

Greek Statuary, Roman Portraits

The Problem of Copies¹

Jean Charles Balty

The originals of great classical Greek statuary—cult idols (*agalmata*) raised in the cella of a temple, or ex-voto (*anathemata*, offerings) dedicated in a sanctuary, or even, more rarely, political dedications erected in public places, were not destined to be copied and only the pure chance of history, from the fall of Greece to Rome and the emergence of a taste for these works of art, gave rise to a process of copying that would snowball. The *Urbild*² of a Roman imperial effigy was never to remain unique. Quite the contrary, it was, by its very nature, destined to be multiplied from the moment of its completion, for the sake of propaganda and thorough distribution of the emperor's image. At first, we cannot imagine a situation more different. However, today, the historical value of these copies is the same, the original having disappeared in one case as in the other. This is not the only paradox.

As we know, with all-too-rare exceptions at hand (the Delphi Charioteer, the Zeus from Cape Artemision, the Antikythera and Marathon ephebes, the Riace warriors), classical Greek statuary is only known by means of these often late replicas³ of originals that have disappeared forever. Pillaged during the plunder of cities such as Corinth (146 BC) or Athens (86 BC), these masterpieces, more often large bronzes, were brought to Rome to adorn the temples and public squares of the conquerors. Part of the plunder was lost at sea; these are precisely the statues that several unexpected discoveries have revealed, because they never reached Rome. Those that did arrive and were esteemed, cited, and copied at will were destroyed, with all-too-rare exceptions as well (such as the *Thermenherrscher* and the seated boxer from the Museo Nazionale Romano), no doubt because they were melted down at the end of

Antiquity during the barbarian invasions. Thus we have, on one hand, copies of works irretrievably lost and, on the other hand, the originals of statues that were perhaps never copied—which thus prevents any comparison between the two. There is yet another exception: the numerous copies and adaptations of the Caryatids of the Erechtheum, including those made for the attic of the porticoes in the Forum of Augustus or for the Euripus of Hadrian's Villa at Tivoli.⁴ They are copies of marble originals, not of bronze ones, and although their evidence is crucial for demonstrating the various options taken by copyists at different moments, we are still faced with just as many questions—beginning with the many questions that arise during the transfer to marble of certain features of the bronze (the addition of a support to balance the work and of lugs to reinforce certain limbs placed too far away from the body, the adoption of a veritable *Bronzestil* to give the appearance of metal,⁵ etc.), which is not effectively illustrated by the present example.

It is important not to underestimate the methodological difficulties of this situation. But is it therefore necessary to speak of “the ghosts of classical Greek statuary” as did Ph. Bruneau⁶ (with whom I share a good number of the questions, nevertheless), and to believe that by seeking to identify the artists, we do nothing but “enter them in a parade of invalids, where uncertain attributions serve only to bolster other, equally dubious attributions,” all of which ultimately concerns only the history of Roman sculpture and not that of Greek sculpture? Nobody will doubt today that this research is just as revealing about the tastes of the Roman period, but these changes from the originals only deal, to be honest, with the expression, depiction, and the angle of the eye opening, the feature of the mouth that effectively discloses the character of the period in which they were copied,⁷ and not the forms themselves. Dozens of replicas generally suffice as proof. No copy is negligible, however, for it always surrenders one detail or another of the original, just as it reveals the period in which it was created. Thus, it is in fact the critical study of each of these replicas, followed by a comparative study of the most certain occurrences and the variables (*Kopienrezension*, *Kopienkritik*) that will ultimately give rise to a global impression of what these originals looked like. Establishing a rich series of castings, like

those in the classical archaeological seminars in German universities, the Skulpturhalle of Basel or the Cast Gallery of the Asmolean Museum in Oxford,⁸ facilitates comparisons, and can even provide certain joinings of the fragmentary pieces of two different collections. From Adolf Furtwängler, Walter Amelung, and Georg Lippold to Walter-Herwig Schuchhardt, the method was refined, and, over the past few years, has led to a series of monographs devoted to several famous originals transmitted by large series of replicas: aside from those of Polykleitos, of which an important exhibition in Frankfurt recalled their high favor throughout Antiquity,⁹ we shall cite the Cassel Apollo, the Leda of Timotheos, the Satyrs of Praxiteles, the Eros of Lysippos, and the Farnese Hercules,¹⁰ alongside countless detailed articles. But, as we shall notice, the method remained—and remains—practiced mostly in Germany, or by those (Greeks and Italians mostly) who studied and were initiated into the field at these universities. In France, it hardly became the focus of detailed work and is only mentioned in handbooks.

