from its appearance on the end panels, as on Kat. 64, where Phaedra and her attendants are depicted without Hippolytos, "wie ein in sich geschlossener und vom übrigen Teil des Frieses abgesetzter Figurenblock" (p. 83). As the author goes on to point out, the abbreviated scene seems perfectly suited to the smaller end panels – and this is so precisely because the ambivalent relationship with Hippolytos of the front panel compositions has been eliminated, and the narrative motivation for the protagonist's pose and gestures is rendered with a greater coherence.

From the evidence of the "Vorbilder" it would seem that this 'abbreviated' version actually represents the original "Kern" handed-down by the visual tradition – the turned head pairs the protagonist with a figure standing not in front, but behind; the motif thus couples both a turning-away and a turning-toward, and the same may be said even in the case of the end panels that depict the scene of Phaedra's resigned collapse (as on Kat. 47, associated by the author, p. 84, with Euripides' image of the lovesick heroine of lines 198 ff.). This interpretation is corroborated by the motif's re-use on the end panel of Kat. 57 where it structures a composition that depicts a seated Theseus who turns to face his daughter standing behind him; here too the figure of Hippolytos stands before Theseus, unacknowledged. Yet again, the same motif, composition, and significance mark the representation of the figure of Achilles in the scene of the Ransom, where he turns from Priam, the father of Hektor, to thoughts of his own father, Peleus (cf. *HOM. IL. XXIV* 507 ff.).

What is revealed by all of these examples is that the models in the Attic sarcophagi workshops served perhaps more significantly as parts, not wholes. The various uses of this single motif suggests what might be called 'ad hoc composition' – that observable tendency on the part of the workshops to continually reconceive the prominent scenes of the myth's repertory while employing an established set of figural forms: "es bot sich somit an, die entsprechende Szene immer wieder aufs neue aus Figuren, die dem gängigen Repertoire der Sarkophagwerkstatt entnommen werden konnten, zusammenzustellen" (p. 86; cf. the author's comments, pp. 94 f. and her conclusions, p. 121).

Despite the cogency of the author's analysis of the workshop practice of combining scenes, one particular aspect of her presentation of this process remains unconvincing. For, if different scenes were drawn from different models, and their individuation was preserved within the fabric of the new composition as a whole, why should we be surprised that the protagonists appear not only repeatedly, but differently? Thus, on Kat. 6, why not recognize Achilles twice – to the left, standing nude before the seated figure of Lycomedes, and again at the center, now in armour? The author's reluctance to do so is echoed in her similar treatment of Kat. 45, which she also recognizes as an amalgam of two scenes (in this instance the Dragging of Hektor and Priam before Achilles), on the grounds that such amalgamation brings with it "auch inhaltliche Änderungen" (p. 50). Her suggestion that the Dragging scene is meant

to take place on the battlefield before the walls of Troy does not deny Achilles the role, as others have noted (see n. 223); why should this combination of scenes be understood so differently from their appearance on the second-century reliefs, Kat. 1, 7 or 12? Is it not simpler to deduce the differences in costume – on both Kat. 6 and 45 – from the use of different models? This would be yet another example of how, in the workshops, the individual parts of a scene dominated the composite whole, and thus constitutes an argument against the view that casts of full compositions served as models.

Where did the sarcophagus designers find the compositions and motifs with which they worked? The sarcophagi's place late in the visual tradition of the myths they depict poses distinct questions about their imagery's authority: What surviving versions of the tales – literary and visual – do they correspond and conform to? How were these known, and why have the sarcophagus designers construed them as they have? For the variety amid the sarcophagus images cannot be explained if these monuments are regarded as merely those stories' illustrations. The author's discussion of their "Vorbilder" answers many of these questions for the two myths she treats; nevertheless, a comprehensive analysis of the relationship between Attic and Metropolitan production may provide answers to others. The basic materials are arrayed by the author, but their synthesis was, given the format of the ASR series, beyond the scope of her brief; this is merely one of the tasks her contribution sets before other scholars. Two instances may suggest some further avenues of research.

A first example is provided by the conspicuously doubled seated figures that distinguish many compositions in both the Achilles and Hippolytos repertoires. Long ago G. RODENWALDT established that this was, in origin, a Lycian motif, one that could be traced at least as far back as late classical times (Ein Lykisches Motiv. Arch. Anz. 1940, 44–57). The motif appears, as we have already seen, on the Achilles reliefs as well as on the front of the second-century Hippolytos sarcophagi (Kat. 56 and 59), and on the end panels of several third-century examples (Kat. 47 and 70). It is also found employed in other Attic repertoires, as on a fragmentary Meleager relief now in Chicago (see G. KOCH in: ASR XII 6 [1975] cat. 168, dated ca. 200–250).

