

Elizabeth Bartman, *Ancient Sculptural Copies in Miniature*. Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition, Band 19. Verlag E. J. Brill, Leiden 1992. XIV, 222 Seiten, 94 Abbildungen.

Nothing better exemplifies our current approach to the study of Classical sculpture than recent discussions of Roman copies. Our attitude has finally changed, from one of complete acceptance of every statue of Roman date as a copy or reflection of a Greek original, to one of controlled skepticism that is willing to consider each monument on its own merit, without prejudging the issue. Thus, sculptures can be seen as true and faithful replicas of Greek prototypes, as modified versions of the Greek original, as pastiches combining parts taken from various models, and finally even as later creations only quoting or echoing earlier Greek forms and styles. Whereas, even as late as a few decades ago, each sculptural find was evaluated almost solely on the basis of its presumed inspiration, now each may be examined as well within its own chronological context and as indicative of the taste and function for which it was created, regardless of its possible prototype. Whereas before an implicit judgment of inferior value accompanied the label of 'copy', today such labels are used more discriminately and with some appreciation. This process has been accompanied by renewed interest in technical features. Sculptural techniques are receiving considerable attention, together with a much more scientific approach to marble identification, based on exacting isotopic analyses aimed at determining proveniences throughout the Mediterranean basin.

This is not to say that the battle has been won. Traditionalists who cling to the safety net of the *ipse dixit* and the *communis opinio*, and scholars specializing in later periods of artistic activity who cannot keep abreast with archaeological discoveries and theories, continue to teach the history of ancient art at the level of the handbooks. In particular, many still adhere to the romantic notions of creativity and the individual genius developed by the nineteenth century on the basis of Roman literary sources, although it has now been repeatedly acknowledged that only a handful of extant statues can be positively identified with those mentioned by the ancient writers. Even Bartman's book under review shows the occasional lapse into the quagmire of attributions and the stylistic jargon of attributionists, almost as if by force of habit, with its allusions to *opera nobilia* and Greek masterpieces (e.g., p. 16 n. 1; pp. 37; 52; 84). Yet this perceptive author goes a long way toward investigating the copying phenomenon in a positive light, and her text provides many insights into the artistic conceptions of the Romans. As I should make immediately clear, I find myself in complete agreement with the majority of Bartman's conclusions and thus, understandably, I consider this monograph both timely and important. It should be required for all college courses on Greek and Roman sculpture.

The text is written in a literate, clear style that invites reading. Most of the items mentioned are illustrated by reproductions of good quality. Regrettably, typographical errors abound, and even some 'computer mistakes' caused by our current mode of composition. A few factual inaccuracies (the replica of the Athena Parthenos from Pergamon stood in the Library, not in front of the goddess' temple [p. 32]; the 'onlooker' within the Pergamene tableau of the Freeing of Prometheus is the Kaukasos [p. 40]) do not detract from the soundness of the whole, and some incomplete or erroneous references are not likely to mislead the reader. Bibliography is extensive and up to date.

Bartman approaches the world of copies from the specific viewpoint of the miniature, by which term she defines any "copy that reduces the height of the original statue to approximately one meter or less" (p. 9). She is more circumspect in approaching a definition of 'copy' and its synonyms 'replica' and 'version', which denote "a work of art that deliberately recalls an earlier image by reproducing its salient formal and iconographic features – its pose, composition, ponderation, proportions, facial type, hairstyle, costume, and other attributes" (p. 9). Two items are omitted from this definition: size and date. The first omission is

intentional, in that Bartman believes that size is irrelevant to the classification. Even under life-size sculptures can be replicated at smaller scale, and miniatures, far from being inferior copies, can be more detailed than full-size versions, as well as more valuable because often made of precious or expensive materials, such as rock crystal and ivory. The second item is in essence discussed throughout the book. Bartman would accept that reduced replicas of specific originals were made as early as the fifth century B. C. or even the Archaic period. But, to my mind, the date of the copy (which, by necessity, must post-date the original) is no more significant than the date of the prototype – not, however, for the traditional aim of recovering the Greek model.