The 1954 discovery in Baiae of some 430 pieces of plaster clearly originating from the screenings of a copyist's workshop, certainly revived cross-Rhine interest for these kinds of study, although the collection could, due to its poor state of preservation, seem completely hopeless at first glance. Above all, it allows us to return to the manufacturing itself of the replicas, which were from the casts that these pieces finally revealed. An allusion of Lucian (*Zeus Tragoïdos*, 33) to the Hermes in the Athenian Agora pitched every day with materials that served to make a specific mold, feature by feature (head, torso, arms and legs), is sufficient proof of the first phase of the process: the preparation of the mold which would serve to produce the positives whence these precious but meager little fragments finally reached us. By means of a technique called "the pointing process," practitioners in their workshops thus materialized the gaps their compass—or any other instrument¹¹—recorded between the most significant guide marks of the cast, which they could measure in three dimensions with somewhat precision. The Baiae discovery could only strengthen the defenders of the *Kopienkritik*. G.M.A. Richter immediately recognized the right side of the face of Aristogeiton

of the famous Tyrannicides group.¹² W.-H. Schuchhardt and Chr. Landwehr continued on with the work. After the joining of fragments, but also the elimination of numerous unusable elements without any preserved surface, the cataloging and first stages of identification could begin. But Schuchhardt's death in January 1976 delayed the completion of the work and the solo publication of the results by his pupil in 1985: *Die antiken Gipsabgüsse aus Baiae. Griechische Bronzestatuen in Abgüssen römischer Zeit*. Thanks to Chr. Landwehr's expert eye, 67 of the 293 usable pieces could be attributed to various famous statues dating from the fifth and fourth centuries BC.¹³ The conclusions were historically important for ancient sculpture, as we are now better able to measure the inevitable lag between these fragmentary casts of bronze originals and the best-known marble replicas, none of which have the precision of detail in the strands of hair or beard (cf. the Aristogeiton), the plasticity or transparency of the drapery (cf. the chiton folds of the Mattei and Sciarra Amazons). The copyist simplifies, schematizes, and hardens in relation to the model; the billowing of the clothes stiffens, or certain features disappear, such as the Mattei Amazon's narrow shoulder belt on the majority of copies (Vatican, Turin, and even Tivoli). The *Kopienkritik* method, practiced widely for nearly one hundred years now, had perhaps never imagined such clear divergences.

* * *

If we disregard a few particular cases of pairs and doublets destined for parallel sanctuaries,¹⁴ it certainly seems that the phenomenon of the copy as such, that is to say on a somewhat industrial scale, only dates back to the Hellenistic Age and to the care taken by the sovereigns of Pergamum—and perhaps those of Antioch and Alexandria, since we know of their interest in Greek culture—to establish veritable collections. The Athena of the Attalid library is the most revealing example, and constitutes valuable evidence of what Pheidias's chryselephantine statue for the Parthenon was like. It was in the Roman world, however, that the practice grew to the extent we now know it to be. Thousands of replicas adorned peristyles and meeting rooms of the richest homes, to the point that we could not study classical sculpture of the fifth and

fourth centuries today if it were not for this extraordinary infatuation of an entire people. In the history of art, no other period can compare in this respect.

At first, it was no doubt simply a phenomenon of acculturation. The early second century marked the end of the Punic Wars and Rome's emergence in the eastern Mediterranean—after a long period of isolation. Until then, Rome was nothing but a small central Italian city, relatively withdrawn. The representatives of the *nobilitas* were rich ground landlords with rough, austere customs. For them, tradition (*mos maiorum*) ruled. Therefore, the initial contact with Greek art was often negative. By the pen of Livy, Cato the Elder purposefully linked the decadence of ancestral customs to the arrival of Greek *objets d'art*,¹⁵ much like Caesar, who explained the gallantry of the Belgian people by their distance from the Mediterranean and from the "sophistication of its civilization."¹⁶ But this rejection by some, attached to the tradition and image of a certain rusticity of Rome which equaled authenticity in their eyes, was coupled with the new value that others attached to such luxury items from a culture other than their own. Just as Cato was indignant about the mockery of ancient temples' terra cotta statues,¹⁷ did Suetonius not write that Augustus received a Rome of brick and left it one of marble at his death?¹⁸ The two hundred years that span the fall of Syracuse (212 BC) to the end of the Augustan Age are in fact the determining period for our subject. The originals of great Greek sculpture stripped from their sanctuaries or the *agorai* of the conquered cities and those that were "granted" in the stipulations of Rome peace treaties as a counterpart of the legates' commitment to no longer execute the inhabitants of the conquered cities, henceforth adorned the temples and public places of the *Urbs*, where they very soon appeared.¹⁹

We must not forget that artists also followed the conqueror and that many sculptors were then summoned to Rome to embellish the quarters of the Campus Martius, where the glory of the triumphant conqueror would be displayed. To satisfy this new taste, architects like Hermodoros of Salamis worked in Rome beside sculptors like Timarchides, Polykles, and Dionysios, or later Skopas the Younger. It is in this particular climate, as the result of an exterior stimulus and a sudden infatuation for classical Greek

art that Roman eclecticism must be understood. Copying is but one of its aspects. The law prohibited the conquerors from appropriating plunder that belonged solely to the Roman people; they resorted therefore to copying to decorate their villas, which imitated the luxury of Hellenistic rulers. Although one could collect the small bronzes of Delos or Corinth and precious tableware, one could only reproduce famous statues or imitate them.

