

Tomasz Polański

University of Kielce

tomaszpolanski@yahoo.com

Antigonos of Karystos and Polemon of Ilion: The Pergamene Contribution to the Theory and History of Greek Art*

Abstract

I am going to collect dispersed items of information which clearly refer or seem to be suggestive of the Aeolic, Pergamene or Attalid school of art historians which developed in the first half of the 2nd century BC and discuss their idiosyncratic methods and original contribution to the Greek intellectual life of the Hellenistic period. Even the fragmentary history of the Attalid art collections which can be reconstructed from the archaeological data and the scarce information in the literary sources shows that the collections grew as a result of various factors: 1. wartime robbery. 2. purchases of artworks. 3. a well-thought out programme of reproducing original Greek artworks. The Attalids must have had professional art historians at their side as consultants. We can identify two of them by name: Antigonos of Karystos and Polemon of Ilion. A number of passages testify to a lively academic debate between them. In the course of their professional polemics they discussed the problems of authorship and authenticity of artworks, they adduced biographical details in their efforts to establish the personal identities of the artists and paid tribute to their heroes with colourful anecdotes. They attributed artworks to alternative authors. They also constructed complicated genealogical trees of schools of painting and sculpture, along the principle of master/pupil relations. Their epigraphic studies must have been inspired and influenced by the editors of the Aeolic Archaic poets.

Keywords

Hellenistic art history, patronage, the Attalids, Pergamon, Xenocrates of Sicyon, Antigonos of Karystos, Polemon of Ilion, Pausanias Periegetes.

* This paper is an enlarged version of my paper presented at the Aeolis Conference in Aliğa – Izmir, 27th–28th September 2018.

I am going to collect together and discuss dispersed items of information which clearly refer or seem to be suggestive of the third outstanding school of art historians in the Greek intellectual life of the Hellenistic period: the Aeolic, Pergamene or Attalid school. The Aeolic school developed in the first half of the 2nd century and succeeded the earlier Sicyonian school and for some time rivalled the Attic school.

I would like as briefly as possible to review the highlights achieved by the Sicyonian school, because I am going to refer to them time and again in the discussion of the idiosyncratic methods and original contribution of the Aeolic school. Its contribution to art critique is visible more distinctly when confronted with the earlier Greek art historical writings, which established this branch of studies in Hellenistic scholarship.

The idea of art history as a branch of scholarship was apparently inspired by a series of writings compiled by 5th and 4th century bronze sculptors and painters. Those writings constituted an intellectual reaction to the phenomenal and unparalleled accumulation of ingenious works of art in Mainland and Aegean Greece. In the literary sources we incidentally learn of Melantheus' treatise on the art of painting (Diog.Laert.4,18), Euphranor's *volumina de symmetria et coloribus* (Vitr.7, praef.14; *HN* 35, 129), Apollodorus' books on painting (Ind. *HN* 35), Apelles' *de arte ad Perseum discipulum* (*HN* 35,111).¹ We also read of Polycleitos' *κάνων* and Timanthes' parallel theoretical work on the art of painting (*HN* 35,74).² The first professional art book we know something about was compiled by Xenocrates of Sicyon, who was a sculptor and one of Lysippus' disciples (*HN* 34, 83). His book proved epoch making. Xenocrates exerted a lasting impact on the Graeco-Roman, Byzantine and Renaissance art critics. His ground-breaking influence can still be felt in the scholarship of the recent century.³ In Pliny the Elder's translations we can still recognize the highly sophisticated language of art books: of Myron we read that he was *in symmetria diligentior* (*HN* 34,58), of Lysippos that he carefully followed the principle of *symmetria nova intactaque ratione quadratas veterum staturas permutando* (bringing innovations which had never been thought of before into the square

¹ Ulrichs 1887, p. 32.

² Sellers 1896, p. XLII, where she aptly described Timanthes' canon as 'the embodiment of theories which had been expanded in an *ars* or τέχνη.' In Pliny's words which doubtlessly were cited from a professional art book: in his painting *absolutissimi operis* Timanthes *artem ipsam complexus viros pingendi* (*HN* 35,74); Polycleitos *HN* 34,55; Galenos on Polycleitos' canon, Sellers p. XLI. We know more names of artists who discussed their art in parallel literary guides to the art of sculpture and painting: Menaichmos (sculptor), Aselepidorus and Parrhasios (painters), Jex-Blake, Sellers 1896, pp. XL–XLI.

³ Xenocrates' art book was identified and recovered from Pliny the Elder's art history by a group of scholars in the latter half of the 19th century: O. Jahn (1854), C. Robert, F. Münzer (1897), E. Sellers (1896), H. Ulrichs (1887).

canon of the older artists, trans. K. Jex-Blake) (*HN* 34, 65). Apelles executed a painting *nihil aliud continentem quam lineas visum effugientes* (nothing save lines which eluded the sight, trans. K. Jex-Blake) (*HN* 35,83), while Athenion of Maroneia was *austerior colore et in austeritate iucundior, ut in ipsa pictura eruditio eluceat* (*HN* 35,134) (he used a severer scheme of colouring (than Nicias), and produced a more pleasing effect withal, thus manifesting in his execution his grasp of the abstract principles of his art, trans. K. Jex-Blake). These quotations show that in his book Xenocrates relied on the already well-developed artistic doctrines of *συμμέτριά*, *μίμησις* and *πρέπον* in the Greek aesthetics. They also testify to the fact that Xenocrates as an art historian inherited a wide ranging and well-developed methodology, which he developed to the peak of its scholarly potential through his own research.

Xenocrates' methodology was based on a generally exact chronological framework which included the bronze sculptors and painters from the Persian wars to Lysippos and his disciples (the 121st Olympiad, 296–293 BC).⁴ Xenocrates also developed the idea of a sequence of five master sculptors paralleled by five ingenious painters. This pattern was based on the idea of *εὑρεταί* (*inventores*) and *τελειωταί* (*perfectores*) (Pheidias/Apollodorus, Polykleitos/Zeuxis, Myron/Parrhasios, Pythagoras/Euphranor, Lysippos/Apelles). In this way he constructed a coherent pattern of the Greek art history and showed its course and the progressing perfection of its art forms. His pattern was founded 'on the idea of 'evolution' from the simpler to the more complex,' as aptly argued by Sellers.⁵ Pliny the Elder's text also shows that Xenocrates' art history was introduced by a short history of the Archaic Greek art based on the same principle of evolution.⁶ As if inspired by the Homeric verse the genealogies of Greek masters grouped in schools made an indispensable component of Xenocrates' art history. With his symptomatic Sicyonian inclination Xenocrates was convinced that the Sicyonian school of sculptors and also of painters (*HN* 35,16) made a core of the Greek world of figure arts.⁷ The Theban-Attic school, which was also discussed in Xenocrates' book (Eupompos, Aristeides I), made actually, in his view, a branch of the Sicyonian school.

⁴ I think Ulrichs 1887, p. 38 was right when he related Pliny the Elder's chapters *HN* 34,54–72 (Pheidias, Myron, Polycleitos, Lysippos, Praxiteles, the Lysippids) to *HN* 34,68: *artifices qui compositis voluminibus condidere haec*.

⁵ Sellers 1896, p. XXIX; id. p. XX: 'the idea of evolution from figures at rest to figures in motion.'

⁶ Sellers on Dipoinos and Skyllis' chapters in *HN* 36,9–10: the history of the Greek *primitivi* Philocles and Cleanthes who allegedly started from mere drawings to Polygnotus of Thasos' models in motion and women represented in transparent garments. Polygnotus of Thasos opened the way for the first great master Apollodorus of Athens (the idea of *festinans ad lumina artis*).

⁷ Cf. a young and prolific branch in the Sicyonian school: *Xenocrates, Tisicratis filius, ut alii Euthycratis* (*HN* 34,83). Tisicrates was a student of Lysippos.

Xenocrates' art history was territorially limited to the Isthmos, Attica (Athens, Rhamnus), Thebaid (Thebes, Thespieae, Lebadeia), Elis (Olympia) and Phocis (Delphoi) and never referred to the Aeolic school. The Pergamene school developed much more later, roughly a hundred years later after the publication of Xenocrates' book. I am referring to Xenocrates' chronology in this section of my paper, because one of the few clearly legible signatures of Pergamene sculptors reads Ξ ENOKPATEΣ. The inscription is dated to the reign of Eumenes II (197–159 BC).⁸ It is tempting to identify two bronze sculptors, art historian from Sikyon and Xenocrates of Pergamon, as one person. Xenocrates of Sikyon's historical idea of *cessavit deinde ars* (the 121 Ol. 295–292 BC) must relate to his late years. Xenocrates the Pergamene sculptor was a different person, who lived about a hundred years later.⁹ Xenocrates of Sicyon also employed epigraphy and the elegiac epigrammatic poetry in his studies of Greek art.¹⁰ I am going to return to this point in the discussion on the Aeolic school.

The Xenocratic model of Greek art history was supplemented by Xenocrates' contemporary, Duris of Samos (born c. 340 BC). Duris was not an art historian. His biographic studies made him into an ancient Giorgio Vasari.¹¹ Duris' biographies included $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$ ζωγράφων (Diog.Laert.1,1,39), and also a parallel biography of bronze sculptors (*de toreutice*, *HN* Ind. 34). He was very fond of anecdotes. After more than two thousand years his stories of Pausias and Glycera (*HN* 35,125), Apelles and Pancaspe (*HN* 35,85–86), of Ialysos' dog and Protogenes (*HN* 35, 103)¹² still sound charming and fresh. Like other commentators I too am inclined to believe that a certain number of recurrent biographic patterns which can be recognized in Pliny the Elder's art history originated in Duris' biographies, for example the ones based on the *summa paupertas* motif at the beginning of an artist's life (Protogenes, *HN* 35,101; Erigonos, *HN* 35, 145), or the artists *nullo doctore* (Silanion, *HN* 34,51; Lysippos, *HN* 34,61).¹³ Duris' writings may also be identified through his theophrastic inclination for characterological studies (e.g. the odd manners of Zeuxis, *HN* 35,62). His biographical studies must have

⁸ *IvP* 138.

⁹ Cf. Sellers 1896, p. XX: 'the activity of Xenocrates cannot have extended much beyond Ol.121.' Hansen 1971, p. 317 mistakenly on Xenocrates the Pergamene (inscription on the great basis, *IvP* 135,138) and Xenocrates the art critic and sculptor (*HN* 34,83: the son of Tisicrates or Euthycrates) as one person.

¹⁰ Sellers 1896, p. LXXIII.

¹¹ Cf. Sellers 1896, p. XLVI–LXVII; Schwartz, Duris (3), *RE* V,2, cc.1853–1856.

¹² The story of Ialysos' dog was based on the Peripatetic motif of *fecitque in pictura fortuna naturam*, Sellers 1896, p. LX.

¹³ The motifs of *summa paupertas* and *autodidaktia* in Lysippos' biography: *Lysippum...Duris negat ullius fuisse discipulum, sed primo aerarium fabrum...non artificem* (*HN* 34,61). Schwarz 1971, p. 39: 'waren doch viele berühmte Bildhauer auch als Maler tätig oder umgekehrt' (n.101: Pythagoras, Polygnot, Mikon, Pheidias, Euphranor, Kallimachos, Protogenes, Eutychides, Damophilos...u.a.). On the sculptor Callimachos: *hunc quidem et pictorem fuisse tradunt* (*HN* 34,92).

been helpful in the resolution of the chronological and onomastic inconsistencies which art historians frequently face in their studies. When confronted with such problems, art historians and philologists tend to turn two persons into one, or conversely, split up one person into two characters to solve the chronological, geographic and onomastic difficulties in the biographies of artists. The same happens in the modern art history and philology. Later on I am going to refer to von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf's laborious effort to make one Antigonos of Karystos out of two, or may be three different Antigonoi (1881). One of them, the art historian from the Aeolic school, was clearly not the same person as the rhetorician and biographer, and here might have been two other Antigonoi (?).