Bartman's study is concerned exclusively with copies or imitations of Greek sculpture. The author gives proper credit to the copyists for their individual transformations of the prototypes into objects suited to the taste of the patrons and the new locations for which the sculptures were intended, but she sees in the Greek pedigree of the models (whether sculptural or pictorial) a large part of the reason for their commission. Yet equally important, I believe, is to acknowledge that Roman ideal creations could be copied as well. In taking for granted that in Imperial times the world of copying focussed solely on Greek ideal statuary and Roman portraits, we are denying the sculptors of that period any ability to improvise and create anew, even if in the styles and modes of a cultured Greek past. Bartman states tentatively that "as much as half of the statuary made by the Romans probably consisted of sculptural copies of earlier works" (p. 3), and she is probably correct. But I would insist that we keep our eyes open and that some of the monuments currently considered of Hellenistic or even Classical derivation be properly reassessed as Roman creations, when stringent criteria of style and content can be met. More on this point later.

Bartman's monograph, a well revised version of her 1984 dissertation for Columbia University, falls into two parts. The first section (Chapters 1–3) deals with the miniature copy in context, and sets the general background. The second section focuses on three 'case studies', each accompanied by a catalogue, that illustrate her main conclusions. All three studies introduce new important points, however, so that the first part cannot be considered complete without the second.

In her introduction, Bartman explains her approach. She emphasizes that the ancients did not make the modern distinction between major and minor arts, derivative versus original, and that they in fact considered each statue – whether full size or miniature, whether original or copy – simply a statue. Her method is comparative, but not in order to select the replica that may adhere most faithfully to the prototype. She seeks instead to "determine how and why the copies look the way they do" (p. 5), interpreting stylistic and iconographic changes to arrive at the techniques and attitudes underlying ancient copying. This laudable aim is not always attained, at least in explicit form, but the many important observations made through the case studies offset this minor drawback. She states that no single ratio for proportional reduction was used in antiquity, although she believes that several existed, and her first example, the *Leaning Satyr* (Anapauomenos) usually attributed to Praxiteles, allows her to discern a pattern of reduction to one-half and two-thirds of the original. Four Tables of Measurements in appendices provide comparative dimensions not only for the *Satyr* at normal and at reduced scale, but also for the other two 'case studies': the *Lateran Poseidon* and the *Herakles Epitrapezios*.

The general discussion covers the types of sculptures copied in reduced format; the materials of these miniatures (bronze, marble, ivory, precious stones, and even terracotta albeit with restricted range of subjects); and other manifestations of miniaturization, for instance, in architecture. A chapter on history traces the practice of copying from early Greek times, but with special acknowledgment of the role played by the Pergamon Attalids and the Romans. A section on display considers the miniatures not only within the private, but also the public sphere – e.g., the *Trajanic Baths* at Cyrene and the *Roman theater* at Capua. This topic leads easily into a discussion of function, with special reference to the copying of cult images and other dedications in Greek sanctuaries. The issue of decorative versus religious use of the miniature copies is left open, but a definite shift in artistic purposes from the latter to the former is acknowledged by the late second century B. C.

Bartman finds that practically every statuary type could be replicated in reduced format. The apparent exceptions are themselves notable: the *Tyrannicides* by Kritios and Nesiotes, perhaps because of their historical significance, and the *Doryphoros* of Polykleitos, perhaps because it established an ideal paradigm that could not be altered. Two statuettes in the *Doryphoros* pose display enough changes in features and

attributes to be considered variants rather than miniature copies. But then, not all ancient works were copied, at whatever scale – not even the Greek originals known to have been in Rome. As Bartman points out, the popularity of Lysippos' *Apoxyomenos* is not reflected by its two extant replicas, while the *Laokoon*, although much praised, was not copied at all.

I still seek the answer to these anomalies in the likely purpose of copies, and thus also of miniatures. Although the Greeks probably did not use statuary to embellish their houses, the Romans who infiltrated the Mediterranean basin by the late second century B. C. brought with them the practice of decorating rooms and gardens with sculptures, several of them in reduced format. I would contend, however, that appropriateness of content determined context; that divine figures (Aphrodite, Hermes, Herakles), whether in gardens or habitation quarters, would carry with them a religious aura appropriate to the setting, and that more typical 'garden statuary', such as satyrs, Nymphs, Erotes, animals, even fishermen and peasants, which may look purely decorative to us, may have symbolized for their owners the animistic landscape beyond the boundaries of the villa. Images of athletes would have recalled the palaestra and sport (or life) competitions. Thus only statuary types with a specific Roman appeal would have been copied (as Bartman would agree; cf. her closing lines, pp. 189–190), and not those with private meaning or 'famous' authorship. I thus continue to believe that the alleged fame of the *Apoxyomenos* (if we have identified it properly) is more modern than ancient, despite Pliny's anecdote, and that Panhellenic sanctuaries did not allow exact copying.