In the court of the Pompeii palaestra, a marble replica of the Doryphoros by Polykleitos stood on a base over one meter high, sufficient enough to prove the sculpture's new stature of *oeuvre d'art*²⁰; at Herculaneum, in the small square peristyle of the so-called Villa of the Pisones, a bronze herm of the work stood beside a bust of one of the Amazons, also by one of the great masters of the fifth century; and a marble herm of the same Doryphoros also came from Herculaneum. In the closed space of houses or libraries, the reduction to herms allowed for a practical regrouping of these valued masterpieces, the company of which was ardently sought—as new references for an entire *art de vivre*, an entire culture. Elsewhere, there were other “companions”: athletes in the so-called Villa of Cynthia at Tivoli, prominent figures from the Bacchic thiasos in the Villa of the Quintilii on the via Appia, Apollo and the Muses in the so-called Villa of Cassius, also at Tivoli, portraits of scholarly men, statesmen, and philosophers in that same villa and in the Villa of the Pisones.²¹ Certain amateurs had two or more copies of the same admired work, such as the proprietor of the villa of Santa Marinella, in southern Etruria, where two slightly different versions of the Meleager of Skopas²² were found, or the owner of the Villa of the Quintilii, who had three copies of the *Child with Goose* by Boethos,²³ or Domitian, whose villa of Castelgandolfo theater aligned four replicas of the pouring Satyr of Praxiteles.²⁴ They all shared the same rhythm, just like the two Eros unbending the bow from the *ninfeo degli Eroti* at Ostia, on the main street that crosses the city from east to west. But elsewhere, mirror reversals were manufactured so as to alternate the ponderation of the works within composite sets, which were therefore in greater demand. The pointing technique made this possible, just as it facilitated the creation of reductions (to two thirds, half, and one third) of these classical originals for a

clientele of connoisseurs whose living space was not nearly as large as those of the great sanctuaries or the *agorai*.

Later, in the second century AD, the large halls of the *thermae*—the *frigidarium* in particular, but also, in the East, the *Kaisersaal*—in turn became veritable museums: just think of all that comes from the ensembles of Cherchel, Cyrene, or Lepcis Magna, of Ephesus or Miletus; and in Rome, from the baths of Caracalla.²⁵ In the recesses that punctuated the walls and on two or three levels, such as between the columns of the *scaenae frons* of theaters, the replicas of famous originals corresponded to each other following a program that the excavations, often of ancient date, did not allow us to specify, but the connections of which we would have liked to understand. Classical Greek statuary lived a second life through these replicas; they drew attention and comments from everyone; and just as in the many dialogues of Lucian²⁶—who was learned in this matter, for he almost joined his uncle's statuary workshop before deciding to study humanities—they entered into every conversation. It was by reference to these works that a woman's beauty, an adolescent's charm, an athlete's bearing or muscling was judged. Orators also made reference to them; aesthetic categories found anchorage points. Art criticism was born; and surely academicism too.

Are they not, in fact, the *opera nobilia* to whom Pasiteles, a contemporary of Pompey, had dedicated five books, according to Pliny, and whence he too seemed to draw inspiration for his work? Sculptor and toreutic artist, creator of an ivory statue of Jupiter in the god's temple at the center of the *porticus Metelli*, Pasiteles was the most distinctive representative of an entire artistic movement and perhaps of an actual school, which has now been named after him,²⁷ since two eclectic sculptors respectively signed one of their works "Stephanos, pupil of Pasiteles" and "Menelaos, pupil of Stephanos." The first statue, a young athlete of Polykleitan ponderation, but of slender shape and archaistic hair²⁸, combined the styles of different periods for an ensemble the author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* would not have disowned, he who went so far as to imagine that a work could have at once a head worthy of Myron, the arms of a statue of Praxiteles, and the torso of one of Polykleitos.²⁹ The second, the Electra and Orestes

group of the ancient Ludovisi collection, currently at the Museo Nazionale Romano (Palazzo Altemps),³⁰ romantic to perfection but somewhat grandiloquent, escapes the “kitsch” of several works of this time, where the amalgamation of form and style ultimately ruptures all artistic coherence, such as the famous San Ildefonso group³¹ that has sparked the imagination of so many “neo-classicists” since Winckelmann.