That the motif was employed in the Metropolitan repertory at a late date confirms the related interpretation of the Ostia relief, and several further examples can be adduced: a Hippolytos relief in the Villa Albani of ca. 300, a Meleager at Autun, dated by G. Koch to the third century, and a Marsyas sarcophagus in the Palazzo Doria in Rome, dated to the mid-third century (for the Villa Albani sarcophagus, see LINANT DE BELLEFONDS in: LIMC V (1990) cat. no. 72; for the Meleager: G. KOCH in: ASR XII 6 [1975] cat. no. 159; for the Marsyas: G. KOCH/H. SICHTERMANN, Römische Sarkophage. Handbuch der Archäologie [1982] fig. 178).

But the double seated figures are also found in the Metropolitan repertory for the Meleager story at a much earlier date, on a relief from Ostia dated ca. 160 (see G. KOCH in: ASR XII 6 [1975] cat. 112, Taf. 96: the figures are posed back-to-back). Moreover, the motif was similarly employed on late Hadrianic/early Antonine funerary urns of Metropolitan origin (cf. a mid-Antonine funerary urn depicting Phaedra and Hippolytos: see F. SINN, Stadttrömische Marmorurnen [1987] no. 636 [= LIMC V (1990) 449 cat. no. 37 s. v. Hippolytos I]. Similarly, on a Vatican urn [inv. 1667; SINN, *op. cit.* cat. no. 557 Hadrianic or early Antonine = KOCH/SICHTERMANN, *op. cit.* fig. 46] representing Adonis and Aphrodite or Phaedra and Hippolytos? Cf. further, SINN, *op. cit.* cat. nos. 555 [Prado]; 558 [Vatican Magazine]; 559 [lost, known from Piranesi] – all dated to the late Hadrianic or early Antonine period). Was this compositional formula also employed on early Metropolitan examples that no longer survive, and did these provide models for Attic production? At least one monument strongly suggests so – the Arles Hippolytos relief, Kat. 50. As the author acknowledges, the formula employed for the figure of Phaedra is indeed similar to that found on the myth's Metropolitan examples (pp. 82; 121; and her general remarks, 100).

The problem is compounded by the vagaries of the surviving examples. None of the Metropolitan Hippolytos reliefs can be dated before the 180s or 190s (see most recently, A. LEWERENTZ, Die Sepulkral-symbolik des Hippolytosmythos auf stadtrömischen Sarkophagen. Boreas 18 [1995] 111–130, esp. 113), and this same motif is found on Adonis sarcophagi whose style suggests their production during the previous generation, ca. 150–175 (KOCH/SICHTERMANN, *op. cit.* 131 ff.). Despite the obvious difficulties for interpretation, several provisional conclusions may nevertheless be drawn. The motif employed on the Arles relief (Kat. 50) must have been devised for the Metropolitan Hippolytos sarcophagi, and must pre-date the surviving examples, as its presence (by *contaminatio*; TURCAN, *op. cit.* 430 ff.) on the Adonis reliefs suggests. This may well represent an artistic response to the Senecan version of the tale since its imagery is foreign to the Euripidean version (cf. the author p. 78). Subsequently, the motif was re-employed by the Attic workshops, when eastern production was begun. Yet given the fluidity with which motifs moved not only between scenes but between mythological repertoires in the Attic series – as the author's catalogue makes abundantly clear – it is entirely possible that the source of the unusual version on the Arles relief was a 'cartoon' derived from the Adonis sarcophagi. In either case, we witness here an example of the impact of *interpretatio romana* on the culture of imperial Greece.

The foregoing commentary has been intended to suggest the richness of the author's accomplishment, as well as to indicate some directions for further research. The continuing vitality of "Sarkophagforschung" depends on volumes, such as this one, which are truly indispensable for our studies – perhaps, inevitably, more for the questions that such authoritative catalogues pose than for those many questions that they can answer. The task of future scholarship is to produce more detailed interpretations of the materials so diligently and intelligently collected here – interpretations that live up to the high standard set by the author of this important contribution.

Toronto

Michael Koortbojian