This statement still rings true to me also for the Athenian Akropolis. The Hermes beset by copyists in Lucian's *Iupp. Trag.* is in fact in the Agora, not on the citadel (p. 13). The fragmentary face identified by Ashmole as the original of the Hope Hygieia type gives no assurance of having stood on the Akropolis (p. 45), since in recent times many marbles found their way there from different locations. The very fact that the fragment could be mistakenly attributed to the Parthenon would seem to belie Ashmole's attribution of the composition to Kephisodotos' circle, and the position of the original east of the altar to *Athene Hygieia* is only tentatively postulated because of a laconic mention in Pausanias (1,23,4). I am not sure that other recent identifications by Greek scholars (although not cited by Bartman) – the fragments of the Barberini Suppliant and the Reclining Aphrodite types (known from several Roman copies) – represent *marble* originals set up on the Akropolis (the Reclining Aphrodite may not even be Classical, but Roman classicizing). Finally, I would object to identifying the female head from the Agora (S 2354) as a copy of the Nike on the hand of the Athena Parthenos. Its approximate resemblance to the Nike of Paionios is not sufficient to postulate the latter's 'quotation' from an earlier monument, and the irregular neckline of the Roman version is hardly evidence for a Victory costume. Note, moreover, that at 0.29 m. from chin to crown, the Agora head can hardly qualify as belonging to a statuette (p. 46 n. 80). Even the copies of the Parthenos' shield are not on a one-to-one scale, as the recent reproduction for the Nashville Parthenon has shown. The practical difficulties entailed by the exact copying of colossal and precious cult images are correctly assessed by Bartman, yet she seems unaware of contradiction in accepting that direct replicas existed of "at least parts" of the Parthenos and her Nike (pp. 45–46; 118 and n. 58).

The Resting Satyr provides an ideal case study, in that more than one hundred copies of it remain, one-fifth of them in miniature. Bartman's catalogue lists 21 items, all of marble, although 7 of them (nos. 6; 8; 9; 10; 14; 18; 19), being over 1 m. high, seem too big for her definition. They are included because they represent almost exactly a two-third reduction of the original height (1.72 m.). Yet there is greater range in dimensions and proportions among the miniatures than in the full-scale replicas, which are also stylistically closer to one another than the former. Within the statuettes, two versions are distinguished, those in 'Fluid' and those in 'Flat' style, although with numerous cross-overs of traits. The popularity of the type is explained by its conformity to an androgynous ideal of beauty particularly appreciated by the Romans. I would again stress its appropriateness for specific Roman contexts, such as gardens and villas, as indicated also by the fact that the smallest copy still measures 0.60 m., and that no bronzes or 'pocket' versions are known. This is certainly not true of the other two case studies.

A section on "Techniques of Copying in Miniature" expands on technical details, the use of plaster casts and of measuring points. To Bartman's bibliography, add M. PFANNER, *Jahrb. DAI* 104, 1989, 158–257; pp. 186–187 discuss the enlargement and reduction of portraits, and 236–251 list sculptures showing *punti*, including purely Roman works like the Trajanic barbarians. Note that Bartman's Cat. 20, fig. 20, a miniature Satyr in Terracina, has been printed reversed. The snake emerging from the tree-trunk support of

Cat. 17 (fig. 49) recurs in the statue of a youth at Bowdoin College, where it is undoubtedly part of the original (Museum of Art no. 1961, 97; cf., e.g., my *Fifth Century Styles*, 215–216, figs. 136–137).

Additional sections, on "The Technical Evidence of the Satyrs" and "The Myth of the Exact Copy", allow Bartman to expand on her analysis of details and to conclude that miniature copies were most often made freehand directly from the original or from an intermediate model such as a line drawing, rather than by measuring from a plaster cast of the original, which would have been 'over-qualified' for the miniature. She follows Peter Rockwell in believing the pointing machine to be a relatively modern invention, not used in antiquity, and, on the basis of the Resting Satyrs, affirms that truly exact copies did not exist. The concept of 'copyist addition' should be replaced by that of 'copyist interpretation', in acknowledgment of the considerable skill and independence that went into translating from the prototype. Such skill belonged to the full-scale copyist as to the maker of miniatures, who were often one and the same person, and whose artistic contribution might have been particularly appreciated by the Roman patron.