From there too, these *Umbildungen* that gave portrait heads to ideal statuary works and would flourish in Rome as early as the middle of the first century BC,³² contributing to placing the person represented under the sign or patronage of various heroes or gods.³³ The Marcellus by Kleomenes in the Louvre³⁴ is undoubtedly one of the most characteristic examples in the early Augustan Age, and thus remains one of our best iconographical sources for tracing back to the lost original, the Hermes Psychopompos called “Hermes Ludovisi,” created, so it seems, just after the Coronea disaster (447 BC), by one of the great Attic masters of the time, perhaps Pheidias or Myron.³⁵ And it is thanks to an equally faithful *Umbildung* that Walter Amelung was able to reconstitute, from isolated heads and torsos, the Sosandra attributed to Calamis,³⁶ before true replicas had even been discovered at Hama and at Baiae. These reconstructions are countless, sometimes combined two by two in a new work like the group of Mars and Venus, whose many copies secured success during the Antonine Age.³⁷

Copies, variants, and adaptations are but the diverse forms used by this *mimesis* which thus took on, depending on the case, the form of an *interpretatio*, an *imitatio*, or an *æmulatio*—to reuse the terms of the classical literature critique that Raimund Wünsche had so successfully sought to apply to plastic arts.³⁸ It would be to gravely under appreciate the character itself of Roman art, as it would to disregard these manifestations of an eclecticism that could “assume” these borrowings and affirm its indebtedness to classical Greek statuary, the source of all inspiration at the time.³⁹

* * *

The Greek portrait is an exceptional homage; it is thus, at the start, unique. Demosthenes, the valiant defender of Athenian freedom against the Macedonian invader, only had his portrait on the

agora forty-two years after his death; and still a specific decree was required for this bronze statue, like a few rare others, to stand in the center of the place near the base of the Tyrannicides—revered as heroes.⁴⁰

It was similar in Rome, for a time at least, to bridle political ambition. These images multiplied fairly quickly, however, because their power over the crowd was quite considerable; the Empire used them in the most developed way. Actually, such things began around the end of the Republican era during Sulla's dictatorship. In 84 BC, statues were erected to the praetor M. Marius Gratidianus by the tribes throughout the city⁴¹ for having taken a decree against monetary fraud. They were taken down two years later, upon Sulla's return, and Gratidianus was assassinated. The erection and destruction of statues followed promotion and disgrace, as demonstrated by the famous examples of Pompey⁴² or Tiberius.⁴³ The occupation of key points of urban topography spurred their increase; under the Empire, the imperial effigy was omnipresent: "in all the money-changer's bureaus, booths, bookstalls, eaves, porches, windows, anywhere and everywhere," to cite Fronto's amusing list in one of his letters to Marcus Aurelius.⁴⁴ Public life went on under the gaze of these images in the curia or the basilicas, the theater, the amphitheater, and in the baths; the statue of the emperor was even placed side by side with those of the gods in the temples. It was found in chapel of the signa in the camps, on the staff of the standards of the various units of the army, at the center of certain military decorations. And let us not forget the more personal homage that individuals paid to the person who had especially helped them or whom they truly held in veneration: there have been portraits in domestic lararia; and was not a bust of Septimius Severus at Ostia discovered in one of the Isola Sacra tombs?⁴⁵

The emperor chose the pose, the way he would be represented, and he also decided on the specific occasion for the creation of this effigy. Important moments of his reign provided the circumstances: accession, of course, but also marriage, triumph, jubilees (*decennalia*, *vicennalia*), attribution by the Senate of some exceptional title or another (*pater patriae*, *optimus princeps*). The elaboration of these determined iconographical types was entrusted to a

sculptor who created the *Urbild*, a terra cotta model no doubt like those that were discovered in the hypogeum of the *Valerii*, in the Vatican, and in a tomb of the via Prenestina⁴⁶ (these models must have been used to produce the marble portraits that were kept in the family). The *Urbild* was cast, and the positives obtained were copied, point by point, in various official workshops to produce the marble replicas for distribution throughout the Empire. These urban workshops in the capital (*stadtrömisch*) would also produce certain copies that were sent to the provinces where, in turn, they might serve as a starting point for another copying procedure, this time intended for the only local production. Certain small differences in the transmission of the original's traits can only be explained in this way,⁴⁷ just as it explains the mistakes of copyists made in the handwritten tradition of an ancient author (we could nevertheless establish the *stemma* of certain series of portraits as philologists do for these texts). Today we only possess—need we specify?—the marbles of these third and fourth production stages; with the rare exceptions noted above, we no longer have the casts used to produce them, and even less the fragile and fleeting *Urbild*. Some copies of excellent quality, *Leitstücke* in our lists of replicas, are perhaps the most remarkable products from the best official workshops. None, however, hold the finesse, the subtlety of relief, or the care itself that characterized the clay busts that left the hands of the sculptor. Works by skillful practitioners, they no doubt only retained a precious few of the “original” qualities.

These portraits also did not capture the individual like a snapshot, representing him at a given moment and in the event itself. Although resemblance was required—and it had its limits⁴⁸—so many filters intervened in the creation of the *Urbild* as a result of the iconographical models it was generally desired to follow that these effigies were, in short, more symbolic than truly realistic. Also, they did not evolve in a linear fashion, suiting the biological aging of the individual portrayed. The emperor was ageless: for forty years, until his death when he was over the age of seventy, Augustus would be a man in his prime radiating the beauty of the so-called “Primaporta type”⁴⁹ figures. The emperor did not age. His image was unchanging, the image of the eternity of the Empire—a complete political image if ever there was.⁵⁰ As such,

we can adequately judge the considerable number of his images that must have been distributed over the years (in spite of the appalling shipwreck of the works of Antiquity, there still remains over a hundred and fifty today) and the importance of this process of manufacturing and distribution—a direct consequence of the omnipresence of the imperial power in the entire urban space.