The Duridian scholarship made an indispensable contribution to art historical studies, as aptly observed by Sellers, who wrote of Xenocrates and Duris 'with their very distinctive histories, the one of art, the other of artists.'¹⁴ The Aeolic art historians made good use of Duris' and Xenocrates' expertise and their methods of analysis. They appended Duris' and Xenocrates' books with new discussions, enriched their factography and managed to develop some of their professional tools of analysis into new specializations.

At the conclusion of my introductory section I would like to recommend a couple of books from the vast bibliography of the subject. Urlichs' doctoral dissertation is still indispensable as a successful and inspiring review of Greek history of art (1887). Other useful items are Sellers' *Chapters* (1896, repr.1976), and the still underestimated erudite monograph on the Greek sculpture and painting of the 5th and 4th century BC in the *Palatine Anthology* by Gerda Schwarz (1971).

Now I am going to focus on some selected aspects of the Attalid patronage in architecture, art, literature and sciences – those which inspired and influenced the development of the Aeolic school of art history. The reader will find a more complex and exhaustive discussion in E. Hansen's great monograph on the Attalids.

Attalos I founded his first victory monuments in Pergamon after the prolonged period of wars with Antiochus Hierax and the Gallic tribes of the Tolistoagi and Tectosages (241–226 BC). Several commemorative and votive inscriptions were found by the German expedition in the late 1880s on the terrace of the temple of Athena.¹⁵ A number of legible signatures of Epigonos can be related to those monuments (*IvP* 29,31,32).¹⁶ Epigonos, the first safely dated Attalid bronze sculptor (c. 250–200 BC on the epigraphic evidence), listed by Pliny the Elder in one of his catalogues of sculptors (*HN* 34,88), marks the

¹⁴ Sellers 1896, p. LXXXII.

¹⁵ Loewy 1885, 154, pp. 115–16.

¹⁶ The inscriptions from the great *bathron IvP* 21–28 are not sufficiently well preserved. Consequently they have been reconstructed in various ways and completed with different names, such as Epigonos, Isigonos, and Antigonos, Jex-Blake, Sellers 1896, n.1, p. 74.

chronologically identifiable early phase of Attalid artistic patronage. Pliny the Elder's short and general description of Attalid patronage stimulated long lasting and inconclusive discussions in the modern scholarship: *plures artifices fecere Attali et Eumenis adversus Gallos proelia, Isigonus, Pyromachus, Stratonicus, Antigonus qui volumina condidit de sua arte* (HN 34,84) (The battles of Attalos and Eumenes against the Gauls were represented by several artists, +Isigonos, Pyromachos, Stratonikos and Antigonos who also wrote books on his art, trans. K. Jex-Blake). Which Attalos and which Eumenes?¹⁷ I am personally inclined to agree with A. Schober, who argued for Eumenes II (197–159 BC) and Attalos II (159–139 BC),¹⁸ and he dated the construction of the Great Altar as late as possible. All of us who are working on the art and literature of Late Hellenism have to contend with inexact chronologies and fragmented factography. The phenomenal creativity of this period marked by artistic and literary genius was largely obliterated by the fatal course of history which brought political disaster to many Greek states and their centres of patronage, either as a result of the Roman invasions or a decline caused by domestic conflict. This applies to Ambrakia (189 BC), Pella (167 BC), Corinth (146 BC), Alexandria (145 BC), and Pergamon (133 BC).

However, the history of the Pergamene sculptors and painters is now not so important to us as the history of the Pergamene art collections, which stimulated the development of the art history. In 210 BC Attalos I purchased the island of Aegina from the Aetolians, and he immediately confiscated a colossal bronze statue of the young Apollo by Onatas and sent it to Pergamon. This act of robbery committed by Attalos on his Greek compatriots launched the history of the Attalid collection of Late Archaic sculpture. It is interesting to observe that nearly four centuries later Pausanias, who was born in the Valley of the Meander, shared Attalos' predilection for Late Archaic beauty and expressed his admiration of Onatas' Apollo, its impressive size and artistic perfection (Paus.8,42,7). Attalos'

¹⁷ Hansen 1971, p. 302. The chronology and subject of the Gallic monuments are additionally complicated by the inadequately known history of the Gallic wars 241–226 BC. In addition the Gallic mercenaries took part in the siege of Pergamon under the command of Seleucus, son of Antiochus III in 190 BC. Eumenes II defeated the Gauls in 166 BC in Phrygia. He had many reasons himself to raise 'Gallic monuments.' It is also not altogether clear who founded the victory monument in the Athenian Acropolis, whether it was Attalos I when he visited Athens in 200 BC, or Attalos II some time later. Pausanias did not make it clear in his concise description of the monument (Gigants, Amazons, Gauls, Marathon), Paus.1,25,2, Overbeck 1995; cf. Schwarz 1971, p. 208.

¹⁸ Cf. Hansen 1971, 302; H. Brunn: Attalos I/Eumenes I; L. Urlichs: Isigonos, Phromachos (Attalos I), Stratonicus, Antigonos (Eumenes II); B. Schweitzer: Attalos I, the early years of Eumenes II. The latter argued that all the sculptors enumerated by Pliny the Elder worked in bronze, while in the 2nd century BC Greek sculpture was dominated by stone cutters. Isigonos is otherwise unknown, consequently sometimes Epigonos substitutes for him, Hansen 1971, p. 303. Cf. B. Andreae's invaluable paper on Phromachos, Vollkommer 2007, pp. 695–699, and R. Vollkommer's Stratonikos, Vollkommer 2007, p. 862.

theft is corroborated by the epigraphic evidence in Pergamon (*IvP* 48). An anonymous poet of the *Palatine Anthology* (IX,238) (Antipatros of Thessalonice?) described the same statue of Apollo with Homer's words, ὄμματα καὶ κεφαλὴν ἀγλαός (*Il.*2,476), clearly fascinated by Apollo's ancient, pre-Pheidian, austere beauty.¹⁹ The studied connoisseurship of the epigram testifies to the poet's familiarity in the art books. We can see time and again that epigrammatic poetry was strongly influenced by art books (dedicatory and ephrastic epigrams, artists' signatures composed by professional poets). An inscription with the name of another sculptor of Aegina, Theron the Beotian, discovered in Pergamon (*IvP* 49), shows that Attalos' robbery in 210 BC involved more than one Apollo of Onatas.²⁰ We also learn from Pausanias of a sculptural group of Charites by Bupalos, yet another Archaic master. The bronze Charites, who embodied feminine grace and beauty, adorned the private apartments of Attalos (II?) (Paus.9,35,6).²¹ In 208 BC Attalos I and his Roman allies sacked the wealthy city of Opus in Beotia. Only the immediate intervention of Philip V saved the Opuntians from the loss of all of their precious votive items and divine images.²² In 199 BC at the beginning of the Second Macedonian War the by now elderly Attalos I and Roman invaders attacked Oreus-on-Euboea, and carried off another set of art works to Pergamon. This robbery was also corroborated by epigraphic evidence in Pergamon: a German team of archaeologists found the signature of Silanion, the Athenian sculptor, active in the 2nd half of the 4th century BC (*IvP* 50).²³ Two statues, one of Athena and one of Hera, were found in the north stoa of Athena's sanctuary in Pergamon. They evidently formed part of the art collection established by Eumenes II.²⁴ The original work behind this copy of Athena was dated to c. 450 BC and described as a work from Pheidias' circle.²⁵ The statue of Hera was compared to the Venus Genetrix, the Iris from the Parthenon and the Kore of the Erechtheion.²⁶ The Volume VII of the *Altertümer von Pergamon* shows many Pergamene copies which can be referred to well-known originals from the 5th and 4th centuries BC, for example a man's head in Berlin which

¹⁹ Benndorf 1862, p. 46, identified the poet as Antipatros of Thessalonice, who visited Pergamon in 10–8 BC, Schwarz 1971, p. 10, n.20. Schwarz 1971, p. 11 emphasised the epigram's *Gelehrsamkeit* and *Pointiertheit*, and added that Apollo's *strahlende Schönheit allein dem Epigrammatiker zum Thema diene*. The reader can find a comprehensive paper on Onatas by E. Walter-Karydi, in Vollkommer 2007, pp. 591–595.

²⁰ *IvO* 49 is dated to the period of Eumenes II. Cf. S. Lehmann, Theron (2nd half of the 3rd century BC), Vollkommer 2007, p. 898.

²¹ W. Müller, Bupalos, Vollkommer 2007, p. 125f. (2nd half of the 6th century).

²² Cf. Hansen 1971, p. 49.

²³ *IvP* 50: Σιλανίων [...] ἐξ Ἰφροῦ [-] = *OGIS* 288. *IvP* 38=*OGIS* 284; cf. Hansen 1971, p. 62.

²⁴ Hansen 1971, p. 353.

²⁵ *AvP* VII, 13–23, no. 22, Pl.II–V; Hansen 1971, p. 354.

²⁶ *AvP* VII, 25–33, no. 23, Pl.VI–VII, Hansen 1971, p. 354.

resembles the head of Harmodios;²⁷ a copy of Athena Parthenos, about one-third of the original size, now in Berlin;²⁸ a graceful copy of Leda, now in Berlin, compared to sculptures from the acroteria of Asclepius' temple in Epidauros, the original dated to the early 4th century BC.²⁹ Many other illustrative examples from the archaeological material may be adduced here.

We may also trace the intelligently designed layout of the Attalid museum, carefully arranged to show the historical and stylistic development of Greek art, in the literary sources. In his catalogues Pliny the Elder listed Apollodorus of Athen's painting *Ajax fulmine incensus* (struck by lightning) (93 Ol. 408–405 BC), 'which can be seen today in Pergamon' (*HN* 35,60).³⁰ In his history of sculpture in stone Pliny the Elder expressed his admiration for a *symplegma*, a sculptural group of wrestlers or more likely of a pair of lovers, which was made by Kephisodotos, the son of Praxiteles, and could once be seen in Pergamon (*HN* 36,24). This quotation from an art book, probably one compiled by a learned Pergamene art historian, was adorned with an impressive epigram, which is rare in Pliny the Elder's highly synthetic catalogues: *symplegma nobile digitis corpori verius quam marmori impressis* (his (Kephisodotos') celebrated group of figures interlaced, in which the fingers seem to press on flesh rather than on marble, trans. K. Jex-Blake).³¹ At an auction of the spoils (*in praeda venanda*) on the ashes of Corinth in 146 BC Attalos II wanted to purchase a highly valued painting of Dionysos by Aristides for a large sum of money (600, 000 denarii) (*HN* 35,24; 7,126; Strabo VIII, 6, 23).³² Attalos' abortive effort to acquire the legendary painting from the hands of Q. Caecilius Metellus, a brutal conqueror, was later ironically commented on by Pausanias. Metellus carried off to Rome whatever was valuable of the Corinthian votive offerings and other adornments to arrange a public show of the Corinthian spoils, Pausanias wrote (τὰ μὲν

²⁷ *AvP* VII, 9, no.18.

²⁸ *AvP* VII, no 24, Pl.VIII, Beiblatt 2,3.

²⁹ *IvP* VII, 58ff., no 40, Beiblatt 6 Timotheos (?).

³⁰ *Quae Pergami spectatur et hodie*, 'still to be seen', should perhaps be read as a quotation from Pliny the Elder's source book; cf. Ajax emerging from the stormy waters at the Gyrai Rocks οἶον ἐκ μέθης ἀναφέρων, with the ship set on fire by lightning in the background, Philostratus the Elder, *Imagines* 13,2.

³¹ The appended stylish epigram, as if cited from the *Palatine Anthology*, should probably have a different translation than the rigid and factual rendering given by Jex-Blake. 'a beautiful couple of lovers, their fingers' touch change marble stone into flesh' (?).

³² Strabo VIII,6,23 cited a passage from Polybius' account of the siege of Corinth. In Polybius' description a group of primitive Roman soldiers threw dice in the middle of the street using the painting by Aristides as a table. Polybius confessed that he saw other paintings lying on the ground in Corinth (ἐρριμμένους πίνακας ἐπ' ἐδάφους). The painting by Aristides was dedicated in the Temple of Ceres in Rome (Plin.*HN* 35,24; 99. Strabo 8.6.23), Richardson 1992, p. 80; Pape 1975, p. 154.

μάλιστα ἀνήκοντα ἐς θαῦμα ἀνήγετο),³³ only to add: ‘those of lesser account he gave to Philopoemen, the general sent by Attalos’ (trans. W. Jones). Pausanias did not forget to add: ‘In my time the spoils of Corinth were still to be seen in Pergamon’ (Paus.VII,16,8). Hansen explained the phenomenon of the large Pergamene collection of copies by ‘the interest of the Attalids in the study of art from both the historical and critical points of view.’³⁴ The Attalids managed to collect a number of original art works, however they were not always able to obtain all the originals they were interested in to reconstruct their imaginary history of Greek art in the rooms, halls, corridors and porticoes of their palaces, so ‘copies had to be produced.’³⁵

It is time to sum up the recent discussion. Even the fragmentary history of the Attalid art collections which can be reconstructed from the archaeological data and the dispersed and scarce information in the literary sources shows that the collections came into existence and grew as a result of different factors:

1. the wartime robbery committed by Attalos I, Eumenes II and Attalos II on Mainland Greece, in the Aegean and Asia Minor (Phrygia, Bithynia). Some of those robberies are documented.
2. the Attalids must have had professional art historians at their side as consultants, which is evident in the case of Aegina (210 BC, Onatas’ Apollo), Oreus (208 BC, Silanion) and Corinth (146 BC, Aristeides’ Dionysos).
3. purchases of artworks, which is corroborated by Pliny the Elder’s art books.
4. a well-thought out programme of collecting copies and reproducing Greek original artworks. The agenda must have been supervised by professional art historians, who created a highly intellectualised, academic art history of the Greeks. Judging by the surviving artefacts from the Pergamene art galleries and ateliers, the Aeolic art historians shared a predilection for the Late Archaic sculpture and the Pheidian school.

³³ Attalos II was renowned as a passionate art collector, which is also reflected by Pliny’s erroneous information on Attalos’ effort to purchase Nikias of Athen’s *necyomantea Homeri*, Odysseus’ *katabasis*. According to Pliny Nikias rejected Attalos’ royal price of 60 talents (*HN* 35,132). Such negotiations would certainly have been impossible on chronological grounds, cf. also *AP* IX, 792. Nikias died c. 300 BC; U. Koch-Brinkmann, *Nikias (II)*, *Vollkommer* 2007, pp. 571–573.

³⁴ Hansen 1971, p. 355.

³⁵ Hansen 1971, p. 355; Pliny the Elder documented the efforts undertaken by the Attalid art historians and copyists when he commented on Epigonos, who *omnia fere praedicta imitatus* (produced examples of almost all the subjects I have mentioned, trans. K. Jex-Blake) (*HN* 34,88). Pliny appended this comment to the preceding catalogue of sculptors who made statues of the same class (*eiusdem generis opera fecerunt*) (*HN* 34,86–87) and of the artists who specialized in certain subjects, for example in portraits of the *philosophos*, *adornantes se feminas* (women adorning themselves), *luctatores* (wrestlers), *tyrannicidas* (tyrant slayers), *feminas nobiles* (society ladies) and others (*HN* 34, 86–87). J. Pollitt was probably right when he commented that *Epigonos alle Statuentypen, die in nat.34,86-87, aufgeführt werden, imitierte (imitatus sollte hier viell. am besten mit ‘in Variatione fertigte’ übersehen werden)*, J. Pollitt, *Epigonos*, in *Vollkommer* 2007, p. 207.

The impact of largely 5th-century BC Greek art on the ingenious, original creation of the Pergamene ‘baroque’ sculpture has been thoroughly studied. Hansen observed resemblances between the Apollo from the Great Frieze and the Apollo Belvedere,³⁶ ‘the giant behind Dione, whose head resembles those of the Parthenon horsemen,’³⁷ and ‘Nyx, whose face is closely related to the Praxitelean.’³⁸ There are numerous examples. Hansen emphasised that the Pergamene art collection was ‘the first of its kind in antiquity.’³⁹

The Attalid art historians worked in the legendary library of Pergamon, which was probably located on the terrace above the sanctuary of Athena. I say, ‘probably,’ because a visitor to the Acropolis of Pergamon would find it difficult to believe that a library could have been accommodated in such small premises. The Aeolic philologists who edited Alcaeus and Sappho’s poems must have been helpful in the art historical studies of the Pergamene epigraphists. If we still had had the writing of Krates of Mallos, the chief librarian of Pergamon, a linguist and cosmologist, we could get a better grasp of the cosmological ideas behind the Pergamene Gigantomachy.⁴⁰

In the 2nd century the Greek men of letters experienced the reality of a gradually narrowing intellectual space in the Hellenic Eastern Mediterranean. The fatal Peace of Apamea (188 BC) and imminent death of Antiochus III radically curtailed the royal patronage of the Seleucids in Antioch on the Orontes. In 167 BC Pella was sacked by the Romans, and Perseus’ great library was carried off to Rome. In 146 BC Roman invaders plundered and destroyed Corinth, a great and ancient centre of the Peloponnesian figural arts. In 145 BC Ptolemy VIII expelled the scholars from the academic institutions of Alexandria. Apollodorus of Athens, a chronographer and historian of religion (περὶ θεῶν), left Alexandria and went into exile like many of his colleagues. He probably found a temporary refuge at the court of Pergamon.⁴¹ At that time Pergamon might have been something of a Noah’s Ark for Greek men of letters and artists. The dramatic course of history in Mainland Greece, the Aegean and Asia Minor in the 2nd century did not create favourable conditions for great, cultural projects. The kingdom of Attalos I was squeezed in between two great military powers, the Antigonids and the Seleucids, and struggled for survival between its dangerous neighbours, Prusias I and the wary Galatians. It was not until 188 BC that the Peace of Apamea offered favourable circumstances to Eumenes II, who

³⁶ Hansen 1971, p. 323; cf. A. Furtwängler, *Zum Apollo von Belvedere*, *AZ* 40, 1882, pp. 247–254; L. Farnell, *JHS* 6, 1883, pp. 127–130.

³⁷ Hansen 1971, p. 336.

³⁸ Hansen 1971, p. 336.

³⁹ Hansen 1971, p. 316 on Attalos I’s art galleries.

⁴⁰ H. Mette, *Sphairopoia. Untersuchungen zur Kosmologie des Krates von Pergamon*, Munich 1936.

⁴¹ Apollodorus dedicated one of his writings to Attalos II, H. Dörrie, *Apollodoros* (5), 1 *KP* c. 438.

started a large-scale programme of patronage. He began to expand and adorn Athena's sanctuary on the Acropolis.⁴² Unfortunately his plans soon came up against new difficulties. 185 BC brought a new war with Prusias I. Hardly that war was over, when another began. This time against Pharnaces, king of Pontus (183–179 BC). Afterwards Eumenes enjoyed only a brief spell of peace. 'Undoubtedly during this period he continued the task of enlarging and adorning his capital.'⁴³ This short interlude of peace was soon over, when the Romans attacked Perseus (172 BC). Eumenes II fought on their side against the brave king of Macedon. Very soon after the Battle of Pydna (22nd June 168 BC), which brought fatal consequences for Macedon and Balkan Greece, Eumenes II was compelled to confront the Gallic warriors from Central Anatolia (166 BC). So it is not surprising that the Great Altar had not been finished when Eumenes II died in 159 BC. His successor, Attalos II, had to confront his sworn enemy Prusias II, king of Bithynia (156 BC), who sacked and destroyed the sanctuary of Asclepios in Pergamon at the feet of the Acropolis. The humiliating plunder and devastation of the Lower City must have been witnessed by Attalos II in person, looking down on it from the walls of the Acropolis. Prusias II carried off Phrymakhos' sacred idol of Asclepios (Polyb.32,25; Diodor, *Bibl.exc.*1, XXXI, fr.46, ed. Bekker). Prusias II also plundered the Temple of Apollo in Temnos, and burnt down the Temple of Artemis in Hierakonnesos. Soon after the conclusion of this destructive war (154 BC) Attalos II was obliged to join his Roman protectors in their war against Andrischos in Macedon (149 BC), the war with the Achaean League (146 BC), and in 145 BC he started a war with the Thracian king Deygyliva. This short review of the successive wars which engaged the Attalids in the 2nd century gives us an insight into the precarious life of Pergamene artists and men of letters including art historians.

We can identify two art historians who were employed by the Attalid court and worked in the library of Pergamon: Antigonos of Karystos and Polemon of Ilion. A third one, Adaios of Mytilene, is still a mysterious figure. Antigonos appears on the pages of Pliny the Elder's art history in the context of Parrhasios (*HN* 35,67–68). This is a rare instance of a more extensive quotation, which we can safely regard as a page from a lost art book, Antigonos' history of the Greek painting in Latin translation. This passage is worth reading full: *primus symmetriam picturae dedit (scil. Parrhasios), primus argutias voltus, elegantiam capilli, venustatem oris, confessione artificum in lineis extremis palmam adeptus. Haec est picturae summa suptilitas. Corpora enim pingere et media rerum est quidem magni operis sed in quo multi gloriam tulerint, extrema corporum facere et desinentis picturae modum includere rarum in successu artis invenitur. Ambire enim se ipsa debet extremitas et sic desinere ut promittat alia post*

⁴² Hansen 1971, p. 105.

⁴³ Hansen 1971, p. 105.

se ostendatque etiam quae occultat. Hanc ei gloriam concessere Antigonus et Xenocrates qui de pictura scripsere, praedicantes quoque, non solum confitentes. Et alia multa graphidis vestigia exstant in tabulis ac membranis eius, ex quibus proficere dicuntur artifices (HN 35,67–8) (He (scil. Parrhasios) first gave painting symmetry, and added vivacity to the features, daintiness to the hair and comeliness to the mouth, while by the verdict of artists he is unrivalled in the rendering of outline. This is the highest subtlety attainable in painting. Merely to paint a figure in relief is no doubt a great achievement, yet many have succeeded thus far. But where an artist is rarely successful is in finding an outline which shall express the contours of the figure. For the contour should appear to fold back, and so enclose the object as to give assurance of the parts behind, thus clearly suggesting even what it conceals. Preeminence in this respect is conceded to Parrhasios by Antigonos and Xenocrates, writers on painting, who indeed not only concede but insist upon it. Many other traces of his draughtmanship remain, both in pictures and on parchments, which are said to be instructive to artists, trans. K. Jex-Blake). Antigonus adhered to the doctrine of *symmetria* which dominated the Greek art history for centuries and also the Xenocratic theory of evolution in the figural arts: it was Parrhasios who first painted real portraits (*argutiae voltus*), perfected rendering of hair (*elegantia capilli*), his models' mouths were shapely and charming (*venustas oris*), and he was the artist who attained such perfection in draughtmanship that he was unrivalled among the Greek painters (*in lineis extremis palmam adeptus*). In his art book Antigonus emphasised that drawing constitutes the very essence of the art of painting (*picturae summa suptilitas*). He explained his judgement in the sophisticated learned language of the professional art historian: 'the contour should appear to fold back, and so enclose the object as to give assurance of the parts behind, thus clearly suggesting even what it conceals' (trans. K. Jex-Blake). Antigonus added that Parrhasios' preparatory studies (*graphidis vestigia*) on wooden tablets and parchment made a corpus of invaluable instructive materials for other painters. Pliny the Elder informed his readers that the quotation was drawn from Xenocrates and Antigonus' art books. I think Sellers was right when she observed that 'the Xenocratic treatise was minutely worked over by a writer (scil. Antigonus) who used it not simply to quote from, but as a solid framework into which to fit new material of his own.'⁴⁴ In his art history Pliny the Elder recorded salient information on the sculptors who worked for the Attalids: *plures artifices fecere Attali et Eumenis adversus Gallos proelia, Isigonus, Pyromachus, Stratonicus, Antigonus qui volumina condidit de sua arte (HN 34, 84)*. Pliny corroborated Antigonus' book on sculpture in bronze as his source in the bibliographical notes for Books 33 and 34 (*Antigonus qui*

⁴⁴ Sellers 1896, p. XXXVII; cf. Urlichs 1886, p. 30.

de toreutice scripsit).⁴⁵ I also think that Urlichs was basically right when he referred Pliny's words on the *artifices qui compositis voluminibus condidere haec* to chapters 54–72 in Book 34, which discuss the art of Pheidias, Myron, Polycleitos, Lysippos, Praxiteles and the pupils of Lysippos down to Xenocrates and Antigonos as the ultimate source.⁴⁶

It is tempting to fill in the missing part of the inscription which celebrated Attalos I's victory over Antiochus Hierax (*IvP* 1,22),⁴⁷ with Antigonos' name: ΓΟΝΟΥΕΡΓΑ. In all likelihood this inscription should rather be attributed to Epigonos, as three others are (*IvP* 1,29,31–32), where Epigonos' name is clearly legible.⁴⁸ I do not think that von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf in his diligent book on Antigonos of Karystos was exactly right when he argued that two Antigonoi, a philosopher, biographer and paradoxographer and an art historian and sculptor were the same person, and lived in the 2nd half of the 3rd century BC.⁴⁹ I have already mentioned this problem. Antigonos the sculptor, and art historian was a contemporary of some sculptors whom we know from the inscriptions on the frieze of the Great Altar: Orestes of Pergamon (*IvP* 1,75,1, c. 183–174 BC), Theorretos (*IvP* 1,83), Nikeratos of Athens (*IvP* 1,132, dated in the reign of Eumenes II, 197–159 BC), Myron of Thebes (*IvP* 1,137=Loewy 116 m, n), Xenokrates (*IvP* 1,138=Loewy 116 k–l), Praxiteles (Loewy 116 o).⁵⁰ Significantly, Loewy always emphasised that on the inscriptional grounds the Pergamene artists should be dated later than is generally accepted on the historical grounds.⁵¹

⁴⁵ Urlichs 1886, p. 33; von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf 1881, p. 7.

⁴⁶ Urlichs 1886, pp. 38–39, who relied on Schreiber's doctoral dissertation, *de artificum aetatibus*, Leipzig 1872, p. 29.

⁴⁷ Loewy 1885, p. 116, i 1–3.

⁴⁸ Cf. J. Pollitt, Epigonos, in Vollkommer 2007, on his inscriptions in Pergamon, pp. 206ff.; von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf 1881, p. 7; Urlichs 1886, p. 33 incorrectly quoted Diog.Laert.2,15,10 when he referred ἀνδριαντοποιός to Antigonos. Cf. E. Paul, Anaxagoras, Vollkommer 2007, p. 37, c. 500–450 BC, *Antigonos v. Karystos würdigte in seinen kunstgeschichtlichen Schriften die Bedeutung des Anaxagoras* (Diog.Laert.2,15; Overbeck 435).

⁴⁹ Antigonos in Pergamon, von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf 1881, p. 7; the art historian and the biographer Antigonos of Karystos are presented as one and the same person, von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf 1881, p. 130.

⁵⁰ Urlichs 1886, p. 34, felt unwilling to concur with the results of von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf's study: *Ich vermute, daß der bekannte Biograph bei Zenobius infolge einer Verwechslung den Kunstschriftsteller verdrängt hat.*

⁵¹ Urlichs 1886, p. 33; Loewy 1885, p. 120; Antigonos cited by Diog. Laert. (9,49) with reference to Democritus the sculptor; Diog. Laert. (2,15) with reference to the sculptor Anaxagoras (Overbeck 435); Diog. Laert. 9,62: Antigonos of Karystos quoted in the biography of Pyrrhon, who was a painter in his young years (an extant painting of his torch bearers was kept in the gymnasium of Elis). I do not think this information can be referred to Antigonos the sculptor and art historian. Diog. Laert. 7,187–8 wrote that Chrysippus the philosopher (not the medical doctor Chrysippus of Knidos, as held by Sellers 1896, p. XXXVIII) was criticized for obscenities described in his writing *de antiquis physiologis*, namely for the erotic and offensive story of Zeus and Hera, cf. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf 1881, p. 8.

At a certain stage in the research Antigonus the sculptor and art historian seemed to appear so real that B. Schweitzer attributed the Pasquino group, Menelaos with the body of Patrokles, to him.⁵² The visitors to 'the Grand Atelier' of Italian art recall the modern classicist reconstruction of the group displayed in the Loggia dei Lanzi in Florence. Schweitzer's attribution is certainly only a speculation.⁵³

Polemon of Ilion, one of the most influential and prolific researchers of the Hellenistic age, discussed the figural arts in a number of his writings.⁵⁴ Referring to Polemon's *Letter to Attalos* (Athen.VIII 346b), K. Deichgräber called him 'ein Glied des pergamenischen Königshauses.'⁵⁵ Thanks to Preller's painstaking collection of Polemon's extant passages (1838) we can learn something about his art descriptions. Athenaios adduced a description of Hippeus' painting (Hippys) in Athens, which depicted the wedding of Peirithoos (Athen.XI, 474c, Overbeck 1960). This ephrastic passage was drawn from Polemon's polemical writing *adversus Antigonum de pictoribus* (πρὸς Ἀντίγονον περὶ ζωγράφων) (Preller frg.63).⁵⁶ Judging by Athenaios' description Hippeus was a genre painter. In his Wedding of Peirithoos Hippeus showed a wine scoop and a goblet made of a semi-precious stone with a rim inlaid with gold leaf (τὴν οἰνοχόην καὶ τὸ κύπελλον λίθινα, χρυσῶ τὰ χεῖλη περιτεραμνίσας). The viewer could also admire other drinking vessels, such as *kantharoi* made of clay, probably Athenian painted *kantharoi* (κεραμεοὺς κανθάρους). There were also pine couches and richly decorated divans on the floor of the banquet hall, and a lamp hanging from the ceiling threw light on the vessels and furniture (τὸν λύχνον ὁμοίως ἐκ τῆς ὀροφῆς ἐξηρητημένον ἀνακεχυμένας ἔχοντα τὰς φλόγας). In his description of the 'luminist painting' Polemon employed his skills of rhetorical description (*ecphrasis*),⁵⁷ and in a passage drawn from περὶ τῶν ἐν

This story, Diogenes Laertios continued, cannot be found in the historians of painting like Polemon, Hysikrates (Xenokrates?), and not even in Antigonus. Diogenes Laertios probably referred to a popular erotic genre of painting, which was discussed by the Hellenistic art historians, e.g. *Parrhasios pinxit et minoribus tabellis libidines* (HN 35,72); *Ctesicles pinxit volutantem* (sc. the Queen Stratonice) *cum piscatore* (HN 35,140) etc. The Pompeian painting showed how popular this genre of painting was in Graeco-Roman Antiquity.

⁵² B. Schweitzer 1936; Hansen 1971, p. 314, n. 110.

⁵³ The sculptural group is obviously real, whatever its authorship: the Pasquino from Palazzo Braschi in Rome, Bernhard 1980, il. 177; the head of Menelaos, MN Warszawa, Bernhard 1980, il. 176; remnants of the group in Sperlonga and Aphrodisias, Bernhard 1980, p. 266.

⁵⁴ Deichgräber, *RE* 21,2, cc. 1288–1320; Sellers 1896, pp. XXXIX–XLV; von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf 1881, pp. 8–10. Polemon's date: inscription in Delphi, Polemon's *proxenia* 176 BC, *ibid.* p. 9.

⁵⁵ Deichgräber *RE* c. 1291.

⁵⁶ Deichgräber *RE* c. 1306; Overbeck 1960.

⁵⁷ Deichgräber *RE* 1305, Athen.V 210ab, Preller frg. 58; Overbeck 1768. Polemon *in contra Antigonum* mentioned the stoa of the Polemarchoi in Phlius painted by Sillax; Deichgräber *RE* 1306, Athen.VIII 341a, Preller frg.66, Polemon *adv. Antigonum*, a genre painting of Androklydes of Kyzikos, the fastidiously rendered images of fish on his painting of Scylla; Deichgräber *RE* 1305, Athen.XI

Σικυῶνι πινάκων revealed his predilection for anecdote, which was shared by all the Hellenistic art historians. He told the story of Melanthios and Apelles' painting of the triumphant Aristratos, tyrant of Sikyon (Plut.*Arat.*13=Preller frg.17).⁵⁸ When Aratos the freedom fighter came to power (251 BC) he decided to destroy the monuments of Corinth's tyrants. However, he wavered in one exceptional case: in Aristratos' painting. Its makers, Melanthios and Apelles, students of Pamphilos from the Sicyonian school, were renowned and very expensive painters. Aratos eventually agreed to save the painting when his friend Nealkes, a representative of the younger branch of the Sicyonian school, painted over the image of Aristratos concealing it with a palm tree. This story can be cited as representative for the Hellenistic art historians. Its anecdotal narrative put together a couple of famous artists (cf. Protogenes and Zeuxis, Parrhasios and Timanthes), artists and well-known historical persons (cf. Nicias and Alexander, Stratonice and Ctesilas). Plutarch's story of Aristratos' painting also offers one more story of art destruction and a story of arts and politics. We encounter similar components in the narrative of an anonymous Theban citizen who hid gold in the statue of Kleon of Thebes, a celebrated singer, during the plunder and bloodshed committed by Alexander the Great, who punished Thebes for its rebellion in 335 BC (Athen.I 19c, Preller frg.25).⁵⁹ The Theban returned to his city after 30 years and recovered his valuables from the statue, which survived the destruction of the city. In this instance Polemon quoted Kleon's epitaph as a token of authenticity: Πυθέα υἱὸς ὀδ' ἔστι Κλέων Θηβαῖος αἰοιδός (Overbeck 506). Polemon was nicknamed στηλοκόπας (stele-glutton) by Asclepiades of Myrlea (Athen.VI 234d). The Aeolic art historians mastered their epigraphic skills to prove the authenticity of artworks. We come across this time and again when we read extant passages of their art books.⁶⁰ The Attalid art historians' epigraphic studies must have been inspired and influenced by the editors of the Aeolic Archaic poets. They too worked under the patronage of the Attalids in Pergamon. This linguistic inclination can also be deduced from Polemon's interests in the ancient Archaic images of divinities worshipped under antiquated and hardly clear names, as for example the stone ἄγαλμα of Dionysos Morychos in Sicily, made by Simmias, son of Eupalamos (Zenob.5,13,

484bc, Preller frg. 60. Polemon's ecphrastic periegetic passage *adv. Antigonum*: an ἄγαλμα or a painting (?) of Διόνυσος τέλειος sitting on the rock accompanied by bald Satyros.

⁵⁸ Deichgräber *RE* 1297; Overbeck 1795; A. Villing, Nealkes in Vollkommer 2007, pp. 548–549.

⁵⁹ Deichgräber *RE* 1298, from *Boiotika* (?), Overbeck 506; Pliny the Elder seems to tell roughly the same story (*HN* 34,59): *Pythagoras Rheginus ... fecit ... citharædum, qui Dicaeus apellatus est, quod, cum Thebae ab Alexandro caperentur, aurum a fugiente conditum sinu eius celatum esset*. The story was commented by Sellers 1896, p. 48n.: a Theban poet named Kleon.

⁶⁰ For example Polemon's story of Lais, who was killed by jealous women in Thessaly. Her epigrammatic epitaph can be found on the banks of the Peneios River, and not in Corinth as sometimes held, Deichgräber *RE* 1308, Athen.589.

ed. Leutsch; Preller frg.73; *Epistula ad Diophilum*).⁶¹ When we read that this epithet originated from the religious ritual of smearing the god's face with grape juice during the grape harvest (ἀπὸ τοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ μολύνεσθαι), we realize that the Aeolic art historians also employed linguistics, and in this particular case etymology, in their art historical studies.

The first half of the 2nd century BC, the age of Antigonus the sculptor and Polemon of Ilion, was remarkable for its ingenious creativity in literature, sculpture, painting, and in sciences and humanities. The Greek artists and men of letters worked as if in a hurry, as if they had wanted to task their work before the imminent disaster. Late Hellenism, period of creativity and invention, was simultaneously characterized by a progressing political and economic decline demarcated by the seizure and destruction of Syracuse (212 BC), Pella (167 BC) and Corinth (146 BC). It is also interesting to observe that this period of nervous creativity marked by human genius which brought a phenomenal development in the Pergamene and Rhodian schools in the beaux arts and sophisticated art historical studies was paralleled by important developments in art theory in the Late Stoic school. Diogenes of Babylon distinguished and described αἴσθησις αὐτοφυής, an irrational, sensual perception of beauty embedded in art forms, something different from the learned perception acquired by artists, art historians and connoisseurs (αἴσθησις ἐπιστημονική).⁶² A passage by Polemon from his περὶ τῶν ἐν Σικυῶνι πινάκων (Athen.XIII 567b, Preller frg.16=Overbeck 1762) seems to recall new inspirations which appeared in aesthetics in his time.⁶³ Polemon wrote that the pornographic paintings by Aristides, Pausanias (Pausias?), and Nikophanes were beautiful: μνημονεύει δὲ ταῦτα καλῶς γραφόντων. Deichgräber commented on this passage in the following way: 'Das Urteil...ist insofern von besonderen Interesse, als es vielleicht von der Voraussetzung, wenn auch nicht von einer voll angebildeten Theorie ausgeht, daß das Ästhetische sich in der Kunstbetrachtung von dem gewählten Thema scheiden läßt.'⁶⁴

A number of passages testify to lively academic debate between the Aeolic art historians Antigonus, Polemon of Ilion and Adaios of Mytilene. In the course

⁶¹ Deichgräber *RE* c. 1312, Preller frg. 73, *Ep. ad Diophilum*, Overbeck 346: cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Protr.*IV, p. 42 (ed. Pott), Overbeck 347, by Simon in Athens. Further examples of the archaistic studies in art, religion and language: Deichgräber *RE* 1307, Athen.X 416bc, Polemon on the temples of Demeter Hodephagia, Demeter Sito (the idol), and Demeter Imalis in Beotia; the statues of Demeter Megalartos and Megalomazos, *Das Epiklezis-motiv spielt hinein, der Sinn für seltene, alte, den modernen Anschauungen nicht mehr Entsprechende Vorstellungen und Bezeichnungen*.

⁶² Tatarkiewicz 1960, p. 237. Philodemos, *de musica* ed. Kemke 11.

⁶³ Deichgräber *RE* 1296, Overbeck 1762.

⁶⁴ Deichgräber *RE* 1296; cf. Chairephanes, Overbeck 1767; cf. supra n.50; this genre of painting was very popular in Graeco-Roman antiquity, Casa VII 2,25 Pompei (Pygmies in African landscapes); V 1, 26 Casa di Lucius Caecilius Iucundus; VI 5, 2 (the tortures of Psyche); Casa del Fauno (a black boy with a white girl on the mosaic) etc.

of their professional polemics they discussed the problems of authorship and authenticity of art works, they adduced biographical details in their efforts to establish the personal identities of artists and presented their own predilection for colourful anecdotes. They attributed art works to alternative authors, they combined two persons in one, or vice versa split up an artist and his work into two separate individuals when confronted with insoluble chronological and biographic difficulties. They constructed complicated genealogical trees of schools of painting and sculpture along the principle of master/pupil relations.

Polemon of Ilion (176 BC, the date of his Delphic proxeny) compiled a polemic in six books τὰ πρὸς Ἀδαίων καὶ Ἀντίγονον, which I have already quoted.⁶⁵ All the extant passages from Antigonos' art books show that Polemon challenged his expertise as an art historian. Polemon, who was an experienced epigraphist and periegetic writer became a demanding adversary for Antigonos.⁶⁶ Unfortunately we know very little about Adaios.⁶⁷ We only learn from Athenaios' *Deipnosophistae* that he compiled a treatise entitled περὶ ἀγαλματῶν (Athen.XIII, 606a).⁶⁸

In his book *de toreutice* Antigonos argued that Nemesis' xoanon in Rhamnous was made by Agorakritos, which was corroborated by the sculptor's own signature: ΑΓΟΡΑΚΡΙΤΟΣ ΠΑΡΙΟΣ ΕΠΟΙΗΣΕΝ (Zenob.V 82).⁶⁹ Pliny the Elder added that Agorakritos lost the competition for the statue of Aphrodite in Athens against Alcamenes, and offered his Aphrodite Nemesis to the demos of Rhamnous (*HN* 36,17). Antigonos' opinion was contested:

οὐ θαυμαστὸν δέ. καὶ ἄλλοι γὰρ πολλοὶ ἐπὶ τῶν οἰκείων ἔργων ἕτερον ἐπιγεγράφασιν ὄνομα. εἰκὸς οὖν καὶ τὸν Φειδιαν τῷ Ἀγορακρίτῳ συγκεχωρηκέναί. ἦν γὰρ αὐτοῦ ἐρώμενος, καὶ ἄλλως ἐπτόητο περὶ τὰ παιδικά (Zenob.V 82) (But this is no proof, for many have also inscribed another's name upon their own works, a complacency which Pheidias probably showed to Agorakritos, whom he loved, trans. E. Sellers).

⁶⁵ Deichgräber *RE* 1304ff.; Sellers 1896, pp. XXXIX–XLV; von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf 1881, pp. 8–10; Polemon's Delphic *proxenia*, von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf 1881, p. 8.

⁶⁶ Polemon's extant citations came from his περὶ τῆς Ἀθήνησιν ἀκροπόλεως (Athen. XI 486d) (Str.9,1,16; Aten.XIII 587c); περὶ τῶν ἐν Σικυῶνι πινάκων (Athen.XIII 567b), περὶ τῶν ἐν Λακεδαίμωνι ἀναθημάτων (Athen. XIII 574c); περὶ τῶν ἐν Δελφοῖς θησαυρῶν (Plut.*quaest.conv.*V,2, 675b); *Boiotika* (?), Deichgräber *RE* c.1298; περὶ τῶν κατὰ πόλεις ἐπιγραμμάτων Deichgräber *RE* c. 1314.

⁶⁷ R. Reitzenstein, Adaios of Mytilene, *RE* 1, 1894, c. 342 Nr. 7.

⁶⁸ Sellers 1896, p. XXXIX; von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf 1881, p. 8.

⁶⁹ Overbeck 836; Sellers 1896, p. XLII; von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf 1881, pp. 9–15; Urlichs 1886, pp. 34–38.

It is clear, then, that Pliny the Elder drew on Antigonus' authority, while Zenobius recalled Polemon's *adv. Antigonum*.⁷⁰ Polemon's biographical argument drawn from *The Lives of The Artists* (Duris of Samos' *Bioi*?) prevailed in the Graeco-Roman humanities.⁷¹ Pausanias did not share these doubts about the Pheidian authenticity of Rhamnusian Nemesis (*Descr.*I,33,3). I would venture on a guess, although I cannot prove it, that Pausanias drew on Polemon's writings on Attica. I think his detailed *ecphrasis* of Nemesis' *xoanon* was a quotation from the lost periegetic writing of Polemon: τοῦτον Φειδίας τὸν λίθον εἰργάσατο ἄγαλμα μὲν εἶναι Νεμέσεως, τῇ κεφαλῇ δὲ ἔπεστι τῆς θεοῦ στέφανος ἐλάφους ἔχων καὶ Νίκης ἀγάλματα οὐ μέγала ταῖς δὲ χερσὶν ἔχει τῇ μὲν κλάδον μηλέας, τῇ δεξιᾷ δὲ φιάλην, Αἰθίοπες δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ φιάλῃ πεποιήνται. It is interesting to observe that Pausanias joined in the old discussion of two Hellenistic art historians and added his own opinion. He contested the explanation why the Aethiopians' images were engraved on the phiale: 'As to the Aethiopians I could hazard no guess myself (συμβαλέσθαι δὲ τὸ ἐς τοὺς Αἰθίους οὔτε αὐτὸς εἶχον) nor could I accept the statement of those who are convinced that (οὔτε ἀπεδεχόμεν τῶν συνιέναι πειθομένων=Polemon?) the Aethiopians have been carved upon the cup because of the river Ocean' (trans. W. Paton). The traditional interpretation said that Okeanos was Nemesis' father. However, Pausanias was an experienced traveller himself. His periegetic experience which included visits to the Near East and Africa inspired him to enrich Hellenistic art historians' discussion with new material and a new argument. He decided to append the old discussion with a fairly long digression on the geography of Africa. His own words begin with a polemical opening phrase: 'Ὠκεανῶ γὰρ οὐ ποταμῶ (the Ocean is not a river) (Paus.I 33,4–6). He concluded his addition with the usual ἐς τοσοῦτον εἰρήσθω. Later he returned to the discussion with Polemon's argument and added a short commentary on the ancient images of Nemesis which had no wings (*Descr.*1,33,7):

⁷⁰ Von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf 1881, p. 13–14.

⁷¹ Suidas and Photius (Overbeck 837); Tzetzes, *Chil.* VII 931 (Overbeck 838); Tzetzes, *Epist.* 2 (Overbeck 839); Paus. I 33,3 (Overbeck 840), Hesychius (Overbeck 841); Pomponius Mela II, 3 (Overbeck 842); Solin., *Collect.rerum memorab.* 7,26, p. 66 (ed. Th. Mommsen); it is interesting to observe that Strabo (IX p. 396, Overbeck 835) recalled a stylistic analysis, which he must have cited from an art book: 'Some say the statue of Nemesis was made by Diodotos, some others that it was by Agorakritos. Personally I think that its size, beauty and perfection suggests it was made by Pheidias' (καὶ μεγέθει καὶ κάλλει σφόδρα κατορθωμένον καὶ ἐνάμιλλον τοῖς Φειδίου ἔργοις). Pliny the Elder attributed Nemesis' *xoanon* to Agorakritos like Antigonus. However, Pliny also suggests that it was attributed to Pheidias: *eiusdem discipulus* (scil. Pheidiae) *fuit Agoracritus Parius et aetate gratus, itaque e suis operibus pleraque nomini eius donasse fertur* (HN 36,17). This passage and its context seems as if Pliny or his Latin translator did not entirely understand the Greek text. It seems contradictory and out of context if compared with the following narrative (the story of Agorakritos' and Alcamenes' contest in Athens), cf. Sellers 1896, p. XLI.

οὔτε τοῦτο τὸ ἄγαλμα Νεμέσεως οὔτε ἄλλο πεποιήται τῶν ἀρχαίων, ἐπεὶ μηδὲ Σμυρναίοις τὰ ἀγιώτατα ξόανα ἔχει πτερά (Neither this nor any other ancient statue of Nemesis has wings, for not even the holiest wooden images of the Smyrneans have them, trans. W. Paton).

‘Later artists, convinced that the goddess manifests herself most as a consequence of love, give wings to Nemesis as they do to Love,’ (trans. W. Paton) Pausanias concluded. At this point the argument takes a conspicuous turn for art history: the chronology and stylistic development of the Greek sculpture with the new inventions in the Late Classical and Early Hellenistic period discussed by Pausanias (winged statues of Nemesis). It is also notable for its Aeolic smack: the oldest Smyranean divine images (τὰ ἀγιώτατα ξόανα). In Book VII (*Descr.*7, 5,1–3) Pausanias writes that Smyrna was originally founded by the Aeolians, who were later driven out of it by the Ionians of Kolophon. He also tells us that the Athenians had a temple of Nemesis in Rhamnous, while the Smyrneans had a temple of two Nemeses. It is tempting to say that this passage has one more quotation from Polemon’s writings and Polemon was Aeolian. Pausanias’ discussion is concluded with a description of the *xoanon*’s base (*Descr.*1,33,7–8). This passage, I think, must also have been a quotation from Polemon. The description (*ecphrasis*) includes a mythological section (the story of Nemesis, Helen, Helen’s mother Leda, Tyndareus, and Zeus), which offers the reader a key to the proper understanding of the images engraved on the base (τὸ βᾶθρον). ταῦτα ἀκηκοὼς Φειδίας πεποίηκεν are the opening words of the description. Pausanias was certainly convinced of the Pheidias authorship. Ulrichs aptly observed that phrases like ποιῆσαι λέγουσι ... φασὶ εἶναι (they say he made something... others say it was someone’s work etc.) make up a stylistic tool, which may be helpful for the recovery of quotations from lost art books and periegetic guides. Von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf was right when he remarked that Pausanias in general followed Polemon in different parts of his *periegesis*, and added : ‘Polemon hat gegen Antigonos geschrieben und hier wird gegen Antigonos polemisiert.’⁷²

In the discussion on Nemesis of Rhamnous’ *xoanon* we can follow the Hellenistic art historians at work. On the one hand, with Antigonos, we can see the employment of epigraphy (Agorakritos’ signature), and art history (the competition between Agarakritos and Alkamenes); on the other hand, with Polemon, we get biographical details and an anecdote (Pheidias’ relationship with Agorakritos),⁷³ the Greek mythology as a key to the right iconographic

⁷² Von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf 1881, p. 13.

⁷³ The anecdotic motif of Pheidias’ erotic relations with boys was also exploited in the story of the great image of the Olympian Zeus: Pheidias allegedly engraved Pantarkes’ name on the finger of Zeus: ΠΑΝΤΑΡΚΗΣ ΚΑΛΟΣ (Photios, Overbeck 742; Clement of Alexandria, *Protr.*53, Overbeck 470); cf. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf 1881, p. 11; Pausanias contemplated an engraved image of ἀναδύομενος,

interpretation (the Nemesis-Helen-Leda story), the analysis of the style (documented in Strabo's passage, Overbeck 835), the story of art forms (the older images vs. more recent ones), and the chronology (the historical context of the Persian war, 480–479 BC). The comparison of Pausanias', Pliny the Elder's, Zenobius', and other accounts gives us a unique chance to realize that Pliny the Elder's and Zenobius' passages present only a highly reduced synthetic references to a real, erudite, prolonged discussion which was rich in arguments of different sorts.⁷⁴

Pliny the Elder preserved a synthetic summary of one more debate between two Pergamene art historians, which was held on the identity of two Pythagoroi (*HN* 34,61). Standing before the statue of Leontiskos, an Olympian champion wrestler and praising its maker Pythagoras of Rhegion, Pausanias sighed with admiration: εἶπερ τις καὶ ἄλλος ἀγαθὸς τὰ ἐς πλαστικὴν! (Paus.6,4,3) (an excellent sculptor if ever there was one, trans. W. Jones) (was there ever a better sculptor than he?). Pliny presented a short catalogue of Pythagoras' works in bronze, and briefly characterized his style, adding that there was a second Pythagoras of Samos, who practised as a painter in his young years. Pliny the Elder saw his bronze group of six nude statues in the Temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei in Rome. They must have been images of Olympic winners with their original inscriptions, where the sculptor's name was usually given as well. The Plinian passage was appended with some perplexing words: *hic* (Samius) *supra dicto* (Rhegino) *facie quoque indiscreta similis fuisse traditur* (*HN* 34,61). What does it mean that they were so similar to one another that you could not tell them apart? We probably have one more instance of the Latin

a young sportsman of Elis, believed to be the portrait of Pantarkes. The image appeared in a scene of an Olympic sports competition on a panel between the legs of Zeus' throne (one of τέσσαρες κανόνες sc. τῶν τοῦ θρόνου μεταξύ ποδῶν) (*Descr.*5,11,3).

⁷⁴ Some other instances of discussions on the authenticity of artworks: Urlichs 1886, p. 37 pointed to the chryselephantine Athena in the Acropolis of Elis: of Kolothos, a pupil of Pheidias, the shield painted by Panainos (Paus.6,26,3); Urlichs 1886, p. 38: Asclepius of Thrasymedes, in Epidaurus μνηοὶ ἐπίγραμμα (Paus.2,27,2) (Overbeck 853) vs Athanagoras, *Leg. pro Christi* 14, p. 61 (ed. Dechair) of Pheidias; cf. Lacroix 1949, XXVI 12. Other instances: on the sculptors of the Mausoleum in Halicarnassos: Praxiteles, *nonnulli etiam putant Timotheum* (Vitr.VII praef.12) (Overbeck 1178); a colossal statue of Mars on the Arx in Rome, *alii Leocharis, alii Thimothei putant esse* (Vitr. II,8,11) (Overbeck 1307). We learn that Kolothos of Heraclea made a chryselephantine sacrificial table in Olympia (Paus.5,20,2). Pausanias added that οἱ δὲ ἐπολυπραγμονήσαντες σπουδῇ τὰ ἐς τοὺς πλάστας (the most inquisitive researchers in the history of sculpture) Πάριον ἀποφαίνουσιν ὄντα αὐτόν, μαθητὴν Πασιτέλους (and not of Pheidias like the aforementioned Kolothos). Was Kolothos of Paros taken for Kolothos the pupil of Pheidias, c. 450 BC? This is still a riddle for modern scholarship to solve: T. Ganschow, Kolothos (I), *Vollkommer* 2007, p. 422: c. 450 BC, he worked on the Olympian Zeus with Pheidias (*HN* 34,87), his works in bronze and chryselephantine technique; Kolothos (II), T. Ganschow, *Vollkommer* 2007, p. 422, a painter from Teos, c. 400 BC; Kolothos (III), T. Ganschow, only in Pausanias (*Descr.*5,20,2). The latter's master's name Pasiteles only adds to the problem.

translation from the Greek used by Pliny the Elder. He does not seem to have fully understood the translation, or perhaps it was abbreviated in such a way that it lost some necessary information. In all likelihood Pliny the Elder preserved an example of Polemon's intelligent, ironical and malicious humour, his tool for sharp professional critique. Sellers correctly interpreted the passage: 'Your second Pythagoras, looks to me suspiciously like your first.'⁷⁵ Pliny the Elder appended his concise chapter on Pythagoras with more equally confusing words: *Rhegini autem discipulus et filius sororis fuisse Sostratus* (It was the Rhegine Pythagoras, however, of whom Sostratos was the pupil and nephew, trans. K. Jex-Blake). This is clearly a biographical argument for two Pythagoroi (Antigonus' version) and not for a single one (Polemon's claim).⁷⁶ The discussion remained inconclusive. Diogenes Laertios again recalled two Pythagoroi (VIII, 1, 25).⁷⁷ In his turn Pausanias acknowledged only one sculptor named Pythagoras, and valued him highly.⁷⁸ In this way and incidentally we have come across one more instance where Pliny the Elder followed Antigonus' argument for two Pythagoroi, while Pausanias referred Polemon's expertise for one Pythagoras. The discussion of the two Pergamene art historians was aptly summarised by Sellers: 'Polemon was wrong in the case of Antigonus' Nemesis, in that of Pythagoras of Samos and Rhegion, he was – as it happens – quite right.'⁷⁹

⁷⁵ Sellers 1896, p. LIII; *ibid.* n. 2: 'W. Klein explained to me, (...) the whole satirical force of the words.' Urlichs 1886, p. 39; Sellers 1896, p. LIII: 'a sharp criticism (...) has amusingly escaped Pliny.' She referred to Münzer 1897, p. 526: 'Polemon's whole book was merely the comprehensive criticism, the improvement, and enlargement of that of Antigonus.'

⁷⁶ Urlichs 1886, p. 39: Sostratos was Rheginus' student and nephew, consequently there is no doubt that there were two Pythagoroi; A. Villing, Sostratos (II) in Vollkommer 2007, p. 848; A. Villing, Sostratos (I), a sculptor in bronze from Chios (?).

⁷⁷ Overbeck 507; Urlichs 1886, p. 39.

⁷⁸ Urlichs 1886, p. 40.

⁷⁹ Sellers 1896, p. LIV; M. Weber, Pythagoras (I), Vollkommer 2007, p. 769: *Da kein Denkmal identifiziert ist, bleibt offen, ob es sich um eine Person handelt, die – aus Samos stammend – aus polit. Gründen in Rhegion ansässig wurde, wie in der Forsch. Meist angenommen.* No original works, no Roman copies, no convincing attributions. However, Pythagoras of Rhegion emerges from the archaeological material. We know his inscription from Olympia. He signed a statue dedicated by Euthymos (472BC), Loewy 1885, 23, p. 19 = *IvO* 144. It is not unlikely that a second inscription from Olympia is also by him (Loewy 1885, 24, p. 20). Other instances of confusion in artists' identities: Socrates' Graces in the Propylaia of Athens: *Socrates fecit alius ille quam pictor, idem ut alioqui putant* (*HN* 36,32) (Overbeck 915); the reliefs of three Graces of Socrates, the son of Sophroniscus in *Schol.Aristoph.Nub.773* (ed. Dindorf); Socrates, s. Sophroniscus in Paus. 1,22,8; 9,35,3, Overbeck 911; Diog.Laert.II, 19 (Overbeck 913) quoted Duris: Socrates, s. Sophroniscus; Socrates, the painter in *HN* 35,137 (Overbeck 1765). Paintings of Asclepius and his daughters and *piger...spartum torquens quod asellus adrodit*. Cf. R. Vollkommer 2007, Sokrates (III), Vollkommer 2007, 840f., the painter: 'Die Existenz des S. hängt von einer sehr schwierigen Textstelle bei Plinius ab (*HN* 35,137)'. S. Ackermann, R. Gottschalk, Sokrates (II), Vollkommer 2007, p. 841: *Als Sohn des Steinmetzen Sophroniskos war der Philosoph auch handwerkll. ausgebildet.*

A trace of Antigonus' art book can also be spotted in Pliny the Elder's information on Telephanes of Phocaea (*HN* 34,68).⁸⁰ In his reference to Telephanes Pliny the Elder adduced 'the sculptors who have written treatises on the subject' (*artifices qui compositis voluminibus condidere haec* (scil. the narrative on the five leading sculptors in bronze, who were presented immediately before the Telephanes passage). Pliny the Elder praised highly Telephanes, whose art rivalled the art of Polykleitos, Myron and Pythagoras. Sellers believed, and I think she was right, that this intriguing information and evaluation of an otherwise unknown sculptor must have been drawn from Antigonus' writings.⁸¹ The Telephanes passage was appended to a chapter which is remarkable for its harmonious, studied Xenocratic composition. Pliny the Elder commented that Telephanes, one of the greatest Greek sculptors, was forgotten because he lived in Thessaly, far from the centres of the arts and humanities, only to add that *alii non hanc ignobilitatis fuisse causam, sed quod se regum Xerxis atque Darei officinis dederit, existimant* (others give a different reason for his comparative obscurity, saying that he passed into the service of king Xerxes and of Dareios, trans. K. Jex-Blake). Urlichs aptly commented on Pliny's words about Telephanes: 'Sie verrät eine auserlesene Gelehrsamkeit und ist deshalb Benützung einer schriftlichen Quellen anzunehmen.'⁸² Here we must take into account Antigonus' *de toreutice*. Interestingly enough, we also learn of a Greek sculptor who emigrated to Persia, and probably worked in Susa or Persepolis. The employment of Greek stonecutters at the court of Susa was documented by the Persian archives, which speak of the Ionian, Lydian, Babylonian and Egyptian craftsmen who also constructed the most fabulous royal residence of the ancient world, the palaces of the Achaemenids in Persepolis, a still unforgettable experience for the modern visitor. In this way Antigonus probably alluded to the contemporary stormy fates of colleagues, artists and scholars, who changed into political émigrés in search of a safe haven to evade the Roman invaders who were annihilating the art centres of the Hellenistic world one by one.

