Tomasz Mikocki, **Les sculptures mythologiques et décoratives dans les collections polonaises.** Corpus Signorum Imperii Romani, Pologne 3,1. Institut d'archéologie, Université de Varsovie, Warschau 1994. 116 Seiten, 72 Tafeln.

This recent volume of the CSIR exemplifies the greaf value of the series with its systematic presentation of the antiquities held in public collections in Poland. While certain key monuments have long been known to scholars – such as the heads of Odysseus, Menelaus, the Capitoline Amazon, or the copy of the so-called Philadelphia Dionysos – much of what is presented here is unpublished (31 of 108 entries), and many other works have appeared solely in Polish publications (more than half of the entries).

The author's catalogue (in a French translation by K. Bartkiewicz) thus brings a substantial body of new material to our attention. He provides thorough, often detailed descriptions of all the entries, along with a record of each work's condition, its state of conservation and restorations, and a full bibliography for each. It should be said, however, that the division of the discussion along these lines does at times lead to some unnecessary repetition. The author's thoroughness is, nevertheless, all the more welcome as the photographs are often of poor quality. More significantly, the volume's scholarly value is much compromised by its poor production: the book is marred by an excess of typographical errors, unfortunately many more than appear on the publisher's accompanying ‚errata' slip; the central margins are rather meager, and as a result the text tends to descend into the ‚gutter' between pages; the captions for the two works shown on plate 33 have been reversed; plates 21 and 22 have been inserted twice, and consequently, there are no plates 37 and 38 (here the descriptions prove essential!).

The volume includes very few examples of ‚provincial' works, which may seem somewhat of a surprise. This is perhaps more suggestive about the history of Polish collecting than Polish archaeological excavation, and volume 6 of the CSIR Poland series is to be devoted to the history of this nation's collections (signaled by the author in the „Avant-propos", p. 7). While some catalogue entries relate their subjects to other works in the volume, seldom do these brief discussions move beyond questions of stylistic comparison. There is more to say here, as always in the case of catalogues with their limitations of format and space, and the following comments address merely a few of many relevant topics: the question of genre, series, and types; the problem of ‚provincial' variants; and the ‚transposition' of famous statuary types to serve as models in other genres. Wherever possible, I have tried to focus my remarks on, or around, works that are published here for the first time. I shall conclude with some comments on individual works.

The group of Satyr heads (cat. nos. 32, 33, 34, and the head of 37 – all thought to have been acquired in Rome) testifies to the popularity of genre subjects – both as an aspect of ancient taste, and of the history of collecting. A vast number of related examples are known, and it seems worth asking whether the discussion of such works in the traditional terms of ‚Kopienkritik', as replicas of particular types (cf. p. 48), is truly relevant to their genre and its character. By definition, genre subjects are general as opposed to specific in their reference; should the particularization of that reference be any more necessary in the case of visual works than in literary ones? The subjects of such works were required merely to be recognizable; need one imagine, for instance, that the various *symplegmata* – the Conservatori Nymph and Satyr, or the Dresden Satyr and Hermaphrodite – were anything other than variants of some common original that introduced the theme? or that versions that reproduced either of them were necessarily faithful to the originals? Group works such as these had little need to precisely copy their models, since it was the conjunction of figures and their actions, and above all, their invention, that was memorable. For example, while the splashing putti found in the Mahdia shipwreck are obviously derived from the same model as the similar figure found at Sperlonga, it is equally clear that they were produced, as this comparison demonstrates (despite the wretched state of the Mahdia figures' preservation) without any overwhelming concern for fidelity at the level of detail. Or, to take yet another example, the lattitude demonstrated by ‚transpositions' of classicizing statuary (cf. the Polykleitan works discussed below) suggests that the tradition continued here, and the continuity that counted, had to do with the conception of the subject-matter, and its visualization, rather than precise replication of putative models. This is true even of monumental examples of reputedly ‚famous' works, as can be seen in the two versions of the Lysippan Herakles found in the Baths of Caracalla. There is no doubt that the ancients did know how to make copies when they wished to; what is less clear is exactly what was intended when they did not.

Similar questions may be asked, not only of the group of satyr heads, but of other sets of replicas as well, such as the three small statuettes of seated figures representing either Fortuna or Bona Dea (cat. nos. 52, 53 and 54). The series is marked by the simplification and variation of different aspects within a consistent and established iconography. This is not, in the first instance, a matter of their relative quality. For example, cat. no. 52 is shown with a slightly different costume than the other two; the drapery falls over her left leg and the folds continue their pattern down the side; the drapery of cat. no. 53, a much finer work in far better condition, has a myriad of more detailed folds, yet the drapery

disappears behind the side of throne; and cat. no. 54's drapery falls over the left leg and merges with front leg of seat. These three statuettes provide an example of several artists' differing attention to various, relatively insignificant details. The signal features that insured identification remain – yet in this case it was primarily the general configuration of the enthroned figure that counted, as opposed to the elaboration of either her costume, its arrangement, or its ornament. A related example is found in the configuration of the ‚Isis‘ knot on cat. nos. 58 and 59. Here too, the specific details of the key identifying feature had no need to be consistent, as its unusual form and visual prominence was surely sufficient.

