

the Gigantomachy on the Altar of Zeus at Pergamon as a mythological allusion to the Attalid defeat of the Gauls specifically and instead interprets it as referring to Attalid victories over various opponents. Architectural sculpture using examples from all over the Hellenistic Mediterranean is the topic of Chapter 19, then Chapter 20 takes up epic themes, e.g., Iliac tablets, Sperlonga sculptures. Other mythological themes are treated in Chapter 21: the Niobids, the female figure preparing a sacrifice from Anzio, and the Belvedere torso, which, has been interpreted as a hero (either Achilles or Herakles, according to Queyrel). Marsyas receives his own chapter (22), as do sensual themes (Chapter 23) and genre images (Chapter 24). The final chapter is given over to sculptures in domestic contexts. A useful catalogue with extensive bibliographies for every illustrated work concludes the text. A timeline, glossary, bibliography, and four indices follow.

The book exhibits an enormous and impressive range of knowledge; the objects chosen include the 'usual suspects,' but also a great number of lesser-known works, e.g., Figs. 281, 356, 372, Pl. 26, a choice that is very welcome. This comes, however, at the cost of depth: discussions of even the most significant or best-known monuments are often frustratingly brief but perhaps this will be rectified in the projected second volume of this series.

While adhering to the usual classification of Hellenistic sculptures into genre, portraits, realism, etc., the organization of this (admittedly unwieldy) assemblage of material raises the question of the intended audience. The appearance of a timeline and glossary suggest that this publication is for someone with little or no previous knowledge of this subject, yet this book is certainly not suitable for a beginning student of sculpture. Discussions of the reception of Hellenistic sculpture and approaches to it appear in the first few chapters before the sculpture itself has ever been discussed, according to Rolley's original plan, leaving the novice lost amid a sea of names and dates. The technique of casting bronze—both direct and indirect—is alluded to but the process is not described in detail nor is Fig. 2 helpful to the novice without more detailed explanation. The discussion of individual works is scattered throughout several chapters, e.g., draped portraits are treated in both Chapters 13 and 14, although the latter specifically addresses this statue type, while the former is more inclusive and also concerns statues of athletes. This does not make easy reading unless one is already familiar with the subject. Granted this is not a monograph with a single argument, and Hellenistic sculpture does not fit into tidy categories, so a certain amount

of repetition can be expected. Nonetheless, one expects some continuity and a logical sequence both within and among chapters. Other volumes in Picard's series are far more beginner-friendly, and it is regrettable that this is not the case with the present tome.

The color plates are, for the most part, excellent but the color is 'off' in some, and there are many black-and-white images that are too small, too dark or muddy, or of not high enough resolution to illustrate the points made in the text, e.g., Figs. 20, 38, 82. The scale should have been included in some drawings to make the point, e.g., Fig. 223. Comparanda often are not illustrated, which is truly unfortunate, yet a great benefit are photographs that offer rarely seen views of familiar works, e.g., Fig. 299c, an aerial view of the tray held by the Anzio figure mentioned above. One oddity of this volume is the reference to images discussed – but not illustrated – in the present volume, which are planned to be illustrated in volume 2. In other words, one needs both volumes in order to understand the text, something that is unlikely to happen outside the confines of a library or unless one is a professional in this field.

In spite of these criticisms, the book is enormously useful for its comprehensiveness and its collection of images, and the price of the volume is remarkably reasonable, especially considering the 53 color plates. Advanced students and scholars will find it a useful and welcome addition to their shelves.

JUDITH BARRINGER
UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH
J.M.Barringer@ed.ac.uk

Guillaume Biard. *La représentation honorifique dans les cités grecques aux époques classique et hellénistique*. pp. 573, 52 b/w plates. 2017. Athens: École française d'Athènes. ISBN 978-2-86958-277-4 paperback €89.

John Ma. *Statues and Cities: Honorific Portraits and Civic Identity in the Hellenistic World*. Pp. xxv + 382, b/w ill. 2015. Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN 978-0-19-873893-0 paperback £35.

Honorificabilitudinitas is a bit of a mouthful: since Dante, at least, the Latinate term has been recognized as an overload of syllables.¹ What

¹ De vulgari eloquentia II.7.6.

follows is not a proposal that we use the word more often. Yet some kind of convoluted noun does seem necessary to denote the circular notion of 'honour' at once earned and conferred. Act as 'honourably' as you will, according to your own standards; but to become 'honoured' or 'honorified' depends upon a power-structure within society (in Britain this is 'the Establishment'). So it happens that, just as some individuals are celebrities because they are celebrities, an 'honours system' can seem flagrantly remote from the actualities of personal conduct. Certain people are, it appears, born honourable; others gain honour by purchase, flattery, or self-promotion. The paradoxes of honorific culture in our own age warn that the study of honorific monuments in antiquity requires a circumspect approach.