Pliny the Elder also offers us an interesting instance of the art historians' discussion on the origin of sculpture in marble (*origo artis*). This discussion shows us one more component of their professional workshop (*HN* 36,9–14). Pliny's principal source (Xenocrates) dated the *inventores* Dipoinos' and Scyllis' *akme* to the 15th Olympiad (580–577 BC).⁸³ They were Cretans who emigrated

⁸⁰ Urlichs 1886, p. 39; Sellers 1896, p. XXII. R. Vollkommer, Telephanes, Vollkommer 2007, p. 874.

⁸¹ Sellers 1896, p. XXII.

⁸² Urlichs 1886, p. 35.

⁸³ The archaeological context of Pliny the Elder's characteristic of Dipoinos and Scyllis is strikingly different: the gap between the archaeological reality and Xenocrates' account was aptly described by Ahermary, Dipoinos, Vollkommer 2007, pp. 184–185: *Die von Plin. tradierten Überlieferungen, ob sie man auf Xenokrates von Athen zurückgehen oder nicht, überraschen* (p. 185). So far sculptures

to Sicyon at a later stage of their lives. Pliny's synthetic entry on Dipoinos and Scyllis, which comprised a short catalogue of their works with museographic information and a colourful anecdote on their conflict with the citizens of Argos (drawn from a Duridian biography?), is interrupted by a polemical chapter on the sculptors from Chios (*HN* 36,11–12). Sellers aptly commented that 'to the Xenocratic contention that the art of sculpture in bronze was elaborated by Daidalid artists on the mainland of Greece, a later writer – presumably Antigonos – adjusted the account of the rise of sculpture in marble in the islands of the Aegean, under the auspices of Chian sculptors.'⁸⁴ In his discussion with Xenocrates Antigonos recalled a popular anecdote which connected the poet Hipponax with the sculptor Bupalos from Chios. Since Hipponax's chronology was well-established (the 60th Ol. 540–537 BC), Antigonos easily acquired the dates for Bupalos and his brother Athenis, and managed to roughly calculate the chronology of their ancestors who were also sculptors: Archermos (father), Micciades (grandfather) and Melas (great grandfather), and in this way Antigonos acquired an approximate date for the *origo artis* as the First Olympiad (776–773 BC) on the basis of genealogy of artists, chronology, and biography employed in his art historical research. To complete Antigonos' methodology of research, I would like to adduce a hidden poetic epigram (the evidence of inscriptions), which was probably unwittingly saved by an anonymous Latin translator: *non vitibus tantum censeri Chion sed et operibus Archermi filiorum* (*HN* 36,12) (Chios was not honoured for her vines alone but for the works of the sons of Archermos, trans. K. Jex-Blake).⁸⁵ In all likelihood here we have a reflection of exactly the same discussion in the *Scholia ad Arist.Aves* v.573. An anonymous scholiast wavered whether the earliest images of a winged Nike and Eros were made by Archermos, the father of Bupalos and Athenis or by the painter Aglaophon of Thasos ὡς οἱ περὶ Καρύστιον τὸν Περγαμηνόν φασι (Overbeck 315). Antigonos' argument was based on strong factual grounds. Hipponax was actually a popular poet and we can still read some of his poems. In addition, we have an inscription from Delos which probably refers to Micciades, the grandfather of Bupalos and Athenis.⁸⁶

in stone from the time of Dipoinos (50 Ol. 580–76 BC, *HN* 36,9) have not been found on the Island of Crete. It is the same with Sicyon, to where Dipoinos and Scyllis emigrated. The archaeological evidence strongly contradicts Pliny's statement *marmore sculptendo primi* (*HN* 36,9) (scil. Dipoinos and Scyllis). Pausanias also differs significantly from Pliny the Elder's account. He never mentions Dipoinos as a sculptor in stone. He records his statues or statuettes of the Dioscuri together with their wives and children in ebony and ivory in Argos (*Descr.*2,22,5). Cf. Georgios Kedrenos, *Comp.Hist.*p.322B (=Overbeck 327=PG 121, cc. 613–614) on the emerald statue of Athena Lindia in the Palace of Lausos.

⁸⁴ Sellers 1896, p. XXVf., p. XLIII: Antigonos 'proclaimed the priority of invention of the isle-schools over the schools of the mainland.'

⁸⁵ Schwarz 1971, p. 134 observed that the *AP* epigrams which referred to the Archaic art were scarce.

⁸⁶ Loewy 1885, 1, p. 3f.

In Pliny the Elder's highly synthetic passage on the beginnings of encaustic painting (*origo artis*) the reader once again encounters a Xenocratic argument confronted with an alternative polemical version (*HN* 35,122). Pliny the Elder informs us that 'some believe that it was invented by Aristeides⁸⁷ and perfected by Praxiteles,' only to add that *aliquanto vetustiores encaustae picturae exstitere* (encaustic paintings of a somewhat earlier date existed). In this discussion we can recognize two rival schools of art historians, and their different perspectives: 1. Aristeides (Theban-Attic school) and Praxiteles, who are representatives of Mainland Greece vs. 2. a somewhat earlier Polygnotus of Thasos, Nicanor and Arcesilaos/Mnasilaos from Paros, probably promoted by Antigonos, who 'proclaimed the priority of invention of the island-schools over the schools of the mainland.'⁸⁸ Antigonos' alternative catalogue of '*inventores*' composed of the Aegean Islander painters also included Elasippos of Aegina who *picturae suae inscripsit ἐνέκκαεν*, which 'he certainly would not have done before the invention of encaustic painting' (trans. K. Jex-Blake). It seems that the anonymous Latin translator managed to save the flavour of Antigonos' erudition (evidence from inscriptions). The words *multo vetustiora principia* (the art's origins are much older) return in Pliny the Elder's art book in the context of the very beginnings of painting, which his source (Antigonos?) dated to the times of king Kandaules, the last of the Heraclids (c. 700 BC) (*HN* 35,55). He praised the Archaic Greek art in much the same way as Pausanias did as well, and centuries later Erhart Kästner: *manifesta claritate artis, adeo absolute* (the art had attained the greatness, even perfection, trans. K. Jex-Blake). This archaizing flavour is symptomatic of the Aeolic art history and of the structure of the Pergamene art galleries as well.

Pausanias preserved an interesting quotation from an old art book on the Graces and their stylistic development (*Descr.* 9,35,6–7). He observed that all the earlier images of the Graces in sculpture as well as in painting (τὰ ἀρχαιότερα) were clothed, and he adduced some interesting examples: the Charites of Bupalos in the temple of two Nemeses in Smyrna, Apelles' painting of Charis in the Odeon of Smyrna, Bupalos' Charites in the palace of Attalos in Pergamon and the painted Charites by Pythagoras of Paros⁸⁹ in the Pytheion of Pergamon. He also added the Charites made by Socrates, the son of Sofroniscos, which stood in front of the Propylaea in Athens. Pausanias admitted that he found himself unable to establish 'who it was who first represented the Graces naked' (οὐχ οἶον τε ἐγένετο πρῶθ' ἄνεσθαι με). In this way he evidently referred to the art books, he consulted. This interesting passage speaks of advanced art historical and comparative studies. Their geography (Smyrna, Pergamon, Athens) points to the

⁸⁷ G. Bröker, Aristeides (I), Vollkommer 2007, p. 81f.

⁸⁸ Sellers 1896, p. XLIII.

⁸⁹ Pythagoras of Paros, otherwise unknown, R. Vollkommer, in Vollkommer 2007, p. 770.

library of Pegamon, that is to Polemon and Antigonos. Hansen nicely referred to the charm of archaic beauty and ancient art forms when she described Bupalos' *Girls* with their 'graceful movement' 'with the left foot extended forward and the right drawn back.'⁹⁰ Pausanias shared with his Pergamene predecessors their predilection for Late Archaic art of c. 550–480 BC, and above all for the pre-Pheidian sculpture, which he valued more than anything else in art. He expressed his enchantment in his captivating comment on Onatas' bronzes: καὶ τέχνης ἐς τὰ ἀγάλματα ὄντα (scil. Onatas) Αἰγιναίας, οὐδενὸς ὕστερον θήσομεν τῶν ἀπὸ Δαιδάλου τε καὶ ἐργαστηρίου τοῦ Ἀττικῶδ (*Descr.*5,25,13) (I shall place Onatas, who belonged to the Aeginetan school of sculpture, after none of the successors of Daedalus or of the Attic school).

Sellers remarked that 'Antigonos, although himself one of the artists employed by the Pergamene kings (*HN* 34,84) accepted the chronological limit of the Xenocratic treatises' (121 Ol. 296–293 BC).⁹¹ The frequently cited passage goes as follows: *cessavit deinde ars, ac rursus olympiade CLVI revixit* (*HN* 34,52). Xenocrates concluded his art history with Lysippos' pupils, whom he called the last sculptors. Who supplemented this statement by Xenocrates with equally memorable words *ac rursus Olympiade CLVI revixit* (and revived again in 156–153 BC)? Sellers believed that it was Pasiteles.⁹² What about Antigonos with his reference to the great revival of the Pergamene and Rhodian art in his own age?⁹³ In this way Antigonos was probably writing of the phenomenon of artistic creativity in the Greek world on the eve of the large scale political and cultural disaster.

In the late years of Attalos II and in the reign of Attalos III (138–133 BC) the Attalid court became a unique refuge for researchers and artists, offering patronage on an incomparable scale in the Eastern Mediterranean, at a time of decline and rapidly diminishing opportunities for the development of the arts and sciences. In 167 BC the magnificent library and art collection of Perseus in Pella was confiscated and transported to Rome. Heracleides the sculptor escaped from Pella to Athens (*HN* 35,135). After 166 BC the mercantile republic of Rhodes, which played the role of a local patron of the arts and letters, was brought to ruin by the Romans and eventually declined and vanished once and forever. In 146 BC the Romans seized, plundered and completely destroyed Corinth. In 145 BC Ptolemy VIII closed down the academic institutions of

⁹⁰ Hansen 1971, p. 357.

⁹¹ Urlichs 1886, p. 32: 'Vielmehr hat des Plinius Gewährsmann Quellen benützt, die nur bis Ol.121 reichten.'

⁹² Sellers 1896, p. LXXIXf. She believed it was Pliny the Elder's reference to the construction programme of Metellus in Rome.

⁹³ Cf. a parallel revival in painting marked by Heracleides of Macedon and Timomachos of Byzantium (*HN* 35,135), cf. Sellers 1896, p. LXXX.