Cat. nos. 17 and 18 contrast two heads representing Herakles: one, a version of the Farnese type attributed to Lysippos, the other a provincial depiction of the famous hero, deriving ultimately, as the author notes, from the same type. While the underlying similarity of these heads is apparent, their outward differences are both more obvious and interesting. On the ‚provincial‘ variant, the treatment of hair and beard are distinguished, and the head lacks the fullness that results from the prominent curly locks encircling the entire head. Thus the thick beard, together with the massive quality of the head itself, serves as the primary reference to the physiognomy traditionally associated with Herakles. While both heads display the raised, ‚bossed‘ brow, so familiar in works associated with Lysippos, the eyes of the fuller faced ‚provincial‘ work slant up and outward transforming the hero's appearance. Perhaps more significantly, this variant also abandons the elongated facial features fundamental to the ‚Lysippan‘ model. Thus, only the general form remains to secure the identification. Clearly it was the pose that allowed for Herakles' recognition; the head had merely to conform, *grosso modo*. In replicating this type, with respect to the statue's head, *decorum* was the key, not fidelity.

The author's discussions of the various examples ‚Idealplastik‘ exhibit certain general problems that seem to arise from when catalogue entries focus solely on individual works. These discussions are marred by a failure to maintain sufficient internal consistency between the descriptions of related examples. Questions of style, above all, of surface treatment, are discussed in much too summary a fashion, especially given the less-than-ideal quality of the photographs, and the similar language employed for these descriptions undermines the coherence of these works' proposed chronology. This is all the more apparent in those instances where the author emphasizes the ‚transposition‘ of the underlying type.

Eight of nine examples of ‚Idealplastik‘ (cat. nos. 72–80), despite their iconographic differences, fall into three basic chronological groups. Cat. nos. 72, 73, and 79, are dated to the Augustan / Julio-Claudian period and consistently described as having been modeled with care to render muscular detail. Yet (despite the obvious difficulties of relying on illustrations – I proceed here with no small degree of trepidation) it seems that cat. no. 79 displays a torso largely defined as anatomical segments divided by muscule groupings, while no. 72 shows a greater tendency toward softened transitions between these segments, and the diminution of linear divisions that so often follows from such surface articulation. No. 73, which, as the author points out, is meant to depict an adolescent, and accordingly displays less musculature, yet is nevertheless fleshier, and still displays a greater tendency towards linearity in its surface structure. Such definition of the forms seems rather different, for example, from those of the Basel Discophoros, similarly dated by P. ZANKER (Klassizistische Statuen [1974] Taf. 1,2; p. 5) to the Tiberian-early Claudian period.

A second group, dated roughly to the Hadrianic period, includes nos. 74–76, all of which are described in similar language (cf. e. g., cat. no. 72, p. 82: „Le modelé des muscles fait ressortir tous les détails anatomiques, tout particulièrement les abdominaux“; cat. no. 74, p. 84: „Le modelé du torse fait ressortir les détails de la musculature“). The author notes, concerning no. 76 (dated to the Hadrianic period, „or slightly later“), that „le modelé des muscles traduit le caractère juvenile de la représentation. L'artiste a tout particulièrement accentué les pectoraux, les abdominaux, les hanches … (etc.)“. Iconographic differences aside, the lean and schematic „youthfulness“ of this version of the Dresdener Knabe is strikingly distinct from that fleshier, „less muscular“ quality which characterized the Julio-Claudian version of the Discophoros, cat. no. 73. And what of the similarly dated yet dramatically different version of the Doryphoros, cat. no. 75, so clearly polished, with its torso's softened transitions between planes, and lacking the hard linearity, especially at the hips, that marks the other two works?

There is no mention that of these three ‚Hadrianic‘ works, only no. 75 has sculpted pubic hair. This is associated by the author with Flavian styles, despite the presence of pubic hair on cat. nos. 77 and 80, both dated to ca. 100 AD. As the author points out, these two sculptures were both probably employed as body types for portraits. And while they do exhibit certain similarities of form, and are likely to be of similar date, no. 80 nevertheless appears softer in its modeling, with less apparent definition of anatomical segments.

These comments are intended to suggest how some of the problems posed by these sculptures – essentially problems of connoisseurship – are magnified by their individuated analyses. Many of these questions cannot possibly be resolved save by means of autopsy, yet the stubborn fact remains that much scholarship depends on catalogues such as this one. As it is the comparative aspect of the discipline that,

in large measure, allows the serious study of such monuments, it is incumbent upon us to continue to perfect the language in which those comparisons are articulated.

Finally, some brief comments on individual works:

Cat. no. 4: The author notes the head's eclectic quality, yet vacillates between an identification as Apollo or Harpocrates. It must be said that the face is strikingly elongated, and thus lacks entirely that distinctive ‚cherubic' quality so typical of the young Egyptian divinity.

Cat. no. 11: This does not appear to be antique; the author presents no comparanda for its style, and none are known to me. When it might have been made is unclear, but it should be noted that awareness of this iconography was early (witness Donatello's so-called Atys-Amorino), and widespread, as is clear from the appearance of a relief (now Villa Albani, Rome) that was much-copied in Renaissance epigraphical manuscripts, and engraved for JACOPO MAZZOCHIUS's Epigrammata antiquae urbis Romae (Rome, 1521).

Cat. no. 71: The Boston Museum's so-called Bartlett Head, cited as a comparison by the author, is similarly less carefully worked at the back. This one is a replica of the type, as the author points out, but despite its numerous restorations, seems to exhibit a much less graceful presentation, lacking the subtle turn and forward inclination that enlivens the Boston head.

Cat. no. 103: This head of Alexander, so heavily cleaned („dépourvus de patine, les traces de la surface d'origine n'étant visibles qu'à l'arrière de la chevelure, dans les creux des boucles et dans les coins des yeux"), compares well, in style (treatment of hair, structure of face) with the Boston Augustus, similarly dated.

Toronto   Michael Koortbojian