The relatively recent discovery in *Lucus Feroniae*, not far from Rome, of an inscription referring to the homage paid to the prefect of the City under emperor Nero's rule, L. Volusius Saturninus, who died a nonagenarian in 56 AD and to whom nine official statues were raised in different parts of the *Urbs*⁵¹, has somewhat revived the problem of typology, but not the question of the possible mass production of certain private portraits using the same process as the imperial portrait. As early as 1971, Klaus Fittschen⁵² had, however, pointed out certain doublets from the time of the Severi. Others belong to the Flavian period,⁵³ as well as to the middle of the third century.⁵⁴ Not to forget the effigies of Herodes Atticus and Polydeukion, found in Athens, Corinth, and in every villa of the famous ancient "millionaire."⁵⁵ In reality, all of these examples are more numerous than had been thought at times and would require a particular reexamination from this point of view. For although the busts of a charioteer from a much debated date⁵⁶ differ from one another on some details and could constitute the successive homage paid year to year throughout a long career, we have a good feeling that the majority of the other works mentioned here were actually mass produced—whatever the number of copies made may be.

What would then remain is the case of certain private portraits of which only one copy was made—portraits which, after the indispensable transfer from the clay model to marble (free carving had no longer been a practice for some time), would have been particularly well finished because they were done by the sculptor himself. Surely there were thousands, but we will never know which ones, and will content ourselves to point out the extraordinary quality of some works in comparison to the majority of the others, mass produced by less skillful practitioners; and there we enter into the greatest subjectivity.

* * *

The imperial portrait opened the door; the emperor's effigy lead the way and, in the most distant provinces, many were those who followed the successive trends of hairdressing, the expression, and the head position of those whose busts and statues dominated the public space. It is to this astonishing phenomenon of mimetism, which we know occurred in other periods of art history but never to such an extent elsewhere, that German archaeologists gave the name *Zeitgesicht* ("face of a certain period"). The imperial portrait, masculine or feminine, thus provides a valuable chronological reference, without which dating private portraits and works, because of their anonymity, would be difficult to achieve. Because they are the only reasonably datable productions of all classical sculpture, these portraits are thus what help to place the replicas of Greek classical originals in their real period, since these replicas take up, in the copyists' workshops, according to the tastes of the moment, certain expressive features of the portraits.⁵⁷ And there lies one final paradox for the phenomenon of copies in the Roman world.

Translated from the French by Mara Bertelsen

Notes

1. This article is limited to statuary. The manufacturing of coins will not be considered here, nor the production of terra cotta, which has already been examined in its various aspects at a recent colloquium: *Le Moulage en terre cuite dans l'Antiquité. Création et production dérivée, fabrication et diffusion*, A. Muller (ed.) (Lille, 1997).
2. I hesitate to write "prototype" in French, since the word has a slightly different acceptance as concerns mass production: the prototype of a race car works; the *Urbild* of an ancient portrait has no doubt never been exhibited itself.
3. Also characteristic of this situation is, in fact, the important chronological gap between the classical original (the fifth to the fourth century BC) and the majority of Roman copies (the first century BC to the first through the third century AD). It often spans some five centuries —the equivalent today of copying the early masters of our national art schools. We are thus able to better understand certain stylistic changes.
4. E.E. Schmidt, "Die Kopien der Erechtheionkoren," *Antike Plastik*, XIII (Berlin, 1973) and H. Lauter, *Die Koren des Erechtheion*, *ibid.*, XVI (Berlin, 1976).
5. In certain cases, the choice of a material that looks like bronze (green basalt from Egypt) is added to the hardness of certain elements that appear as if

- they have been chiseled (eyelids and the contours of lips); cf. for certain replicas of the Doryphoros, in Saint-Petersburg or Florence: P.E. Arias, *Policleto* (Milan, 1964), pl. IX-X and 42; D. Kreikenbom, *Bildwerke nach Polyklet. Kopienkritische Untersuchungen zu den männlichen statuarischen Typen nach Werken Polyklets* (Berlin, 1990), nos. III.10 and III.44, pl. 132-133 and 178-179.
6. Ph. Bruneau, 'L' 'Arès Borghèse' et l'Arès d'Alcamène ou De l'opinion et du raisonnement," in *Rayonnement grec. Hommages à Charles Delvoye* (Brussels, 1982), p. 199.
 7. What is very significant in this respect is the mannerism of the hold of the head and the expression of the eyes on a replica of the head of the Cassel Apollo preserved at the Palazzo Vecchio in Florence (cf. E. Schmidt, "Der Kasseler Apollon und seine Repliken," *Antike Plastik*, V (Berlin, 1966), p. 22-25, pl. 25) or that of the Apollo with the omphalos of Baiae, today in the National Museum of Naples (cf. P. Zanker, *Klassizistische Statuen* (Mainz, 1974), p. 91, pl. 72.1). P. Zanker (*ibid.*) well indicated the relationship between these two works.
 8. Elsewhere, they often get—or got—bad press. The Musée des Moulages in Brussels, for which there was even a catalog, no longer exists. The Museo dei Gessi of the "La Sapienza" University in Rome, also in peril a few years ago, was fortunately just revived thanks to the attentive care of Andrea Carandini. The French collections of Versailles, founded on none other than the ancient Royal collection of Louis XIV, also nearly foundered. A recent colloquium brought attention to their invaluable worth.
 9. Cf., aside from the catalog proper (*Polyklet, der Bildhauer der griechischen Klassik* (Frankfurt am Main, 1990)), the large task of clearing undertaken by D. Kreikenbom, *Bildwerke nach Polyklet, cit.*
 10. E. Schmidt, *Der Kasseler Apollon und seine Repliken, cit.*; A. Rieche, "Die Kopien der 'Leda des Timotheos'," *Antike Plastik*, XVII (Berlin, 1978), p. 21-55, pl. 10-34; P. Gercke, *Satyren des Praxiteles*, 1968; H. Döhl, *Der Eros des Lysipp – Frühhellenistische Erosen*, Diss. (Göttingen, 1968); D. Krull, *Der Herakles vom Typ Farnese* (Bonn, 1985).
 11. M. Pfanner, "Über das Herstellen von Porträts. Ein Beitrag zu Rationalisierungsmassnahmen und Produktionsmechanismen von Massenware im späten Hellenismus und in der römischen Kaiserzeit," *Jahrbuch des deutschen archäologischen Instituts*, CIV, 1989, p. 198-200, believes that the Ancients did not know of the pointing instrument as is attested until at least the end of the eighteenth century.
 12. G.M.A. Richter, "An Aristogeyton from Baiae," *Amer. Journ. Arch.*, LXXIV, 1970, p. 296-297, pl. 74.
 13. Aside from the Tyrannicides, we shall cite the Persephone of the Corinth-Mocenigo type, the Mattei, Sciarra and Sosikles Amazons, the Velletri Athena, the Aphrodite of the "Hera Borghese" type, the "Westmacott Ephebe," the "Narcissus" of the Louvre, the Ploutos from the Eirene and Ploutos group by Kephisodotes, the Belvedere Apollo.
 14. For this entire problem, cf. Fr. Brommer, "Vorhellenistische Kopien und Wiederholungen von Statuen," in *Studies presented to David Moore Robinson*, I (Saint Louis, 1951), p. 674-682 with, p. 677, the recall of those two passages of Pausanias, I.40.2, 44.4, and IX.10.2 relative to the Artemis Soteira of Strongylion at Megara and Pasai, and to the Apollo Ismenios and Apollo Phileios by Kanachos, the first destined for Thebes, the second for Milet.