A section on the demographics of the Resting Satyr copies allows further insights. Given their very wide distribution throughout the Roman Empire, these replicas cast doubt on the traditional definition of 'provincial', and raise the important question on whether it is a matter of style or findspot. Examples of the type found in Rome are flat and disproportioned enough to fit the definition, whereas highly refined items come from Lyon and Lepcis Magna. I would agree completely with the statements that "whether imported or made locally, the provincial copy shared with copies displayed elsewhere the function of confirming the elite status of its owner" (p. 84), and that "imperial Rome was the trend-setter for ideal sculpture" (p. 85). The same conclusion, based on a wider range of types, was reached by E. HARNETT in her dissertation on the sculptures from Minturnae (Bryn Mawr College 1986, of forthcoming publication): all subjects in the province could find parallels in the capital city, as if chosen from a sales catalogue.

As final comments, Bartman suggests that wealthy owners tended to prefer large-scale copies to the miniatures, that statues for public display were often hastily made, and that we still have not reached full understanding of copying practices and workshops. Yet the picture is further refined by the next two case studies.

The Lateran Poseidon type is represented by a total of 34 miniatures, of which 24 are in bronze, and Cat. 32, in marble, is not pertinent. Here the opposite situation prevails, in that only two large-scale and somewhat dissimilar stone versions of the composition are known. Bartman convincingly argues that the figural scheme originated in two-dimensional form, probably in Greek painting, and was then adapted to freestanding renderings at miniature scale without specific reference to a single prototype. The colossal statue from Portus (the Trajanic harbor of Rome) that has given its name to the type is one such adaptation, not the allegedly close copy of a Greek masterpiece, often attributed to Lysippos, which never existed; its mediocre quality is further disproof of this notion. It was created in Imperial times, when the pose with raised foot made it compositionally similar to images of the Emperor stepping on a conquered enemy, and probably carried the same message of victory and territorial expansion. As a type, however, the image was a true signifier of Poseidon, appropriately connected with ancient harbors and repeatedly selected for their adornment, with the customary ancient preference for the formulaic over the novel. Our modern tendency to value the large-scale replicas over the miniatures is another indication of our prejudices.

I believe Bartman is entirely correct in advocating a generic motif rather than a specific prototype for the 'Lateran Poseidon' type, and in equating it with representations of Zeus hurling the thunderbolt, so often repeated in statuette format. The miniatures are highly idiosyncratic in their appearance, the bronzes apparently more cursory the smaller their size. Most of them could easily have been 'pocketed' by the ancient owners (p. 117), thus stressing, to my mind, the devotional purpose of such images. It is perhaps significant that the bronzes larger than 18 cm. in Bartman's catalogue are only two: the Ambelokipi figurine (Cat. 2; 0.45 m.) and the Poseidon from Pella (Cat. 22; 0.46 m., 0.52 m. with base), the latter definitely known to have come from a shrine. That the marbles are fewer, and usually above 0.54 m. in height (the smallest being Cats. 10 and 13, in Eleusis and Herakleion), seems to me to negate their use as mere decoration, and to emphasize their possible public or religious nature. Yet, even Cat. 29, fig. 57, at an estimated height of only 18 cm., most unusual for a stone piece, comes from the Baths at Carthage; it is completely different in appearance, almost barbaric with its woolly hair and disproportioned head. Cat. nos. 16 and 33 are above 1 m. high, thus not conformant to the definition.

In discussing the 'Lateran type', Bartman comes closest to accepting a Roman date for the many independ-

ent inventions after a generic Greek 'prototype'. Her point that four of the preserved eight replicas of the head have drilled pupils should be stressed for further verification that ideal statuary avoided contemporary practices in its evocation of a classical past. Only three of the Poseidon miniatures, in the author's opinion, could form a coherent unit, which she names the Eleusis group after one of its members. All others present wide variation in orientation, proportions, and details. The concept of *Grundtypus* seems here applicable, as used by CH. LANDWEHR in her study of bearded heads of river-god type (in: B. ANDREA [ed.], *Phyromachos-Probleme* [1990] 101–122, esp. p. 117), and by P. KRANZ in his analysis of the Klein-Glienicke Asklepios (Jahrb. DAI 104, 1989, 107–155, esp. 126–127). The point should be stressed, because even recent publications repeat the Lateran Poseidon's connection with a famous statue of the late fourth century (e.g., E. WALTER-KARYDI, Jahrb. DAI 106, 1991, 243–259, esp. 257–258). My initial position, as stated by Bartman (p. 105 n. 16), was modified after her research (see now my *Hellenistic Sculpture 1*, 125–126).