Certain problems are immediately obvious. Defining what constitutes an 'honorific statue', for example, proves no less difficult than defining the term 'cult statue'. A superannuated yet still valuable discussion by M.K. Welsh (ABSA 11, 1904-5, 32-49) laid down three conditions: (1) the statue must be erected not in honour of a deity, but a mortal; (2) the award of the statue must be made as a gift, not claimed as a right (of office, or status); and (3) the commission of such a statue must come not from a private individual, but some collective resolve. Welsh therefore defined the category as '*portrait-statues set up by the authorisation of a public body out of regard for the person represented*' (art. cit. p. 35). This precise definition, as Guillaume Briard points out (p. 6), severely curtails the field of study. It imposes a clarity of purpose that probably never existed in antiquity; and if, again, we consider the phenomenon in modern times, we soon apprehend the complexities particularly arising from Welsh's third criterion. Take a well-known recent case – the bronze effigy raised in 1992 in honour of Sir Arthur Harris, British Air Chief Marshal during the Second World War. Harris is widely credited with, or accused of (and deplored for), directing large-scale bombing raids upon the cities of Cologne and Dresden. The assigned location of his 'honorific statue' appears to be part of a public thoroughfare – on London's Strand. And while the effigy is posthumous, it seems to qualify as a full-length portrait – 'realistically' evoking Harris as he would have appeared c. 1945, in Royal Air Force uniform. The inscribed dedication gives his name along with several national 'honours', including the title 'BT' (Baronet); it also mentions the 55,000 casualties among 'the brave crews of Bomber Command', and adds a collective sentiment: '*The nation owes them all an immense debt.*' Yet the commission for the monument, and the funds to pay for it, came from not from any governmental source, rather an association of Bomber Command

veterans. The 'public' space was in fact granted by officials of St Clement Danes – a church ruined during the war, then in 1958 rebuilt; or more precisely, as inscribed: *Restituit Reginae Classis Aeronautica*. The nexus of institutional validation of the statue is therefore potent – ecclesiastical, royal, military – but does it amount to 'public authorisation'? Add the abiding controversy about historical motives for commemorating this particular individual and it becomes easy to see how difficult it could be, in any age, to draw precise boundaries between 'private' and 'public' (and indeed between 'secular' and 'sacred').

Accepting such categorical fluidity – almost to the point of '*une pluralité insaisissable*' (p. 387) – Briard has produced a survey that succeeds in both extending and refining our knowledge of a type of commission once highly visible in the urban fabric of Classical antiquity. Honorific representations – including paintings and reliefs as well as freestanding statues – might typically be seen in any area of a city. At somewhere like Priene they must have been almost oppressively ubiquitous. But we are missing the point if we conceive such representations to have been quintessentially part of the democratic or semi-autonomous *polis*. From Demosthenes, admittedly, it seems that Athenians considered the Tyrannicides Group as prototypes of honorific memorial (*Lept.* 70) – though there is no explicit evidence for formal voting procedure in this case. Briard however argues that the origins of the type lie with aristocratic practice in the early to mid-sixth century BC, placing images of distinguished family members along the processional routes of sanctuaries. This practice becomes 'democratized' at Athens during the fifth century, albeit gradually: commemorative gestures associated with Themistocles, Cimon and Pericles create precedents for the first secure example of the genre, the statue of Conon commissioned by a decree of the Assembly in 393 BC, and erected in the Stoa of Zeus Eleutherios, in the Agora.

I say 'secure': arguably Conon's naval success off Cnidus in 'freeing the allies of Athens' from Spartan domination made it possible for the Athenians to accord him 'highest honours' (*megistai timai*) because the victory, as Demosthenes confides, was glossed as a sort of tyrannicide. But Conon, being alive, could hardly be accorded the same heroic status as Harmodius and Aristogeiton. The fact that he was financed by the Persian Great King must further have complicated discussions in the Assembly and Council. So we suppose that other factors were overridingly persuasive at the time: the general's largesse towards Athens and Athenian citizens, perhaps; otherwise, the perceived necessity of matching either the conspicuous

honours shown at Panhellenic sites to the Spartan commander, Lysander, or the recognition of Conon's actions by other city-states. In any case, we have no sooner established our first proper honorific representation than we collide with a recurrent problem pervading any study of the type. What manner of representation was this statue of Conon?

