



The first two chapters are also introductory in nature. In ›Chapter One‹ (Research History, pp. 12–48) B. assembles the historical and archaeological sources that document the activity of a large number of artists and artisans on the island from the Archaic period (above all in relation to bronzes): references in ancient literature and evidence from nineteenth-century travellers combined not just with finds from the island but also with statue bases signed by their makers. ›Chapter Two‹ (pp. 49–57) is a survey of the political history of Rhodes from its foundation as a federal state in 408/7 BCE to the late Roman period.

›Chapter Three‹ (Subjects and Types of Rhodian Sculpture, pp. 58–285) is the main part of the book. It examines questions concerning the iconography, typology and dating of the sculptures included in the catalogue and attempts to identify the figures depicted. It also introduces other smaller works from the island of the same type or similar. The material is arranged thematically in four sections: A. Gods (pp. 58–141), B. Mortals (pp. 142–236), C. Portrait Heads (pp. 237–258), D. The Roman Period (pp. 258–285).

The first section (Gods) examines statues of idealized types that are interpreted as gods. For the most part they are Hellenistic versions, reworkings of or independent creations that derive from certain widespread statuary types of Aphrodite, Dionysos, Asklepios, Apollo and Athena from the Classical period. The main focus is on three types of Aphrodite, the creation of which, according to a widely held view among scholars, is connected with Rhodes: the types of Aphrodite Pontia–Euploia, Aphrodite Pudica and Aphrodite Tiepolo. This view is backed up by the fact that a good deal of Hellenistic sculpture has been found on the island, as well as numerous copies in small-scale sculpture from the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Similarly, the popularity of the Asklepios Este in the small-scale sculpture from the island and the Hellenistic version of it, known as the Epidauros Asklepios type, may be due to that fact that, as B. suggests, the latter reproduces the type of the cult statue from the Rhodes Asklepieion.

The attempt to explore the connection of the types mentioned above with Rhodes is laudable and entails detailed examination of all the relevant sources. However, due to the fragmentary nature of the works concerned, it is difficult to make a thorough-going assessment of their relationship with each supposed archetype.

Several over life-sized heads deserve special mention: the masterly mid-2nd cent. head of (probably) Aphrodite (cat. no. 006), which, it should be noted, bears a striking similarity to the well-known head of Helios (cat. no. 017); heads cat. nos. 094 and 097 from Rhodes town (found in the vicinity of the Sanctuary of Cybele and at the foot of the Acropolis respectively), which may have belonged to cult statues; cat. no. 093, also from the Rhodes Acropolis, which seems highly likely to have come from an acrolith of some Ptolemaian queen, as the author has also pointed out; the diademed bust cat. no. 024 from a tomb monument. As regards sculpture from the Roman period, the head of an Aphrodite Fréjus (cat. no. 008) can be added to the copies known to date of the corresponding type.

A few more observations can be made: The torso cat. no. 009, which B. interprets as an Eleusina-type Asklepios, is more likely to come from a funerary statue representing an elderly man, as is suggested by the distinctly bulging stomach. Figure cat. no. 014 is interpreted as an adult, but is a youth; it should be considered in relation to the Gymnasium, where it was set up (perhaps an Eros?). In relation to the colossal head of Helios cat. no. 017, B. quite rightly rejects Merker's assertion that it was topped by a lion's or elephant's head helmet. She suggests that it is more likely that it was a full-length figure (p. 111, cf. 113). However, we should not rule out the possibility that the head comes from a relief tondo, like, for example, the more or less contemporary colossal head in the Antikensammlung, Berlin<sup>4</sup>. The holes drilled in the neck of the Rhodian head could be due to its removal from its support in secondary use. The hairstyle

4 WINTER 1908, 234 no. 283 Beiblatt 32; VON DEN HOFF 2015, 55–63; SCHOLL 2016, cat. no. 33 (von den Hoff).

of ›Attis‹ cat. no. 021, pointing to a Kassel-type Claudius, gives rise to the suspicion that it was, in fact, an idealized portrait<sup>5</sup>.