15. Livy, XXXIV, 4; cf. also Pliny the Elder, XXXIX, 16 (34) concerning the conquering of Asia (188 BC), "where luxury comes from" (*unde luxuriam*), and Salust, *Catilina*, XI, 5, concerning Sulla's campaign (87-85 BC), where the army "acted excessively" (*luxuriose*), *contra morem maiorum*" and learned, for the first time, [...] to admire statues, paintings and chased vases."
16. Caesar, *De bello Gallico*, I, 1, 3.
17. Livy, XXXIV, 4.
18. Suetonius, *Aug.*, 28, 5.
19. One of the first, it seems, was the colossal Herakles by Lysippos, that came from the taking of Taranto, Pliny the Elder, XXXIV, 18 [40].
20. It is difficult to imagine the original on such a high pedestal; the Delphian exvoto statues of Daochos have a base of around 40 cm.
21. Cf. respectively, on these series, R. Neudecker, *Die Skulpturenausstattung römischer Villen in Italien*. (Mainz, 1988), nos. 68.1-4 p. 236, pl. 15.2-3; 39 *passim* p. 192-195, pl. 9 and 11.1-2; 66.1-9 p. 230; 66.13-28 p. 230-231, pl. 16-19; 14 *passim* p. 148-155 and 105-114.
22. *Ibid.*, no. 58.1-2 p. 217, pl. 27.1-2.
23. *Ibid.*, no. 39.19 a-c, p. 194, pl. 10.1-3.
24. *Ibid.*, no. 9.2 a-d, p. 141, pl. 5.1-4
25. Cf. H. Manderscheid, *Die Skulpturenausstattung der kaiserzeitlichen Thermenanlagen* (Berlin, 1981).
26. Whether they are in fact the *Imagines*, or any other dialogues, the allusions made to these statues are many.
27. M. Borda, *La scuola di Pasiteles* (Bari, 1953).
28. Most recently, A. Linfert, in P.C. Bol et al., *Forschungen zur Villa Albani. Katalog der antiken Bildwerke*, I (Berlin, 1989), no. 20, p. 89-93, pl. 29-33.
29. F. Preisshofen, and P. Zanker, "Reflex einer eklektischen Kunstschauung beim Auctor ad Herennium" *Dial. Arch.*, I (1970-1971), p. 102-103 and 113-117.
30. P. Zanker, in W. Helbig, *Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom*, 4th ed., III (Tübingen, 1969), no. 2352, p. 274-275.
31. Most recently, P. Zanker, *Klassizistische Statuen*, *op. cit.*, no. 26, p. 28-30, pl. 30-31.1, 3.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 76.
33. For the developments of this practice, cf. H. Wrede, *Consecratio in formam deorum. Vergöttlichte Privatpersonen in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Mainz, 1981).
34. J. Ch. Balty, "Notes d'iconographie julio-claudienne, IV. M. Claudius Marcellus et le 'type B' de l'iconographie d'Auguste jeune," *Ant. Kunst*, XX (1977), p. 108-112.
35. Cf. S. Karouzou, Ερμης "ψυχόπομος," *Ath. Mitt.*, LXXVI (1961), p. 94-106, pl. 64-69.
36. W. Amelung, "Weibliche Gewandstatue des Fünften Jahrhunderts," *Röm. Mitt.*, XV (1900), p. 181-197, pl. III-IV.
37. For the combination of two *Umbildungen*, cf. T. Hölscher, "Römische Bildsprache als semantisches System," *Abhandl. Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Kl.*, 1987.2, p. 38-40, pl. 13.1-3.
38. R. Wünsche, "Der Jüngling vom Helenenberg," in *Festschrift L. Dussler* (1972), p. 45 sq.
39. The archaistic trends that were manifest at different times, in particular in the Augustan Age, cannot be neglected: Ed. Schmidt, *Archaistische Kunst in Griechenland und Rom* (Munich, 1922); M.-A. Zagdoun, *La sculpture archaisante*

- dans l'art hellénistique et dans l'art romain du Haut-Empire* (Paris, 1989), p. 189-220; M.D. Fullerton, *The Archaistic Style in Roman Statuary = Mnemosyne*, suppl. 110 (Leiden, 1990). For the historical and moral aspects of the problem, cf. especially P. Zanker, *Augustus und die Macht der Bilder* (Munich, 1987), p. 242-252.
40. Cf. H.A. Thompson and R.E. Wycherley, *The Agora of Athens. The History, Shape and Uses of an Ancient City Center = The Athenian Agora*, XIV (Princeton, 1972), p. 155-160 and pl. 8 (plan); for the texts, R.E. Wycherley, *Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia = The Athenian Agora*, III (Princeton, 1957), nos. 256-280, p. 93-98.
 41. Cicero, *De Officiis*, III, 80; Seneca, *Dial.*, V, 18, 1; Pliny the Elder, XXXIV, 27; texts conveniently collected by G. Lahusen, *Schriftquellen zum römischen Bildnis, I. Textstellen. Von den Anfängen bis zum 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr.* (Bremen, 1984), nos 148-150, p. 30; cf. Id., *Untersuchungen zur Ehrenstatue in Rom. Literarische und epigraphische Zeugnisse* (Rome, 1983), p. 39.
 42. Plutarch, *Cato Min.*, 43, 7.
 43. Suetonius, *Tib.*, 13, 1.
 44. Fronto, *Ad Marcum Caesarem*. IV, 12.4 (ed. C.R. Haines, Loeb Classical Library, 1919, I, p.207 for the translation).
 45. G. Galza, *La necropoli del Porto di Roma nell'Isola Sacra* (Rome, 1940), no. 37 bis, p. 247, fig. 147; cf. D. Soechting, *Die Porträts des Septimius Severus* (Bonn, 1972), no. 37, p. 157-158.
 46. H. Drerup, "Totenmaske und Ahnenbild bei den Römern," *Röm. Mitt.*, LXXXVII (1980), p. 87-89, pl. 37.2-40.
 47. Cf., in the transmission of the "Primaporta type" of the portraits of Augustus, the variant indicated by B. Schmaltz, "Zum Augustus-Bildnis Typus Primaporta," *Röm. Mitt.*, XCIII (1986), p. 211-243, pl. 78-96.
 48. We know Napoleon's retort to Louis David: "Why do you need a model? Do you think that the great men of Antiquity posed for their portraits? Who worried whether the busts of Alexander resembled him? It is sufficient to have an image of him that is true to his genius. This is how great men ought to be painted"; cf. R. Cantinelli, *Jacques-Louis David* (Paris, 1930), p. 69.
 49. For the signification of this type, cf. P. Zanker, *Augustus und die Macht der Bilder* (Munich, 1987), p. 103-106, fig. 83-84.
 50. Moreover, "the portrait always has a political vocation"; cf. Ph. Bruneau, "Le portrait," *Revue d'archéologie moderne et d'archéologie générale*, I (1982), p. 90.
 51. Cf. W. Eck, "Die Familie der Volusii Saturnini in neuen Inschriften aus Lucus Feroniae," *Hermes*, C (1972), p. 469-473.
 52. Kl. Fittschen, "Zum angeblichen Bildnis des Lucius Verus im Thermen Museum," *Jahrb. des Inst.*, XXXVI (1971), nos. 6-7 p. 240, fig. 29-30 and 17-18 p. 241-243, fig. 37-40; cf. also *ibid.*, no. 10 p. 240, fig. 31-32 and G. Dareggi, "A proposito di un ritratto virile di età imperiale," *Mél. Ét. Franç. Rome*, C (1988), p. 321-330.
 53. G. Daltrop, *Die stadtrömischen männlichen Privatbildnisse trajanischer und hadrianischer Zeit* (Münster, 1958), n.2, p. 96.
 54. H. von Heintze, "Drei spätantike Porträtstatuen," in *Antike Plastik*, I (Berlin, 1962), p. 7-32, pl. 1-18; for the interpretation, cf. Kl. Fittschen, "Die Krise des 3. Jahrhunderts n. Chr. im Spiegel der Kunst," in G. Alföldy et al., *Krisen in der Antike – Bewusstsein und Bewältigung* (Dusseldorf, 1975), p. 134-135, fig. 4-6.