Reportedly it was made of bronze, and set up accompanied by an image of the Cypriot king Evagoras, who had furnished Conon with substantial military support. This information amounts to frustratingly little. Since the image set a precedent – it was soon followed by similar dedications to other successful *strategoi*: Iphicrates, Chabrias, and Conon's son Timotheus – we cannot help wondering whether it created a type. So far as can be judged from Roman versions, some senior soldier with luxuriant long hair below his raised helmet was represented either 'in action', vigorously turning his neck (Figure 1), or else as if meditating his next move (e.g. the so-called 'Pastoret head', in the Ny Carlsberg, Copenhagen). The well-known image of Pericles on the Acropolis, a posthumous evocation devised (at the sculptor's own expense?) by Kresilas, provides some sort of prototype, at least for the head. When the statue was full-length, the body seems to have been garbed with a military cloak, as indicated by the figure traditionally known as 'Phocion'. But how congruous were the likenesses of Conon and the others (especially his son)? In other words – is it part of the defining nature of an honorific representation that it becomes part of a virtual *society* of such representations?

Addressing the issue of how honorific projects relate to the art of portraiture, Briard notes the stark absence of ekphrastic content in the texts of honorific decrees (p. 378). A statue might be defined as something special, in terms of its production; yet no words describe the appearance of the honorand. *Mimēsis* was only a means to an end; and that end was not to capture an individual's likeness, rather to reflect virtues personified. Once this principle is accepted, our often desperate wish to unite identities with images can be gently discarded. Conon, Chabrias, Phocion, or some other *strategos* – in a sense the 'name game' not only does not matter now, but also never did. After all, the *raison d'être* of an honours system can surely be expressed in Platonic terms as a mode of transformation, whereby 'the Ordinary Man' becomes the good citizen or *agathos politēs*.² Viewed as such, the honorific representation carries no obligation to

'reality'. *Agathoi politai* were recognizably graced by their *philotimia*. They were something else.

Therefore, if we resort to somewhat derogatory terms when it comes to summarizing the limited expressive range of honorific representations – e.g. 'himation man', *Normaltypus*, *Petite Herculanaise*, etc. – we should do so with due awareness of making anachronistic judgement. By the same token, localized variations on the visual theme of generic good citizen should perhaps be credited as such. Of the Romans who settled on Delos during the second century BC, those who distinguished themselves at the time have been singled out for notable modern opprobrium – i.e. their honorific monuments have, in retrospect, drawn the opposite response to that originally intended. The *locus classicus* may be Andrew Stewart's tirade against a series of portraits demonstrating 'self-delusion, horrendous conceit [...] and appalling lack of taste'.³ Even allowing for some (unlikely) xenophobic mischief on the part of Athenian-trained sculptors when commissioned to portray foreigners, this must be an error of historical aesthetics. Epigraphically, C. Ofellius Ferus was honoured in the 'Agora of the Italians' for his sense of justice and 'love of goodness' (*philagathia*). The head that once belonged to his Polykleitan body was probably 'veristic': in which case, the subject's acclaimed *dikaio synē* may here be symbolized not only by the chiasitic balance of his nude posture, but also by a fair apportion of 'Greek' and 'Roman' styles.

What a society of honorific statues would have looked like on the island is the image chosen for the cover of the revised paperback edition of John Ma's *Statues and Cities*. A reconstruction (by Elizabeth Baltes) of the Delian 'Dromos' in the mid-first century BC, using 3-D positioning technology, conjures up an impressive scenario. 'Ordinary' citizens promenading along this avenue may have felt like they were 'running the gauntlet' of the great and the good; if not indifferent passers-by, then presumably tormented by alternate goads of *phthonos* and *aemulatio*. Readers already familiar with Ma's monograph will know however that no single image can possibly encapsulate all the spatial nuances and collective effects of honorific statues when gathered for display. Ma's subtle and discursive approach seems perfectly pitched for the subject;

² Terminology borrowed from Adkins 1960, 226-232.

³ Stewart 1979, 144-5. Antipathy towards negotiatores on Delos is fuelled by suspicion that their fortunes were made by the slave trade – the evidence for which is little more than a few lines of Strabo (14.5.2). As for the so-called 'Pseudo-Athlete' (Athens NM inv. 1828) repeated laments over its stylistic dissonance may stem in part from poor-quality photographs (see e.g. D. Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* [Yale 1992], 35).



Figure 1. Detail of the head of an unknown Greek general, in marble, from a Roman villa on the Via Cassia: after a fourth-century BC bronze? Palazzo Massimo, Rome, inv. 74037.

coincidentally, it seems an ideal complement to Briard's work. Moreover, the conceptual terms coined by Ma to explain the assorted cumulative powers of honorific statues in Hellenistic cities also serve in post-antique times: 'serialization', for example, is evident enough in the case of modern London.⁴ The further diffusion of ideas and terminology that is signalled by a paperback edition is most welcome.