The examination of the sculptures in the next section (Mortals), begins with a group of female statues and statuettes, which depict, more or less faithfully, statuary types of the late Classical period (or simply appropriate individual motifs from them). Some sculptures included in this analysis show important typological differences or are so fragmentarily preserved that it is impossible to connect them with specific types of statuary (e. g. cat. nos. 025. 099). As was the case with the sculptures discussed in the first section, here too the detailed examination of statues and statuettes from Rhodes has failed to come up with any new information about the lost archetypes.

Other types of female statues found widely distributed throughout the eastern Aegean are also published here (e. g. the Pudicitia type: cat. no. 031, Small Herculean Women statue type: cat. no. 035, Polla Valeria: cat. nos. 039. 040, Sopheia: cat. no. 032, and Baebia: cat. no. 033), for the most part high quality works. A small head of Arsinoe II (cat. no. 065) occupies a special place in the presentation of the new material.

Among the works published here a number of himatiophoroi adopt common statuary types (›Normal type‹: cat. no. 041–043, ›Kos type‹: cat. no. 044–046, ›Demosthenes type‹: cat. no. 047–050) and show the usual variety found at the time in respect of individual motifs. The ›heroic‹, semi-nude depiction used in idealized statuary types (›Hüftmanteltypus‹: cat. nos. 051. 053–054, ›Schulterbauschtypus‹: cat. no. 052) was probably a popular choice for the depiction of young men who died prematurely. Cat. nos. 051 (preserved with head intact) and 088 are both of very high quality.

A few remarks might be made in the third section (Portrait Heads): head cat. no. 064 from a herm, despite having been interpreted by most scholars as representing an athlete, is perhaps more likely to depict Herakles in the Lansdowne type, because it repeats basic motifs of the thick locks pushed up from the forehead of that type. It should be noted that heads that depict this type are often seen connected with herms<sup>6</sup>. Furthermore, cat. no. 072 may, in fact, come from Ephesus (cf. p. 287, note 3.ζ), as it shows considerable stylistic similarities with heads from that area<sup>7</sup>.

The setting up of statues to Roman emperors in the cities of Rhodes, Lindos and Kamiros is attested in inscriptions. In the last section (The Roman Period), in addition to the already well-known head of Augustus in the Prima Porta type (cat. no. 081) B. recognizes Roman emperors in another three busts: B. adopts Vermeule's identification of head cat. no. 082 as the Emperor Tiberius. However, the central motif of its hairstyle finds closer similarities with that of the Claudius Kassel type (it should be noted here that many of the busts of this type are the result of reworkings). For head no. 083, published here, B. suggests the Emperor Trajan in the so-called ›Opferbildtypus‹ (Typus IV B). However, the head is more reminiscent of the busts of the last Ptolemies; it may depict one of them. The presence of a narrow band could be explained by the traditional way in which rulers were depicted on Hellenistic busts. In head no. 084 B. recognizes Antoninus Pius in his main type, but the deviations from the Roman

5 See the similar depiction of Antinous in the Musei Vaticani, Galleria Chiaramonti II 19, inv. 1205, MEYER 1991, 86–87 no. I 65, pl. 75.

6 See KAZAKIDI 2015, 83. 109 n. 709. On the type see KASTEINER 2000.

7 See for example KAZAKIDI 2018, 293–306.

original seen in the hair and the shape of the head (already pointed out by Wegner) exclude its being counted among the portrait busts of that emperor<sup>8</sup>.

A remark should be made as regards the overall organization of material: perhaps a more typological classification of the sculptures, regardless of their presumed content (e. g. ›idealized types‹ and ›portraits‹) in accordance with the usual arrangement in catalogues of sculpture<sup>9</sup> would have made the author's job easier and avoided some inconsistencies.

In the ›fourth chapter‹ an attempt is made to link the sculptures with the locations where they once stood based on their archaeological context (pp. 286–325). Thirty-eight of them come from the heart of the city, mostly the eastern foot of the acropolis, where the sanctuaries and some opulent residences were located. However, of the greatest interest is the group of sculptures from the extensive architectural remains attributed to a single residence, the so-called Papastamati Plot Villa, including the imperial busts (cat. nos. 081 and 082). The presence of the imperial busts, the size of the residence and its elaborate decoration encourage the author to ask whether it might have been one of the places where the prominent Romans to whom the island played host once stayed. There is as yet little evidence of sculptures coming from other sanctuaries.

The evidence for the funerary function of a large number of marble statues and the link made between some of them and large-scale, above-ground tomb monuments with accessible, ›walk-in‹ spaces (stoas/porticoes and atria) offer interesting insights into Rhodian society and the habits of the upper classes in the late Hellenistic period. This issue cannot be given sufficient prominence in the context of this particular chapter. But it is worth noting that these are life-size or over life-size statues, often of very high-quality craftsmanship and similar to types associated with honorific depictions.

Despite the scanty information available from the excavation data, not an unusual situation when dealing with ancient sites with continuous occupation up to the present day, B.'s meticulous study has delivered results. It covers topographical issues relating to the ancient city and gives us a useful overall survey of earlier and more recent rescue digs. Moreover, it redefines the find spots of earlier finds that were published with the wrong provenance (e. g. p. 287 n. 3).

In ›Chapter Five‹ (Stylistic analysis and chronological development of Rhodian sculpture) the author uses the traditional method, which consists in comparing typologically similar works of sculpture and translating their stylistic differences into a pattern of chronological evolution (pp. 326–335). Female heads with idealized models, clothed male and female torsos and male busts constitute representative groups of works that allow us, as B. acknowledges, to trace a linear development in style.

The few sculptures that can be dated to the late 4th c. BCE show a distinct typological and stylistic similarity with Attic works. Female torsos with a rigid delineation of the draperies and selective use of the drill date to the 3rd cent. BCE, an echo of the classical tradition (cat. nos. 037. 036. 035 from towards the end of the century); torsos with more elegant proportions, which have been given the various characteristics of garments of successive periods, with an emphasis on the transparency of the himation, date to the 2nd cent. BCE (cat. nos. 040. 028. 100). The statues in which a more intensely decorative tendency, based on widespread use of the drill and stylized motifs, is observed date to the late Hellenistic period, i.e. from the end of the 2nd cent. and into the 1st cent. BCE (cat. nos. 031. 099. 030. 027. 025). A few more torsos in a different style, characterized by more severe (cat. nos. 033. 096. 026) or more linear (cat.

8 Despite the appealing nature of B.'s hypothesis, we should keep to the guidelines set by the comparison of copies method, as instituted by German scholars. See for example the series editors' preface (K. Fittschen et al.) in: HERTEL 2013. Moreover E. Chioti has included this head from Rhodes among the busts of private citizens in her recent doctoral thesis on the busts of the Antonine period in Greece, CHIOTI unpublished, 75. On the main type of Antoninus Pius see KNOLL – VORSTER 2013, 285–286 [in cat. no. 64] (Joachim Raeder). For a new, third prototype of Antoninus Pius see FITTSCHEN 2017, 189–196.

9 Cf. for example, MACHAIRA 2017; MACHAIRA 2018.



no. 032) delineation of the drapery folds can be dated to the late 2nd cent. BCE, mainly on the basis of their overall structure and the relationship between body and draperies. Statues of himatiophoroi survive from perhaps as far back as the end of the 3rd cent. (cat. no. 009), but most of them are from the 2nd cent. BCE, following a more or less chronological order (cat. nos. 045. 047. 046. 012. 048. 042) based on a tendency to elongate the figures, increasingly elegant proportions and a taste for decoration involving greater use of the drill and the stylization of certain motifs on the draperies. As with the female statues, a few male torsos display a different style with more simplified motifs and rougher carving (cat. nos. 044. 011). The female (cat. nos. 039. 038) and male figures (cat. nos. 010. 051. 049. 050. 041) are characterized by reduced overall volume, stylization and stiffness in the draperies.

Correspondingly, one can see a development in the female heads from the more austere forms of the 4th and 3rd cent. BCE (cat. no. 093) to the 2nd-cent. heads that show movement and have rounder outlines to the face with soft forms (cat. nos. 095–098. 101–103) involving greater use of the drill (cat. no. 004), characteristics that are consistent with those of contemporary art of Pergamon, but which are applied less intensively in the Rhodian works. The heads that look back to classical models can be put in the late Hellenistic period, with the depiction of individualized features creeping into portrait busts (cat. nos. 061. 065. 062. 060. 005. 058 and the child portrait no. 089). The idealized youthful heads of the late 2nd and 1st cent. BCE go back to the Lysippan and Skopadic models of the 4th cent. (cat. nos. 064. 051. 063), whereas the portraits are distinguished by their individualized features, which have been harmoniously absorbed, in more or less obvious ways, into the classical form (cat. nos. 066. 077. 070. 069. 067. 071 and the child busts nos. 090. 091).

A group of archaizing works are also to be dated to the late Hellenistic period (cat. nos. 018. 019. 020). The transition to the early Imperial period is smooth and the sculptures of that period are distinguished by the classicizing style typical of the Greek workshops of the eastern Aegean (cat. nos. 081–085). A few sculptures are dated to later periods, up to the 3rd cent. CE (cat. nos. 013. 086–087).

The limitations of stylistic analysis as a dating criterion in the Hellenistic period are well known<sup>10</sup>. Nevertheless B. manages to describe in great detail the stylistic differences between works of the same kind and to document their relative dating according to the dateline for Hellenistic sculpture, drawn up for the most part by A. Linfert and later developed by Chr. Kunze and other scholars<sup>11</sup>. The dating of a few works is also based on their archaeological context.

In ›Chapter Six‹ materials and methods of making are re-examined (pp. 336–341). B. maps the quarries from which most of the stone on the island comes (the grey-blue Lartian stone, soft tufa and other red or grey-green limestone) thanks to the precious details she has carefully amassed; she describes their main properties and identifies a considerable number of sculptures made from similar materials. Careful inspection of the working of the surfaces of the sculptures included in the catalogue has led B. to make some in part original observations: i) techniques used to fill in small, and sometimes larger, parts with plaster (e. g. cat. no. 067. 015 etc.) or with separately carved pieces of marble (pp. 350–354, e. g. cat. nos. 033. 036. 063. 090. 083 etc.), ii) combining different types of stone (e.g. Lartian stone and white marble) in the same sculpture (cat. no. 022), iii) the use of tenons set low into busts of the late Hellenistic and early Imperial periods, a phenomenon that has also been seen in other contemporary centres of production and attributed to a possible shortage of materials (p. 344), iv) the heads cat.

10 See for example the author's preface in MARCADÉ 1969. And see CELANI 2005.

11 KUNZE 2002.

nos. 067. 073 probably coming from roundels (*imagines clipeatae*) and v) the painting of the sculptures (see esp. cat. no. 086)<sup>12</sup>.

In ›Chapter Seven‹ (Inscriptions, Signatures, Workshops, pp. 358–365) B. attempts to compile a list of the craftsmen, both Rhodian and non-Rhodian, who worked in marble and whose careers are attested above all by their signatures. She notes that on Rhodes – by contrast with Delos, for example – they mainly sign bronze statues, and only more rarely the marble ones (p. 362). The fact that they could be granted the right of residence (*epidamia*) must have played an important part in craftsmen from elsewhere deciding to settle in Rhodes, as it gave them certain political rights.

›Chapter Eight‹ (Relations between artists workshops in Rhodes and the eastern Mediterranean, pp. 366–420), has a firm foundation in the work of A. Linfert and the improvements that subsequent scholars have brought to it. The author has carried out a most meticulous stylistic analysis of typologically similar works (or motifs) from Rhodes, Athens and what were at the time the most important cities of the eastern Aegean (Kos, Delos, Pergamon, Priene, Tinos, Samos, etc.). B. confirms that Rhodes, which attracted travelling craftsmen, played an important part in the adoption, transformation and distribution of what were for the most part Attic statuary types, which first emerged on the island with advent of the Athenian craftsmen in the latter part of the 4th cent. BCE (e. g. the Asklepios Este/ Epidaurus or Giustini etc. types) It was also on Rhodes that some highly original and eclectic works were created, which are also found widely distributed throughout the eastern Aegean (e. g. Aphrodite Pontia–Euploia etc.). The mobility of craftsmen and the transportability of types and techniques helped to give the sculpture coming out of the workshops of eastern Greece from the 3rd cent. BCE onwards and above all in the 2nd cent. (apart from on Samos and Delos) a common character. But by the 1st cent. clear stylistic differences were emerging that show the workshops going their separate ways (p. 394).

In ›Chapter Nine‹ (Assembled Data) the sculptures in the catalogue are classified in tables by size (table 1), iconography and provenance (table 2) and date (table 3) (pp. 421–438). In the conclusions that follow (pp. 439–454) the basic characteristics of Rhodian large-scale, stone sculpture are summarized: i.e. that these works in stone show quite a wide variety in their use of materials (Lartian stone and other local coloured stones were perhaps used on a wider scale than has previously been acknowledged, as B. shows) and of styles, because overall they were characterized by high quality carving and a classical style, both of which require skilled craftsmanship and a corresponding artistic tradition. 2nd-cent. sculptures, for example, are notable for their use of expressive media and techniques that intensify the ›dramatic impression‹ they give, a tendency that probably developed not only under the influence of bronze sculpture on the island, but also of other similar tendencies that were dominating other artistic centres, above all Pergamon. The sculptures found on Rhodes do not, however, reach the same level of baroque style as the contemporary Pergamene sculpture, which may be due to the function they served and the demands of their patrons: they were for the most part works that were set up individually as private dedications or funerary monuments, and we know of no large group sculptures and programmes of architectural sculpture like those of the royal monuments at Pergamon or other cities that belonged to the Hellenistic kingdoms or to their sphere of influence. As is well known, the high productivity of Rhodian sculpture workshops that began with the arrival of Athenian craftsmen on the island, especially those working in bronze, is attested by indirect references in the ancient literature and by the artists' signatures both on the island and elsewhere. Rhodian influence is also suggested by the typological and

12 Laboratory tests would have been useful for some works, e. g. the hard, reddish patina on the hair of the Helios might indicate traces of a substrate applied prior to gilding. Moreover, I think that the torso cat. no. 013 has been reworked and probably also head cat. no. 018, as is suggested by the rough excision of locks of hair when a deep channel was cut in the nape of the neck and by the disproportionately large right ear; Cat. no. 022 may come from a relief; cat. no. 036 is more likely to have been set into an architectural support (e.g. a funerary naiskos or small shrine), rather than having lost the other part of its originally bipartite structure (p. 352).

stylistic references in works of the minor arts from other areas (especially cities of Rhodian Peraea) to works of large-scale sculpture from the island (p. 450). Moreover, the export trade in Rhodian stone sculpture, especially statues with decorative motifs, is attested at least in Alexandria and Rome, while a Rhodian provenance has also been proposed for sculpture in other places on the Italian peninsular and in the eastern Aegean (pp. 452–453). As B. concludes, the Rhodian figures are distinguished by their adoption of Ionian softness. The combining of features from Attic and Asia Minor sculpture, apparent in both clothed figures and in busts and archaizing works, is the main characteristic of Rhodian art« (cf. p. 334).

Nevertheless, we rarely find among the many works produced in stone any sculptures showing typological or stylistic originality, and for the most part they do not show a standard stylistic approach with distinct characteristics and a common line of development. Despite the valuable information provided by the new material in this book, the general picture given of the nature of Rhodian stone sculpture and its contribution to Hellenistic art does not differ significantly from the one we already have<sup>13</sup>.

As a sort of ›Appendix‹ (pp. 455–477) B. recapitulates the debate about the Nike of Samothrace, the Punishment of Dirce, the Laocoon, the Sperlonga sculptures and the Muses by Philiskos of Rhodes, works which have been linked in the literature with Rhodian sculpture. She notes that the sculptures that are presented in her study »are in no way typologically linked with the above mentioned works« (p. 455). Nevertheless, a certain stylistic relationship can be observed between them and reinforces the view that these works and their models can be traced back to Rhodian sculpture.

The ›Bibliography‹ is generally substantial and relatively up-to-date (pp. 478–522)<sup>14</sup>.

Turning to the ›Catalogue of Sculptures‹, it is detailed and includes the necessary identificatory information on the works, careful observations on their stylistic characteristics and comprehensive descriptions. The documentation is systematic and comprehensive, the result of archival indexing and careful, in situ observation; inserting a reference to the relevant pages in the text where the corresponding sculpture is discussed at the end of each entry would be a help to the reader. As regards methodology and the compiling of the catalogue, the criteria according to which those sculptures that are discussed in detail were chosen from among the published works are not made completely clear. The monograph does not include trophies (including supports for statues?), armour-clad figures, or sculptures in an archaizing style (but see pp. 113–119) etc. (see p. 9).

The current Index makes it easier to search the catalogue, but there are no indexes of museums, terms or names. Similarly, in an overview of Rhodian sculpture, a list of all the sculptures that come from or are connected with Rhodes would have been very useful.

The book ends with the assembled ›illustrations‹. Many of them are of excellent quality, but unfortunately a number do not meet the specifications for publication. Less than half of the works have been photographed from all four sides. Pictures of details (especially where there are joins) would undoubtedly be useful.

This monograph provides an iconographic, typological and stylistic study of a large number of marble sculptures from Rhodes, which, following in the footsteps of other similar studies, concentrates on questions relating to the provenance, the development over time and the distribution of the types and various styles that can be seen to exist side by side. Furthermore, B.'s research is based on the assumption that in the Hellenistic period local schools of sculpture with distinguished stylistic futures emerged and developed in the major cultural centers of the Greek world. However, the difficulty to distinguish the different stylistic

13 See MACHAIRA 2017; MACHAIRA 2018.

14 A few useful studies could be added: on judging works by size (e.g. p. 5 n. 36) see above all FITTSCHEN 1994; on the cult of Sol/Helios and more particularly on the colossal head (cat. no. 017), and another, contemporary and equally colossal head of the same god from Koskinos on Rhodes, now in the Berlin Museums, inv. Sk1886 (not included in the catalogue), see MATERN 2002, with all the bibliography; on the Neo-Attic workshops, see FITTSCHEN 2008.

preferences is well known<sup>15</sup>. According to a more recent tendency in the study of sculpture, especially of that of the Hellenistic period, understanding individual stylistic choices requires to a large extent understanding the function of the sculpture, in other words the identity of the person or body who commissioned it and the person/body that paid for it, its purpose and the place where it was erected. The interrelationship between these factors is evident, for example, in certain categories of sculpture, such as portraits or archaizing sculpture. Furthermore, this sort of research, which requires studying the sculpture and the historical sources at the same time<sup>16</sup>, allows other questions that are an essential part of understanding the sculptures, such as the role of sculpture as a means of communication or a commercial product, to be addressed.

The book has been published online by the e-publisher ›Access Archaeology Publication‹, while a print version can be ordered from Archaeopress, Oxford. As is well known, this kind of online publication for academic work is aimed at giving free, direct and complete access to scholarly research while at the same time ensuring the maximum possible savings in financial and other costs, in line with the ecological spirit of our age<sup>17</sup>. In these circumstances the responsibility for editing and proofreading lies with the author. Editing, which is lacking in B.'s book, would have given greater clarity to the text and elegance to its form, especially in the case of the printed version, which is now available in university libraries: the book has retained the cumbersome form of a Ph.D. thesis and the ISBN number on the flyleaf is perhaps the only thing that connects it with the more refined format of the book. In the short introductory note, there is an attempt to justify the choice of what was evidently a rushed publication: »The Thesis contains much valuable analysis and catalogue material and this publication has been produced in order that the work should not be overlooked merely for reasons of language«. The author's anxiety is justified: the Greek-speaking community of archaeologists is constantly shrinking and texts in Greek are often overlooked. But does acknowledging this justify undervaluing Greek text? While B.'s English Introduction is impeccable as regards the content and form, there are a lot of spelling mistakes, typing errors, etc., some serious, in the Greek text<sup>18</sup>.

To sum up, despite its editorial weaknesses, this monograph provides a significant contribution to the study of the typology, iconography and dating of Rhodian sculpture and of Hellenistic sculpture in general. In her work B. has given a detailed presentation of new material, which she fully documents by means of ground-breaking archival and in situ research, while also closely re-examining a number of already published sculptures that add to the catalogues of Rhodian sculpture by G. Merker, G. Gualandi and V. Machaira<sup>19</sup>. It is particularly important that part of the – mainly more recent – material comes from identified excavation sites. Moreover, she provides original information on the provenance of the different types of stone available on the island and how it was used in sculpture. It is also useful that she has assembled the signed works from the island and elsewhere and that there are references in the thematized chapters to many more works not only in the Museum of Rhodes but also in museums abroad. In addition, she has systematically combined old questions and new evidence from research about the special features of Rhodian sculpture, the great marble creations connected with Rhodes and assessing the role of the island's workshops in the production and distribution of Hellenistic types of sculpture. It is in any case a considerable help to have at our disposal a

15 Cf. MACHAIRA 2017; 2018.

16 E.g. BIARD 2017.

17 The thesis, it is worth noting, is also freely available on the website of the Greek National Documentation Centre: <http://thesis.ekt.gr/thesisBookReader/id/33185#page/1/mode/2up>.

18 E. g. p. 56: αὐτοκράτορα [sic] Κλαύδιο, i. e. General Claudius etc.

19 MERKER 1973; GUALANDI 1976; MACHAIRA 2011.



series of scholarly catalogues on Rhodian sculpture<sup>20</sup>, together forming a firm foundation for further research into Hellenistic sculpture on the island and into sculpture as a source for the social and economic history of the island as part of the Hellenistic world.

## Bibliography

- BIARD 2017 G. Biard, *La représentation honorifique dans les cités grecques aux époques classique et hellénistique*, Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 376 (Athens 2017)
- CELANI 2005 A. Celani, *Scultura dell'ellenismo: problemi di metodo*, *ASAtene* 83, 2005, 299–338
- CHIOTI unpublished E. Chioti, *Αυτοκρατορικά και ιδιωτικά πορτρέτα της εποχής των Αντωνίωνων στην Ελλάδα* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Thessaloniki)
- FANTAOUTSAKI 2011 C. Fantaoutsaki, *Preliminary Report in the Excavation of the Sanctuary of Isis in Ancient Rhodes. Identification, Topography and Finds*, in: L. Bricault – R. Veymiers (eds.), *Bibliotheca Isiaca* 2 (Bordeaux 2011) 47–63
- FITTSCHEN 1994 K. Fittschen, *Rez. zu: D. Kreikenbom, Griechische und römische Kolossalporträts bis zum späten ersten Jahrhundert nach Christus*, *JdI Ergh.* 27 (Berlin 1992), *Gnomon* 66, 1994, 612–615
- FITTSCHEN 2008 K. Fittschen, *Über den Beitrag der Bildhauer in Athen zur Kunstproduktion im römischen Reich*, in: St. Vlizos (ed.), *Athens during the Roman Period: Recent Discoveries, New Evidence*, *Proceedings of the International Archaeological Symposium*, Athens, October 19–21, 2006 (Athens 2008) 325–336
- FITTSCHEN 2017 K. Fittschen, *Ein dritter Bildnistypus des Antoninus Pius?* in: E. Voutiras – E. Papagianni – N. Kazakidi (eds.), *Bonae Gratiae. Essays on Roman Sculpture in Honour of Professor Theodosia Stefanidou-Tiveriou* (Thessaloniki 2017)
- GUALANDI 1976 G. Gualandi, *Sculture di Rodi*, *ASAtene* 54, 1976, 7–259
- HERTEL 2013 D. Hertel, *Das römische Herrscherbild* 1, 3. *Die Bildnisse des Tiberius* (Wiesbaden 2013)
- VON DEN HOFF 2015 R. von den Hoff, *Die Clipei aus dem Mittelsaal H des Gymnasions von Pergamon*, in: R. Grüßinger – U. Kästner – A. Scholl (eds.), *Pergamon als Zentrum der hellenistischen Kunst – Bedeutung, Eigenheiten und Ausstrahlung. Kolloquium Berlin 26.–28.9.2012* (Petersberg 2015) 55–63
- KASTEINER 2000 S. Kasteiner, *Herakles. Die Darstellungen in der Großplastik der Antike* (Köln 2000)
- KAZAKIDI 2015 N. Kazakidi, *Έργα γλυπτικής στο ελληνιστικό γυμνάσιο. ΕΙΚΟΝΕΣ ΕΝ ΓΥΜΝΑΣΙΩ. Ηπειρωτική Ελλάδα και νησιά του Αιγαίου* (Thessaloniki 2015)

<sup>20</sup> See also the publication of the finds from the sanctuary of Isis, FANTAOUTSAKI 2011, 47–63, while publication of more sculptures is being undertaken by MACHAIRA 2017; MACHAIRA 2018; MACHAIRA 2019.

- KAZAKIDI 2018 N. Kazakidi, »Ένα υποτιθέμενο πορτρέτο του Κλαυδίου στο Εθνικό Αρχαιολογικό Μουσείο Αθηνών και τα ελληνιστικά του παράλληλα από τη Σμύρνη«, in: P. Karanastasi – Th. Stephanidou-Tiveriou – D. Damaskos (eds), *Γλυπτική και Κοινωνία στη Ρωμαϊκή Ελλάδα, Καλλιτεχνικά προϊόντα – κοινωνικές προβολές, Β' Διεθνές Συνέδριο Ρωμαϊκής Αρχαιολογίας, Ρέθυμνο 26–28 Σεπτεμβρίου 2014* (Thessaloniki 2018) 293–306
- KNOLL – VORSTER 2013 K. Knoll – C. Vorster (eds.), *Katalog der antiken Bildwerke 3. Die Porträts. Skulpturensammlung, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden* (München 2013)
- KUNZE 2002 C. Kunze, *Zum Greifen nah: Stilphänomene in der hellenistischen Skulptur und ihre inhaltliche Interpretation* (München 2002)
- LINFERT 1976 A. Linfert, *Kunstzentren hellenistischer Zeit. Studien an weiblichen Gewandstatuen* (Wiesbaden 1976)
- MACHAIRA 2011 V. Machaira, *Ελληνιστικά γλυπτά της Ρόδου. Κατάλογος 1* (Athens 2011)
- MACHAIRA 2017 V. Machaira, *Το πρόγραμμα μελέτης και δημοσίευσης των ελληνιστικών γλυπτών της Ρόδου: Παρατηρήσεις και επιμέρους συμπεράσματα*, in: P. Triantafyllides (ed.), *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στα νησιά του Αιγαίου*, 2017, *Proceedings of a Conference held in Rhodes 3* (Mytilene 2017) 31–41
- MACHAIRA 2018 V. Machaira, *Ελληνιστική πλαστική στο Αιγαίο: Ρόδος και Δήλος, πόλοι δημιουργίας και διάδοσης, Δωδεκανησιακά Χρονικά 28*, 2018, 128–149
- MACHAIRA 2019 V. Machaira, *Sculpture funéraire de Rhodes. Quelle individualisation?* in: D. Boschung – F. Queyrel (eds), *Das Porträt als Massenphänomen / Le portrait comme phénomène de masse, Morphomata 40* (Paderborn 2019) 169–185
- MARCADÉ 1969 J. Marcadé, *Au musée de Délos: étude sur la sculpture hellénistique en ronde bosse découverte dans l'île* (Paris 1969)
- MATERN 2002 P. Matern, *Helios und Sol. Kulte und Ikonographie des griechischen und römischen Sonnengottes* (Istanbul 2002)
- MERKER 1973 G. Merker, *The Hellenistic Sculpture of Rhodes, Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 40* (Göteborg 1973)
- MEYER 1991 H. Meyer, *Antinoos, die archäologischen Denkmäler unter Einbeziehung des numismatischen und epigraphischen Materials sowie der literarischen Nachrichten. Ein Beitrag zur Kunst- und Kulturgeschichte der hadrianisch-frühantoninischen Zeit* (München 1991)
- SCHOLL 2016 A. Scholl (ed.), *Antikensammlung der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin. Katalog der Skulpturen in der Antikensammlung der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin 1* (Petersberg 2016)
- WINTER 1908 F. Winter, *Die Skulpturen mit Ausnahme der Altarreliefs, AvP 7* (Berlin 1908)