55. This term comes from P. Graindor, *Un milliardaire antique : Hérode Atticus et sa famille* (Cairo, 1930). For portraits of the orator and his pupil, cf. G.M.A. Richter, *The Portraits of the Greeks* (London, 1965), III, p. 286-287, fig. 2044, 2046-2049; A. Datsouli-Stavridi, "Συμβολή στην εικονογραφία του Πολυδεύκη," in *Athens Ann. Arch.*, X (1977), p. 126-148; Ead., "Συμβολή στην εικονογραφία του Ηρώδη του Αττικού," *ibid.*, XI (1978), p. 214-231; E.K. Gazda, in *Roman Portraiture. Ancient & Modern Revivals*, cat. exhib., (Ann Arbor, 1977), no. 6, p. 20-21.
56. Kl. Fittschen, "Bemerkungen zu den Porträts des 3 Jahrhunderts nach Christus," *Jahrb. des Inst.*, LXXXIV (1969), p. 225-230, fig. 43-46; cf. J. Ch. Balty, "Style et facture. Notes sur le portrait romain du III^e siècle de notre ère," *Rev. arch.* (1983), p. 312-314, fig. 17-20.
57. The comparison is not always made clear in certain archaeological publications; but it is always an underlying component of these works.

Selected Bibliography

- Becatti, Giovanni. *Arte e gusto negli scrittori latini*. Florence: Sansoni, 1951.
- Bieber, Margarete. *Ancient Copies. Contributions to the History of Greek and Roman Art*. New York: New York University Press, 1977.
- Borda, Maurizio. *La scuola di Pasiteles*. Bari: Adriatica Editrice, 1953.
- von Hees-Landwehr, Christa. *Griechische Meisterwerke in römischen Abgüssen. Der Fund von Baia. Zur Technik antiker Kopisten*, cat. expo. Frankfurt am Main: 1982.
- Jucker, Hans. *Vom Verhältnis der Römer zur bildenden Kunst der Griechen*. Frankfurt am Main: V. Klostermann, 1950.
- Landwehr, Christa. *Die antiken Gipsabgüssen aus Baiae. Griechische Bronzestatuen in Abgüssen römischer Zeit*. Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1985.
- Lauter, Hans. *Zur Chronologie römischer Kopien nach Originalen des 5. Jahrh.* Diss. Bonn, 1968.
- Lippold, Georg. *Kopien und Umbildungen griechischer Statuen*. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1923.
- Niemeier, Jörg-Peter. *Kopien und Nachahmungen im Hellenismus. Ein Beitrag zum Klassizismus des 2. und frühen 1. Jhs. v. Chr.* Bonn: R. Habelt, 1985.
- Pape, Magrit. *Griechische Kunstwerke aus Kriegsbeute und ihre öffentliche Aufstellung in Rom. Von der Eroberung von Syrakus bis in augusteische Zeit*. Diss. Hamburg, 1975.
- Sismondo Ridgway, Brunhilde. *Roman Copies of Greek Sculpture: The Problem of the Originals*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1984.
- Vermeule III, Cornelius C. *Greek Sculpture and Roman Taste. The Purpose and Setting of Graeco-Roman Art in Italy and the Greek Imperial East*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1977.
- Zanker, Paul. "Zur Funktion und Bedeutung griechischer Skulptur in der Römerzeit," in *Le classicisme à Rome aux 1^{er} siècle avant et après J.-C.*, in *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique*, XXV. Vandœuvres-Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1979, p. 283-314.