Alexandria. Apollodorus fled from Alexandria to Pergamon. T.-H. Schmidt showed in his brilliant paper (1990) that the work to construct the Great Altar of Pergamon was abruptly halted and its sculptures were never completed.⁹⁴ The only viable explanation is that the cessation of work on the monument must have coincided with the sudden death of its patron. It could not have been Eumenes II's death (159 BC). His brother Attalos II must have continued his architectural and artistic undertakings. Polybios emphasised 'their concord and agreement and mutual respect, that is now inferior to no one' (Polyb.23,11,7).⁹⁵ Attalos III himself practised the art of bronze smithery. He also worked with wax (*cerisque fingendis*), which is part of bronze-casting technology, which Attalos espoused with skill and passion (*aere fundendo procudendoque oblectatur*). The sinister purpose behind the assassination of the whole royal family, the Queen Mother Stratonike, and Attalos III with his wife Berenike, looms large over the Roman imperial historiography: *Perpenna consul ... Attalicasque gazas, hereditarias populi Romani, navibus inpositas Romam deportavit* (Iust.36,4,8).⁹⁶ The faction of the Gracchi Brothers desperately needed money to carry out their land reform in Italy. Pergamon was plundered by the Romans. The war against Eumenes III, Attalos III's legitimate successor to the throne, added to

⁹⁴ Cf. Hansen 1971, p. 340: *the work on the relief was left unfinished* (scil. the Telephos frieze), *so also was the colonnade within the walls of the court*. No inscriptions by any artists have ever been found on the Telephos frieze. I would like to draw the reader's attention to 'the images of art in art,' a symptomatic feature of the Late Hellenistic art and literature: Aleus in front of the statuette of Apollo and a statue of Athena in Teuthrania. These analogies to the narrative mythological landscape painting are arguments for as late as possible a chronology. I would date the Telephos frieze to the second half of the 2nd century BC on stylistic grounds. Hansen 1971, p. 347, n. 282: the work on the great frieze started in 188 BC, the Telephos frieze 25 years later (c. 160 BC ?). Cf. A. Lawrence, *Later Greek Sculpture and its Influence*, London 1927, pp. 116–118; W. Klein, *Vom antiken Rokoko*, Vienna 1921; Hansen 1971, p. 347: 'The fact that the last touches were never put on the architecture and the sculptural decoration of the superstructure indicates that the work was brought to a hasty conclusion and this is confirmed by the condition of the small frieze.' 'Yet it is virtually certain that no brush ever touched the frieze, for not only there is the carving incomplete in some parts, but throughout the entire length of the frieze are sections which seem hardly planned' (Hansen 1971, p. 347 referred to von Salis 1912, pp. 93–95. Bernhard 1980, p. 310, p. 330 dated the great frieze to c. 180–170 BC. Bernhard 1980, p. 310 argued that the Altar was not completed before the death of Eumenes II (159 BC). I think the Altar was not completed before the death of Attalos III (133 BC), when the work was abruptly stopped and abandoned.

⁹⁵ Brückner 1904 adduced the historical reasons for the late date of the Altar: Helorus and Achaeus, the sons of the Danube, could have appeared on this frieze only after the fall of Macedon (168 BC), while the reception of the Arcadians only after the restoration of the Achaean League's honours, which were once granted for Eumenes II, only to be abrogated in 172 BC. The absence of Roma, Telephos' sister, might have testified to the deteriorating relations with Rome after 168 BC. Stähler 1966, p. 105, Hansen 1971, p. 348, n. 291 dated the beginnings of work on the small frieze c. 165 BC.

⁹⁶ Cf. Polański 2013 for the essential bibliography, which misses Cardinali G., *La morte di Attalo III, Festschrift Giulio Beloch*, Rome 1910, pp. 269–320.

the destruction and robbery of the kingdom.⁹⁷ Incidentally, we hear of artworks from the Pergamene galleries displayed in Rome by the conquerors, as for example the bronze statues of Aesculapius and Hygieia by Niceratus, which were displayed in the Temple of Concordia.⁹⁸ Pliny the Elder mentioned of *tubicen* (*HN* 34,88), in all likelihood Epigonos' bronze trumpeter, which he probably saw in Rome. This Pergamene bronze work probably survived in the impressive marble stone copy of the dying Gaul in the Capitolino.⁹⁹ Epigonos' dead mother and child (*matri interfectae infante miserabiliter blandiente*) (an infant piteously caressing its dead mother, trans. K. Jex-Blake) (*HN* 34,88) can also be added to the catalogue of the Pergamene plundered art. This small but impressive ephrastic piece, a rarity in Pliny the Elder's economic catalogues, is either suggestive of personal observation (Rome) or of Antigonos/Polemon's quotation.¹⁰⁰ Next the bronze Alcippe, the sister of Caicus in Pompey's theatre can also be added to the list of plundered Pergamene antiquities.¹⁰¹ In fact the looting of the Pergamene art galleries went on for a longer time.¹⁰² Attalos III was one of the best educated Hellenistic monarchs, an enthusiast and patron of the arts and sciences, a sculptor and a man of letters. In comparison with him the contemporary Roman aristocrats looked like poorly educated semi-illiterates, which is what they were. With the slaying of Attalos III and his closest relatives the greedy and aggressive Roman senators also terminated the last great project of patronage over the Hellenistic arts, letters, and sciences.

⁹⁷ In her otherwise simply brilliant book Hansen 1971 repeats the slogans of the hostile war propaganda, when she writes about the 'fanatical bands' of Aristonicus, cf. Robinson 1954, Polański 2013.

⁹⁸ Pape 1975, p. 155; cf. M. Fränkel, *Pergamon* VIII, 1, 1890, nr. 132; Hansen 1971, p. 301: 'made for the Asclepium in Pergamon and transferred to Rome after the annexation of the kingdom,' n. 14; K. Bursian in: *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie zu München*, 1874, p. 154.

⁹⁹ Hansen 1971, p. 305, 303 n. 30; the art of Pergamon was famous for its images of barbarians as well as of exoticism and death, cf. Bieńkowski 1908.

¹⁰⁰ Hansen 1971, p. 305: Epigonos' *Dead Mother* is sometimes included in reconstructions of the circular Gallic monument in Pergamon. In this context it is interesting to observe that the smaller victory monuments were dated by Lippold not for the reign of Attalos I, but for Attalos II's, Hansen 1971, p. 312.

¹⁰¹ The bronze image of Alcippe: *Tat.orat. ad Graec.*53, Overbeck 917, Hansen 1971, p. 300. Other instances of plunder in Pergamon: the Pasquino warrior from the Palazzo Braschi, see above; 'Pergami symplegma' (*HN* 36,24). The locative may be interpreted as either Pliny's 'non vidi' (the group was still in Pergamon in his time, not in Rome), or as a translated citation from a Pergamene art historian's book compiled in the 2nd century BC. Likewise the paintings by Apollodorus of Athens *sacerdos adorans et Aiax fulmine incensus quae Pergami spectatur hodie* (*HN* 35,60).

¹⁰² *Tac. Ann.* 16,23,1 (Nero), Pape 1975, p. 195; cf. Verres' plunder of art works in Chios, Erythrae, Halicarnassus, Tenedos, Samos, Aspendos, Perge, Pape 1975, p. 206ff.

Bibliography

- Benndorf O., 1862, *De Anthologiae Graecae epigrammatis quae ad artes spectant*, Bonnae.
- Bernhard M., 1980, *Sztuka hellenistyczna*, Warszawa.
- Bieńkowski P. von, 1908, *Die Darstellungen der Gallier in der hellenistischen Kunst*, Vienna.
- Brückner A., 1904, Wann ist der Altar von Pergamon errichtet worden, *Archäologischer Anzeiger*, pp. 218–224.
- Cardinali G., 1910, La morte di Attalo III, *Festschrift Giulio Beloch*, Rome, pp. 269–320.
- Dawson C., 1944, *Romano-Campanian Mythological Landscape Painting*, Yale Classical Studies 9, New Haven.
- Deichgräber K., Polemon von Ilion, *RE* 21,2 NB 1994, cc. 1288–1320.
- Dittenberger W., 1903, *Oriens Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*, v. 1–2, Leipzig (repr. Hildesheim 1960) (=OGIS).
- Fränkel M., 1890, *Die Inschriften von Pergamon*, Altertümer von Pergamon VIII, Berlin (=IvP).
- Hansen E., 1971, *The Attalids of Pergamon*, Ithaca N.Y.
- Hughes Fowler B., 1989, *The Hellenistic Aesthetic*, Bedminster, Bristol.
- Die Inschriften von Olympia*, ed. W. Dittenberger, K. Purgold, Berlin 1896 (=IvO).
- Jahn O., 1850, Über die Kunsturtheile des Plinius, *Berichte des Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, pp. 105–142.
- Jex-Blake K., Sellers E., 1896, *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art*, London (repr. 1976).
- Jucker H., 1950, *Vom Verhältnis der Römer zur bildenden Kunst der Griechen*, Frankfurt am Main.
- Der Kleine Pauly* 1–5, ed. K. Ziegler, W. Sontheimer, Munich 1979 (=KP).
- Lacroix L., 1949, *Les reproductions de statues sur les monnaies grecques. La statuaire archaïque et classique*, Paris.
- Loewy E., 1885, *Inschriften Griechischer Bildhauer*, Leipzig.
- Magie D., 1950, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the 3rd Century after Christ*, vol. 1–2, Princeton.
- Marek C., Frei P., 2010, *Geschichte Kleinasien in der Antike*, Munich.
- Münzer F., 1897, *Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der Naturgeschichte des Plinius*, Berlin.
- Overbeck J., 1868, *Die antiken Schriftquellen zur Geschichte der bildenden Künste bei den Griechen*, Leipzig (repr. Hildesheim 1959) (=Overbeck).
- Pape M., 1975, *Griechische Kunstwerke aus Kriegsbeute und ihre öffentliche Aufstellung in Rom*, Hamburg.
- Patrologia Graeca*, ed. J.-P. Migne, Athens 2004 (repr. Paris 1864).
- Peters W., 1963, *Landscape in Romano-Campanian Mural Painting*, Diss. Assen.
- Polański T., 2002, *Ancient Greek Orientalist Painters. The Literary Evidence*, Kraków.
- Polański T., 2013, The Destruction of Cultural Heritage in the Kingdoms of Pontus and Kommagene during the Roman Conquest, *Iran and the Caucasus* 17, pp. 239–252.
- Polański T., 2014, Attalos III, King and Sculptor. An Appendix to Vollkommer's Künstlerlexikon, *Studies in Ancient Art and Civilisation* 17, 2014, pp. 163–179, Festschrift Evdoksia Papuci-Władyka.
- Preller L., 1838, *Polemonis Periegetae fragmenta collegit, digessit, notis auxit*, Diss. Lipsiae.
- Richardson L., 1992, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, Baltimore, London.
- Robinson E., 1954, Cistophori in the Name of King Eumenes, *Numismatic Chronicle*, pp. 1–7.
- Salis A. von, 1912, *Der Altar von Pergamon: Ein Beitrag zur Erklärung des hellenistischen Barockstils in Kleinasien*, Berlin.
- Schmidt T., 1990, Der späte Beginn und der Vorzeitige Abbruch der Arbeiten am Pergamonaltar, in: B. Andreae, G. de Luca, N. Himmelmann, hrsg. *Phryomachos-Probleme*, Mainz 1990, pp. 141–162.

- Schreiber G., 1872, *Quaestionum de artificum aetatibus in Plinii naturalis historiae libris relatis specimen*, Diss. Leipzig.
- Schwarz G., 1971, *Die griechische Kunst des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v.Chr. im Spiegel der Anthologia Graeca*, Wien.
- Schweitzer B., 1936, Das Original der sogenannten Pasquino-Gruppe, *Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Klasse der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* XLIII, 4, Leipzig.
- Stähler K., 1966, *Das Unklassische im Telephosfries*, Münster.
- Tatarkiewicz W., 1960, *Historia estetyki*, t. 1. *Estetyka starożytna*, Wrocław 1960.
- Urlichs L., 1887, *Über griechische Kunstschriftsteller*, Würzburg.
- Vitry P., 1894, Étude sur les épigrammes de L'Anthologie Palatine qui contiennent la description d'une œuvre d'art, *Revue d'Archéologique* 24, pp. 315–367.
- Vollkommer R., 2007, *Künstlerlexikon der Antike*, Hamburg.
- Wilamowitz U. von, 1881, *Antigonos von Karystos*, Philologische Untersuchungen, IV, Berlin.
- Will E., 1966–1967, *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique (323–30 av.J.C.)*, vol. 1–2, Nancy.
- Winter F., 1908, *Die Skulpturen mit Ausnahme der Altarreliefs*, Altertümer von Pergamon VII, Berlin (=AvP).