Is the topic now exhausted? At least, its archaeological and historical limits seem apparent. It is unlikely that we shall ever know, for example, to what extent the gilded statue of Phryne at Delphi, raised on a column among the images of kings and generals (Plut. *Mor.* 400f-401b), 'broke the mould' of honorific conventions: could she (or rather her admirers) possibly have sponsored an image conforming to the wrapped-up epitome of female

virtues that dominates as if *de rigueur* from the fourth century BC until the third century AD? It is hard to think so. Incredulity is likewise invited by the reports that Demetrius of Phaleron was honoured during his lifetime by hundreds, if not thousands, of bronze statues. One source (Diog. Laert. 5. 75-6) specifies the total as 360. Modern sceptics (e.g. Tracy 2000) demand to see some of the bases of so many disappeared statues. Yet Diogenes is careful to supply supporting details for his report: official motive (Demetrius did great service to Athens), political opportunity (as *nomothetês* for a decade or so Demetrius had the power), and psychological plausibility (Demetrius, being of non-aristocratic origin, was all the more likely to welcome statues of himself, especially in the equestrian mode). 'Omnivorous Envy', says Diogenes, brought widespread downfall of the images, including some vindictive recycling (into chamberpots): so goes the narrative – and again we can readily think of comparable reversals of fame in our own times. But is such plausibility sufficient to compensate for the absence of archaeological evidence?

Suspending Cynical indifference, we do what we can to salvage the prosopography of ancient civic fame. The project continues: and, as these studies indicate, it makes progress. Perhaps only the final 'leap of faith' remains beyond us – because we insist on regarding statues as inanimate lumps of metal or stone (and therefore condemning an ensemble of them as 'oppressively ubiquitous'). By way of correcting this perception, a passage of Lucretius serves to remind us that the demarcation between the society of statues and the community of citizens was not so clear in antiquity. It comes in the course of his explication of atomistic theory, so tends to be overlooked by art-historians. One way of proving that matter is composed of invisible particles, says the poet (1. 316-18), is to look at the right hands of bronze statues by urban gateways: they are typically worn smooth, from being touched by all those coming and going to and from the city. The world evoked by the allusion to this habit was one in which 'the great and the good' may have been literally put on pedestals: where of course they were not out of sight – yet not 'out of touch' either.

NIGEL SPIVEY

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE, FACULTY OF CLASSICS
njs11@cam.ac.uk

⁴ So with reference to the controversial monument to 'Bomber' Harris, it may be noted that not only does the statue belong to a series of metropolitan monuments commemorating British military heroes of the past (e.g. Wolfe, Nelson) but also, more specifically, to a sequence of distinguished commanders of the Royal Air Force (e.g. Dowding, Trenchard).

Adkins, A.W.H. 1960. *Merit and Responsibility: A Study in Greek Values*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stewart, A.F. 1979. *Attika: Studies in Athenian Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age*. London: Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies.

Tracy, S.V. 2000. Demetrius of Phalerum: Who was he and who was he not?, in W.W. Fortenbaugh and E. Schütrumpf (eds) *Demetrius of Phalerum: Text, Translation, Discussion*: 331-345. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Roman

Kathleen Warner Slane (with contributions by Ethne Barnes, David S. Reese and David R. Jordan). *Tombs, Burials, and Commemoration in Corinth's Northern Cemetery* (Corinth Volume XXI). pp. xxix+270, b/w and colour illustrations. 2017. Princeton: the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. ISBN 978-0-87661-022-0 cloth \$150.

Contents of the Volume

Each of us who has experience working within longer-running archaeological projects – of which the American excavations at Corinth is a prime example – is likely at one point or another to be confronted by that particular project's excavation, documentation and/or storage history. One wishes to (re)study, and to have a fresh look at old excavations and the associated finds, motivated for instance by new concepts, or new questions. As it may turn out, the dossier in question is incomplete (finds or records have been lost), which as such hampers the desired complete (re)interpretation. The research for the volume under review here inevitably suffered from such project histories – archaeology within archaeology – albeit this appears to have been limited. Only a few minor typographical errors and omissions were noted.

Following four introductory sections (lists of illustrations and tables, bibliography and abbreviations, and explanatory notes), the volume's core consists of ten chapters. It is richly illustrated by means of numerous plans, sections, tables, photographs (including two large colour plates) and drawings. The majority of these illustrations are found at the back of the book, and largely concern the burials' architecture and the associated finds found within.

The project is introduced and summarised in Chapter 1. The context and architecture of, and finds from the actual graves and burials in the Northern Cemetery, are presented and discussed in Chapters 2 to 5. These comprise individual as well as group burials, as well as both cremation and inhumation burials. Whilst some of these graves presumably were situated in the open air (which originally were likely marked in one way or the other), a total of seven underground tombs (both dug out as well as constructed) is presented. Chapters 6 to 9 discuss the actual remains and artefacts in so far as these were available or accessible for study: the