Another point worth making, because it has been generally ignored, is that the so-called Demetrios Poliorketes from Herculaneum has goat's, not bull's horns, as noted by A. RUMPF as early as 1963 (Mitt. DAI Athen 78, 1963, 176–199; cf. H. P. LAUBSCHER, Mitt. DAI Athen 100, 1985, 333–353). Allusion to Poseidon is at most limited to the pose, and even bull's horns have been equated with Dionysos rather than with the sea-god.

The final case study, on the Herakles Epitrapezios, opens with a controversial statement – that miniatures were originally made by the Greeks because of technical difficulties with stone-carving and bronze-casting. If the latter technology may have required mastering, this is not the case for sculpture, which seems to have begun at almost colossal scale, probably because of Near Eastern/Egyptian inspiration and tutoring. The phenomenon of under life-size statuary is indeed a manifestation of the Archaic period, but not because of manufacturing difficulties, and is certainly more prevalent toward the end than at the beginning of the phase. Bartman is probably correct in stressing the renewed importance given to the miniature in Hellenistic times. Yet I am not sure that the Herakles Epitrapezios validates her point.

Although carefully wary of Martial's epigram and Statius's *Silvae* describing the pedigree of Novius Vindex' table ornament, Bartman would accept a Lysippan creation at small scale and Alexander's initial ownership of the piece or of one like it. She explores the theory that the Sikyonian master might have created first a colossal image and then a miniature, which the extant statuettes would replicate, but she ultimately rejects it. The Alba Fucens Herakles, colossal, is considered peripheral rather than central, other large-scale renderings being variants rather than copies, only 'related' to the Lysippan original (p. 156). The few bronze statuettes (4, as against 15 in marble, one in limestone, and one in terracotta) are inconsistent in pose, style, size, or composition. By contrast, the marbles are more coherent, although divergent in certain details. The so-called London group, comprising 11 items, represents a 'subset' sharing basic iconography and dimensions, while 5 additional items may qualify as mirror reversal. This uniformity of scale within the London group suggests a prototype of the same size, but larger than Vindex's bronze (said by Statius to measure less than one Roman foot), perhaps after a second or third generation model (p. 165). The type would therefore be an example of a work initially conceived in miniature, that was replicated to size and even enlarged by later copyists.

I find it hard to believe that an object in private possession (whether the Epitrapezios said to belong to Alexander, or that owned by Vindex, if not one and the same) would be made available for copying to any approximate scale. Lysippos can hardly have created the piece for Alexander after the Macedonian left for Asia, when the sculptor seems to have been otherwise fully occupied at Dion with the large bronze group of the *hetairoi* fallen at the Granikos, as well as with other commissions. I doubt that the master followed the king in his campaigns. Alexander's attachment for Herakles would hardly have demanded the god represented with a full beard, in a convivial pose. A youthful, beardless rendering in a more heroic stance would have better suited the image Alexander was trying to convey of himself, if his alleged portraits with the lionskin can be given any credence. The Greek Herakles, I suspect, was a tragic or potentially threatening figure when drinking, witness the consequences of some of his bouts. By contrast, the bibulous Hercules set *on* a table seems to fit best with Roman convivial ideas, perhaps meant to encourage the drinker *at* the table. Why couldn't the concept of the seated Epitrapezios have originated within Roman circles, if even the epithet is only known through Roman poetry? Bartman provides a lengthy discussion of the term and of the possible setting of the miniatures, but she fails to convince me. I would agree that the religious interpretation given to the type by Picard on the basis of Phoenician practices (reviewed in Appendix 1) is

not compelling. But the very number of the stone miniatures, as contrasted with what would have been a more obvious replication in the original bronze, suggests to me a specific Roman meaning for the type, placed within a garden or on a marble table in a villa. Even the possible second-century B. C. date of the terracotta example (Cat. 8) from Sinalunga (at 0.47 m. of considerable height for its medium) would not contradict this theory, given its Italic provenience.

My skepticism with regard to Lysippos and Alexander in no way undermines Bartman's general conclusions and approach. The Epitrapezios still reflects Greek styles and forms, and a Roman/Hellenistic origin for the invention of the type would represent just another facet of the phenomenon already explored in connection with the Lateran Poseidon. It would fit with the conception of the *Grundtypus* mentioned above, and with Bartman's analysis of the aims and meanings behind the copies.

The length of this review should convey something of the interest elicited by this book, and the importance of its content.

Bryn Mawr

Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway