

Polykleitos,
the Doryphoros,
and Tradition

Edited by Warren G. Moon

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN PRESS

Published with the assistance of the Getty Grant Program

Frontispiece: Minneapolis Doryphoros
(Minneapolis Institute of Arts 86.6)

Photo: Courtesy of the Minneapolis Institute of Arts

The University of Wisconsin Press
114 North Murray Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53715

3 Henrietta Street
London WC2E 8LU, England

Copyright © 1995
The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System
All rights reserved

1 2 3 4 5

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Polykleitos, the Doryphoros, and tradition / edited by Warren G. Moon.
376 p. cm. — (Wisconsin studies in classics)
Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-299-14310-4 (cl.)

1. Polyclitus, 5th cent. B.C. — Criticism and interpretation.
2. Polyclitus, 5th cent. B.C. Doryphoros. I. Moon, Warren G.
II. Series.

NB101.P63 1995
730'.92—dc20 94-30288

CONTENTS

	<i>Contributors</i>	ix	
	<i>Preface</i>	xi	
1	Jeffrey M. Hurwit	The Doryphoros: Looking Backward	3
2	J. J. Pollitt	The <i>Canon</i> of Polykleitos and Other Canons	19
3	Ira S. Mark	The Lure of Philosophy: Craft and Higher Learning in Ancient Greece	25
4	Gregory V. Leftwich	Polykleitos and Hippokratic Medicine	38
5	Richard Tobin	The Pose of the Doryphoros	52
6	Hugo Meyer	A Roman Masterpiece: The Minneapolis Doryphoros	65
7	C. H. Hallett	The Replica of Polykleitos' Doryphoros in the Minneapolis Institute of Arts: An Archeological Description	116
8	C. H. Hallett	<i>Kopienkritik</i> and the Works of Polykleitos	121
9	K. J. Hartswick	Head Types of the Doryphoros	161
10	Brunilde S. Ridgway	<i>Paene ad exemplum</i> : Polykleitos' Other Works	177
11	Angelos Delivorrias	Polykleitos and the Allure of Feminine Beauty	200
12	Carmen Arnold-Biucchi	Reflections of Polykleitos' Works on Ancient Coins	218

13	Carlos A. Picón	Polykleitan and Related Sculptures in American Collections: Recent Acquisitions	229
14	Andrew Stewart	Notes on the Reception of the Polykleitan Style: Diomedes to Alexander	246
15	John Pollini	The Augustus from Prima Porta and the Transformation of the Polykleitan Heroic Ideal: The Rhetoric of Art	262
16	Warren G. Moon	Nudity and Narrative: Observations on the Synagogue Paintings from Dura-Europos	283
17	Phyllis Pray Bober	Polykles and Polykleitos in the Renaissance: The “Letto di Policreto”	317
18	A. A. Donohue	Winckelmann’s History of Art and Polyclitus	327
		<i>Index</i>	357

Winckelmann's History of Art and Polyclitus

18

A. A. DONOHUE

In memory of Kyle Meredith Phillips, Jr.

The Doryphorus was identified in 1863, one hundred years after the publication of Johann Joachim Winckelmann's *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums*.¹ Much has changed since Winckelmann felt it necessary to dispute the Polyclitan attribution of the Hercules and Antaeus in Florence and saw fit to dismiss it on the grounds that the group was "second rate and more than half restored."² Yet although current approaches and criteria differ greatly from Winckelmann's, his view of the history of Greek art shaped and continues to influence modern scholarship. Winckelmann's contribution to the study of Classical aesthetics has naturally received the most attention: his formulation was decisive for the rise of European neoclassicism in art and literature, especially in the case of the generation of German writers who followed him. It is increasingly recognized that his aesthetic doctrines continue to have repercussions for the history of art; for instance, W. A. P. Childs has remarked the way in which Winckelmann's aesthetic analysis has guided the very definition of Classic style.³ With respect to even the most basic historical concerns—that is, questions of what happened, and when, and where—to a surprising extent modern research not only follows lines suggested by Winckelmann, but also takes for granted some of his historical formulations.

Winckelmann's treatment of Polyclitus now appears less useful for the history of Greek art than for its historiography, but its importance for understanding the present state of the subject is difficult to overestimate. Two issues are especially significant: Winckelmann's methodology and the nature of his sources. Winckelmann's treatment of Polyclitus, when examined in light of the methods by which he constructed his history, offers

several insights into the historiography of Greek art. It can be shown that Winckelmann's entire historical structure depended less on the evidence of the monuments than on ancient literary sources and that the reliability of the art-historical information supplied by those sources is seriously compromised by their own aims and contexts. To the extent that the history of Classical art has been shaped by evaluations of the named great masters, it is built on a foundation not of facts, but of formulations. These formulations were devised in antiquity and accepted and perpetuated by the post-antique writers on art. They are coherent within the limits of ancient theories on artistic, cultural, social, and political development, and they conform to the ancient structures and conventions of critical and historical discourse. What they offer, in the end, is not history but its facsimile.

LIFE AND WORKS OF WINCKELMANN

It is helpful to begin with a brief summary of Winckelmann's life and works as they bear on his approach to the art of ancient Greece.⁴

Johann Joachim Winckelmann lived from 1717 to 1768. He was born in Prussia, and although he was the son of a poor cobbler, his intelligence and industry enabled him to acquire a relatively good elementary education and to attend gymnasium in Berlin. He first attended university at Halle, where his poverty constrained him to follow subsidized studies in theology, which he detested and abandoned; later medical studies at Jena were equally unsuccessful. One of his major interests was Classical literature, and he early showed the love of books and miscellaneous learning that remained characteristic throughout his life.

In 1743 Winckelmann became associate rector

at Seehausen, in the Altmark, which meant in fact that he was an impoverished schoolmaster. His five years there he considered to be his most heroic period, filled with privation, humiliation, and endless study. During church services he read a copy of Homer tucked into a prayer book. One winter he permitted himself only four hours' sleep each night, poised in a chair so that he could resume his labors at 4 A.M., reading and making extracts from borrowed books. His notebooks of polyglot and polymathic extracts, now in Paris, make it possible to follow his prodigious consumption, including Greek and Roman playwrights, historians, philosophers, orators, and rhetoricians.⁵

Winckelmann's rich inner life could not, however, compensate for the poverty of his circumstances, and in 1748 he escaped Prussia for a happier situation by securing a post as a librarian to Count Heinrich von Büнау at his estates in Nöthnitz, outside Dresden, in Saxony. His duties were to help catalogue the library, one of the largest and finest in Europe, and to assist the count in the preparation of his vast *Genaue und umständliche Teutsche Kayser- und Reichshistorie*. For the next six years Winckelmann read even more widely, learned something of the basic techniques of research and documentation, and became convinced that he wished to devote himself to the study of history. Service with the count gave him entrée to the Saxon court, and his horizons were widened by contact with intellectual circles and visits to the libraries and galleries of Dresden, a major center of arts and letters.

During these years he came to recognize his life's work, the study of art. He began to frequent the galleries of Dresden, and his notebooks show a new direction in his readings: ancient and modern writings on art. By 1753 he was writing short descriptions of paintings in the royal collections that depend heavily on judgments borrowed from the major writers on art.⁶ To pursue his work, he felt it necessary to go to Rome; to reach it he became a Catholic and abandoned Büнау's service. He moved to Dresden in 1754, the year Raphael's Sistine Madonna also took up residence there, and roomed at the house of Adam Friedrich Oeser, from whom he took drawing lessons. During this year in Dresden he produced his first important work, *Gedanken über die Nachahmung der Griechischen Werke in der Mahlerey und Bildhauer-Kunst*, which was enthusiastically received on its publication in 1755. The essay was an attack on the Baroque style then popular at the Saxon court, and specifically on Bernini. Highly emotional, but somewhat lacking

in references to actual works of art, it argues for a return to the principles of ancient Greek aesthetics—noble simplicity and quiet grandeur—by the imitation of which modern art was to be improved. It is an impassioned, not always coherent tract with unmistakable polemic intent, and it sets the agenda for all Winckelmann's subsequent writing.⁷

In November 1755 Winckelmann finally reached Rome and saw for himself the monuments that had inflamed his soul. He haunted the libraries and galleries and great collections, enthusiasm sometimes outstripping prudence, as for example when he climbed up to examine an over-lifesize herm of Minerva in the gardens of the Villa Ludovisi, only to discover that it was insecurely mounted. He became friendly with the painter Anton Raphael Mengs; his circle of acquaintances widened as he skillfully rode the waves of patronage in papal circles; and his reputation grew. He took several trips to the area of Naples to see the archaeological work at Herculaneum and Pompeii. He remained in Florence from September 1758 to April 1759 to catalogue the collection of ancient gems of the late Baron Stosch, which he published in 1760. In 1763 he became Papal Antiquary. Throughout his Italian years he produced essays and books; at the end of 1763 appeared the first edition of his *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums*.⁸

Winckelmann was a nervous author, constantly changing and emending his work, and the *Geschichte* immediately began to undergo a long series of alterations and additions. Winckelmann was at work on a new edition of it in 1768, when he was persuaded to return to Germany for a triumphal visit. He left Rome on April 10 in the company of Bartolomeo Cavaceppi, in high spirits; but by the time they reached the Alps he had lapsed into deep melancholy, depressed by the uncongenial, un-Italian scenery and climate. He reached Vienna, where he received the praise of the Empress Maria Theresa and some gold and silver medallions, but then turned back to Rome, unkindly abandoning Cavaceppi to the horrors of the North. When he reached Trieste on June 1, traveling incognito, he discovered that he could not secure passage for some days. He struck up an imprudent friendship with an ex-convict. On the eighth of June, while Winckelmann was hard at work preparing notes for the printer of the revised *Geschichte*, his new friend entered his room, choked and stabbed him, and fled. The authorities rapidly located the murderer and returned him to Trieste, where, unimpressed by his ready admission that he had killed Winckelmann

in the belief that he was a person of no importance—a Jew perhaps, or a Lutheran—they executed him on the wheel.

This essay is concerned with the first edition of the *Geschichte*, in which Winckelmann commits himself to an explicit historical structure, and secondarily with the *Gedancken*, the essay that sets the aesthetic program to which the *Geschichte* in turn conforms. It is these works, rather than the later essays, books, and reworkings of the *Geschichte*, that reveal the genesis of Winckelmann's thought.

WINCKELMANN'S PERIODIZATION OF GREEK ART
At the heart of Winckelmann's view of the history of Greek art is his scheme of periodization. Periodization—a graceless word referring to the division of events into coherent, labeled groups—is a recurring focus of attention for historians in every field.⁹ For historians of the later eras of Western art, periodization often involves making sense of relatively well documented masters and monuments: defining the limits, for example, of Mannerism or the Baroque.¹⁰ For historians of ancient art, however, periodization is something quite different. Because all too frequently it is necessary to treat monuments that are divorced from any context, the task is to build a history for them, very often by means of dating on the basis of style. Stylistic similarities establish attributions to regions and hands and the placement of works within relative chronologies. The two major difficulties with this approach are that few absolute dates anchor the relative chronologies, and for some material, for instance, Hellenistic sculpture, the notion of logical stylistic development all but collapses.¹¹ It is generally recognized that the basic outline of the periods of Greek art—the stylistic and chronological groups of Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic—is derived from Winckelmann.¹²

Winckelmann establishes a sequence of four styles—*der ältere Stil*, *der hohe Stil*, *der schöne Stil*, and *der Stil der Nachahmer*—which he correlates with the series of the great artists of Greece:

Greek art, like Greek poetry, has according to Scaliger four principal periods . . . ; we might even count five such epochs. For as every action or event has five parts, and, as it were, stages,—namely, beginning, progress, state of rest, decrease, and end, in which lies the ground of the five scenes or acts in dramatic pieces,—so it is with the succession of time in art; but since the close of art is beyond its bounds, so there are properly only four periods in it for consideration here. The more ancient style lasted until Phidias; through him and the artists of his time art attained its greatness. This style may be called the grand and lofty. From the time of Praxiteles

to that of Lysippus and Apelles, art acquired more grace and pleasingness; this style should be named the beautiful. Some little time subsequent to these artists and their school, art began to decline among their imitators; and we might now add a third style, that of the imitators, until art gradually bowed itself to its fall.¹³

Winckelmann describes the Older Style as hard, deficient in grace, but powerful:

The characteristics and peculiarities of this older style may be embraced, in a general way, in the following brief description. The drawing was vigorous but hard; powerful but without grace; and the strength of expression detracted from beauty. . . . As we comprehend under the older style the longer period of Greek art, this description is to be understood with some reservations, depending on the different stages of progress during that period, in which the later works must have been very unlike the earlier.¹⁴

It is worth remarking that here he allows the possibility of variation within styles, an idea that occurs later in the *Geschichte* in a somewhat different form.

Winckelmann next explains the change to the Grand Style and defines its characteristics:

Finally, at the time when Greece attained its highest degree of refinement and freedom, art also became more unfettered and lofty; for the older style was constructed upon a system composed of rules which, though originally derived from nature, had afterwards departed from it and become ideal. The artist wrought more in conformity to these rules than to nature, the object of imitation, for art had created for itself a nature of its own. The improvers of art elevated themselves above this adopted system, and drew nearer to the truth of nature, by which they were taught to throw aside, for flowing outlines, the hardness of the older style, with its prominent and abruptly ending parts of the figure, to make the violent positions and actions more refined and becoming, and to display in their works less science, and more beauty, loftiness, and grandeur. Through this improvement in art, Phidias, Polycletus, Scopas, Alcamenes, Myron, and other masters, made themselves celebrated; and their style may be called the Grand Style, because their chief object, besides beauty, appears to have been grandeur. But a clear distinction must be made here between hardness in drawing and sharpness, in order not to mistake the sharp rendering of the eyebrows for example, which we constantly see in shapes of the highest beauty, for an unnatural hardness remaining from the older style; for the sharpness with which the parts are denoted has its foundation in ideas of beauty, as we have already remarked.

But it is probable, and it may be inferred from some remarks of writers, that the rectilinear still continued to be characteristic in a certain degree of the drawing of the grand style, and that the outlines in consequence passed into angles,—a characteristic which seems to have been denoted by the word “square” or “angular.” For as these masters, like Polycletus for example, were lawgivers in proportion, and therefore probably established exactly the measure of each one part, it is not incredible that a certain degree of beauty of form may

have been sacrificed to this great exactness. But though grandeur was displayed in the figures of these great masters, still, in comparison with the waving outlines of their successors, it may have exhibited a certain hardness. This appears to have been the hardness which was censured in Callon, Hegesias, Canachus, and Calamis, indeed even in Myron. Canachus however was younger than Phidias, for he was the scholar of Polyclitus, and flourished in the ninety-fifth Olympiad.¹⁵

The didactic, prescriptive nature of the categories is clear even from the reference to "*die Verbesserer*," "the improvers" of art, but it is also clear that at this point Winckelmann senses a major difficulty: the same sources that praise the sculptors in question also accuse them of displaying an undesirable hardness in their work. Winckelmann's solution is to postulate holdovers from the previous style and to advance a finicky, not altogether convincing distinction between an unnatural hardness and a sharp definition of parts.

The sources on which he relies are Pliny's passages on Polyclitus and Lysippus using the difficult term *quadratus*¹⁶ and the well-known passages of Cicero and Quintilian comparing the styles of sculptors. It seems that in discussing Polyclitus, Pliny may understand *quadratus* as contrasting with a pose in which one leg of a figure bears its weight; whether he does or should take Varro's comment as essentially negative is not clear.¹⁷ His remarks in *Natural History* 34.65 unquestionably link *quadratus* with an artistic rendering that is older than and in contrast to that of Lysippus.¹⁸ Winckelmann's conception of hardness as characteristic of an older style seems to reflect his conflation of the passages from Cicero and Quintilian that offer comparative scales of rigidity:

No one who is expert in such comparatively trivial matters fails to realize that Canachus' statues are too rigid to be life-like, that Calamis' are stiff, but less so than Canachus'; that Myron's aren't yet sufficiently realistic, though undoubtedly to be described as beautiful; that Polyclitus' are more beautiful and by now positively perfect (or so I think). So too in painting. We praise Zeuxis, Polygnotus, Timanthes, and the shapes and lines produced by those who used no more than four colours. But in Aetion, Nicomachus, Protogenes, Apelles, everything is now perfect. Perhaps the same is true generally: nothing is perfect the moment it is invented.¹⁹

A similar variety can be traced in statuary. Callon and Hegesias made things that were rather harsh, very like Etruscan. Calamis' products were already less unbending, Myron's softer still. Polyclitus' had surpassing care and beauty; most yield him the palm, but, in order to have something to carp at, find in him a lack of weight. For, while giving an unrealistic beauty to the human form, he is regarded as not having provided gods with their due of authority. Indeed, he is said to have avoided representing more advanced age, restrict-

ing his enterprise to smooth cheeks. What Polyclitus lacked, it is agreed that Phidias and Alcamenes possessed. But Phidias (so it is said) was more skilled at representing gods than men; in ivory, however he was far beyond any rival.²⁰

These passages are of key importance in Renaissance histories of art, as E. H. Gombrich demonstrated, and, as will be seen, have particular importance for Winckelmann's treatment of Polyclitus.²¹

Winckelmann compares the change from the Older to the Grand Style to developments in modern art, raising the issue of personal styles within period styles:

[I]t might however be shown that the ancient writers have very often judged of art in the same manner as the moderns; and the firmness of drawing, the correctly and severely rendered figures of Raphael, have to many appeared hard and stiff, when compared with the tenderness of the outlines and the round and softly treated forms of Correggio. Malvasia, a historian of the Bolognese painters, but a person of no taste, is altogether of this opinion; so to uncultivated minds the Homeric verse, and the antique majesty of Lucretius and Catullus, sound negligent and coarse in comparison with the brilliancy of Virgil and the charming sweetness of Ovid. If, on the other hand, the opinion of Lucian in art is good for anything, the statue of the Amazon Sosandra, from the hand of Calamis, was to be placed among the four most admirable figures of female beauty. For in his description of her beauty he mentions not only the whole dress, but also the modest mien and the soft and covert smile. However, the style of one period can no more be general in art than in writing; for if Thucydides, of all the authors of his time, had been the only one preserved, we should, from the conciseness amounting almost to obscurity in the speeches of his history, have formed an erroneous conclusion in regard to Plato, Lysias, and Xenophon, whose words flow onward like a gentle stream.²²

Winckelmann closely follows the comments of Dionysius of Halicarnassus on the language of the historian Thucydides, finding in them the idea of stylistic variation within a particular period:

But to those who refer Thucydides's language to its historical period and assert that it was familiar to the people of that time, I am content with a short and obvious reply: that none of the many orators and philosophers who lived at Athens during the Peloponnesian War used this style, neither Andocides, Antiphon, Lysias and their fellow orators, nor Critias, Antisthenes, Xenophon and the other companions of Socrates. It is clear from all these facts that Thucydides was the first to write in this style, and that he did so in order to be different from the other historians.²³

Winckelmann next discusses the beginning of the third, the Beautiful Style, establishing its chronology and characteristics:

The works of the great improvers of art having been lost, it is impossible to determine more precisely the

varied learning and the attributes of the grand style. . . . But we can speak with more confidence of the style of their successors, which I term the Beautiful, for some of the most beautiful figures of antiquity were without doubt executed in the period within which this style flourished; and many others of which this cannot be shown are at least imitations of them. The beautiful style of art begins with Praxiteles; it attained its highest splendor through Lysippus and Apelles, — the proofs of which will be adduced hereafter. It is therefore the style which prevailed not long before and at the time of Alexander the Great and his immediate successors.

The principal attribute by which the beautiful style is distinguished from the grand is grace; and in this respect the artists last named hold the same relation towards their predecessors that Guido, among the moderns, would hold to Raphael. This will be shown more clearly when we come to consider the drawing of this style, and the grace which constitutes its peculiar character.²⁴

Winckelmann's source for the notion of grace is again Dionysius, in the context of a comparison between artists and orators:

I think one would not be wide of the mark in comparing the oratory of Isocrates, in respect of its grandeur, its virtuosity and its dignity, with the art of Polyclitus and Phidias, and the style of Lysias, for its lightness and charm, with that of Calamis and Callimachus; for just as the latter two sculptors are more successful than their rivals in portraying lesser human subjects, where the former two are cleverer at treating grandeur and superhuman subjects, so with the two orators: Lysias has the greater skill with small subjects, while Isocrates is the more impressive with grand subjects. This is perhaps because he is naturally of a noble cast of mind: or, if this is not the case, it is at least because his mind is wholly set upon grand and admirable designs. So much for the orator's style.²⁵

It should be noted that whereas Dionysius gives Calamis grace, Cicero and Quintilian do not.

This passage provides the second example of Winckelmann's drawing a parallel between ancient and modern art. His source for the contrast between Raphael's grandeur and Guido Reni's grace seems to be passages from Bellori taken gloriously out of context:

Raphael of Urbino, the great master of those who know, thus writes to Castiglione of his Galatea: "In order to paint a beautiful woman, it would be necessary for me to see many beautiful women, but since there is a scarcity of them, I make use of a certain Idea which comes to my mind."

Likewise Guido Reni, who in grace has surpassed every other artist of our century. . . .²⁶

When the divine Raphael with the ultimate outlines of his art raised its beauty to the summit, restoring it to the ancient majesty of all those graces and enriching the merits that once made it most glorious in the presence of the Greeks and the Romans, painting was most admired by men and seemed descended from Heaven.²⁷

Thus the Beautiful Style is defined as the highest

point of art. Winckelmann then analyses and criticizes what followed:

As the proportions and forms of beauty had been thoroughly studied by the artists of antiquity, and the outlines of figures were so determinate that it was impossible either to go beyond them or fall within them without error, the conception of beauty could be carried no higher. Inasmuch therefore as art could not advance, it must go backwards, because in it, as in all the operations of nature, we cannot think of any stationary point. The conceptions of deities and heroes were figured in all possible ways and positions; it was difficult to invent new ones; consequently the path was opened to imitation. It cramps the spirit to copy; and if it did not seem possible to surpass a Praxiteles and an Apelles, so also it was difficult to equal them; the imitator has always proved inferior to him whom he has imitated.

The same result took place also in art which had happened to philosophy; as among philosophers, so too among artists there arose Eclectics or Compilers, who, being deficient in original powers, sought to unite in one the peculiar beauties of many. But as the Eclectics are to be regarded only as copyists of philosophers of particular schools, and have produced little or nothing original, so also no complete, original, and harmonious work was to be expected in art when it took precisely the same course. As the grand writings of the ancients were lost in consequence of abridgments made of them, so also, through the productions of the eclectics in art, the grand original works were probably neglected. Imitation favored the lack of accurate knowledge; the drawing consequently became timid; and what the artist wanted in knowledge, he sought to supply by diligence, which gradually displayed itself in details that, in the flourishing times of the art, were omitted, and deemed unfavorable to the grand style.

Here we feel the truth of what Quintilian says, that many artists would have executed the ornaments on the Jupiter of Phidias better than Phidias himself. Through the effort to avoid any supposed hardness, and thus to make everything tender and soft, those parts which were strongly rendered by preceding artists became rounder, but insipid: sweeter, but less expressive. . . . Precisely in the same way corruption has at all times crept also into the style of writing, and thus music, renouncing its manly tones, degenerated like art into the effeminate. The actual excellence in any production is frequently lost by the very care with which it is elaborated. . . .²⁸

The inferiority of imitations to their originals is a point taken from Dionysius of Halicarnassus in a section of his essay on the orator Dinarchus concerning the attribution of speeches:

And we make the same assumption with regard to Demosthenes: if his impressiveness of diction, his originality of composition, his vivid portrayal of emotion, his pungency and keenness of mind, which shows itself in the configuration of every letter, his vitality and vehemence are constantly present, there need be no further hesitation about including them among the speeches of Demosthenes. But if the highest degree of each of these qualities is absent, or consistency of style is not maintained throughout, let them remain among the speeches

of Dinarchus. Generally speaking, two different forms of imitation can be found with regard to ancient models: one is natural, and is acquired by intensive learning and familiarity; the other is related to it, but is acquired by following the precepts of the art. About the first, what more is there to say? And about the second, what is there to be said except that a certain spontaneous charm and freshness emanates from all the original models, whereas in the artificial copies, even if they attain the height of imitative skill, there is present nevertheless a certain element of contrivance and unnaturalness also? It is by this rule that not only orators distinguish other orators, but painters the works of Apelles and his imitators, moulders the works of Polyclitus, and sculptors the works of Phidias.²⁹

Winckelmann's discussion of the Eclectics, it will be recalled, was shown by Denis Mahon to have been crucial in the application of the label "Eclectic" to the Carracci.³⁰ In terms of the historiography of Greek art, what is most significant is the equation of imitation with decline, an idea that clearly has gripped Winckelmann. He bolsters his argument with a horrendous misinterpretation of a passage from Quintilian.³¹ Nonetheless the message is clear: imitation is decline.

Winckelmann then offers a reprise:

If we review and condense the substance of this Book, we shall see in the art of the Greeks, especially in sculpture, four stages of style, namely, the straight and hard, the grand and square, the beautiful and flowing, and the imitative. The first probably lasted, for the most part, until the age of Phidias; the second, until Praxiteles, Lysippus, and Apelles; the third probably ceased with the school of the three latter artists; and the fourth continued until the downfall of art. The period during which art was in its highest bloom was not of long duration; for from the age of Pericles until the death of Alexander, at which time the glory of art began to diminish, there are about one hundred and twenty years.

In general the fate of art in modern times is, as regards periods, similar to that of antiquity. In it likewise there have occurred four principal changes; there is this difference only, that modern art did not fall gradually from its height, as among the Greeks; but as soon as it had reached, in two great men, the utmost degree of elevation at that time possible, — I here speak only of drawing, — it fell again and at once. Until Michael Angelo and Raphael, the style was dry and stiff; the highest point to which art attained, after its restoration, was in these two men; after an interval, in which a bad taste prevailed, came the style of the imitators; this was the period of the Caracci and their school, with its followers, and it extended unto Carlo Maratti. But, if we speak of sculpture in particular, the history of it is very brief. It flourished with Michael Angelo and Sansovino, and ended with them. Algardi, Fiamingo, and Rusconi came more than a hundred years later.³²

Here another parallel is drawn with modern art. The scheme of a high point followed by a sudden decline is taken cleanly from Bellori, who,

however, sees the role of imitation somewhat differently:

When the divine Raphael with the ultimate outlines of his art raised its beauty to the summit, restoring it to the ancient majesty of all those graces and enriching the merits that once made it most glorious in the presence of the Greeks and the Romans, painting was most admired by men and seemed descended from Heaven. But since things of the earth never stay the same, and whatever gains the heights inevitably must with perpetual vicissitude fall back again, so art, which from Cimabue and Giotto had slowly advanced over the long period of two hundred and fifty years, was seen to decline rapidly and from a queen become humble and common. Thus, with the passing of that happy century all of its beauties quickly vanished. The artists, abandoning the study of nature, corrupted art with the *maniera*, that is to say, with the fantastic idea based on practice and not on imitation. This vice, the destroyer of painting, first began to appear in masters of honored acclaim. It rooted itself in the schools that later followed. It is incredible to recount how far they degenerated then, not only from Raphael but from those artists who had introduced the manner.³³

In the second part of the *Geschichte*, Winckelmann focuses on the chronological and political context of Greek and Roman art, and he is able to point to historical circumstances that account for the decline:

After the death of Alexander the Great, rebellions and bloody wars arose in the kingdoms which he had conquered, as well as in Macedonia itself, under his immediate successors, — all of whom had died off about the one hundred and twenty-fourth Olympiad, — and continued to rage even under their successors and sons. Greece suffered more in a brief period from the hostile armies by which it was continually overrun, from the almost annual change of government, and the heavy taxes by which its means were exhausted, than from all the previous internal wars of its states among themselves.³⁴

And further:

The loss of freedom, from which art had as it were received its life, was necessarily followed by its decline and fall on the very spot where liberty had once eminently flourished.³⁵

He explains away a contradiction in the absolute chronology and draws a parallel between art and letters:

This decline in the flourishing state of art is to be understood of new artists who became eminent; for those who, like Lysippus, Apelles, and Protogenes, had survived the period in question, are reckoned as belonging to the age in which they flourished. The great change in art for the worse which ensued on Alexander's death is manifested also in the language and style of composition of the Greeks; for from this time forward most of their works are written in the common dialect so called, which was never at any time or in any place the dialect

of the people; it was the language of the learned, just as Latin is at the present day.³⁶

The *Geschichte*, then, presents a system of four period styles — Older, Grand, Beautiful, and that of the Imitators — all with chronological boundaries and parallels with the development of art in later times.³⁷ It has long been recognized that the passages on periodization are a complex mixture of ancient and modern sources. The question is what contribution these sources made to Winckelmann's formulation of the history of Greek art.

One hundred years ago, Adolf Furtwängler reproached archaeologists for making less use of the monuments than Winckelmann had. "Winckelmann's History of Art," he asserted, "is wholly based upon a fresh and personal observation of the monuments, of which he makes a constant and extensive use."³⁸ A similar evaluation has been put forward more recently by Alex Potts, who believes that Winckelmann's personal observation of the monuments was key to his new and original formulation of the history of art; he sees the scheme of the rise and fall of Greek art to be different in intention and structure from earlier schemes such as those found in Vasari and Bellori, largely because he believes it offers a new kind of role for history.³⁹ In like way, Francis Haskell and Nicholas Penny assert that "Winckelmann's chronological account depended on an analysis of successive stylistic phases, and there were no precedents for such an approach to classical art."⁴⁰ There are good reasons to believe that the situation is quite different. Winckelmann's historical construct, exemplified in the scheme of four styles that encompass the rise and fall of Greek art, demonstrably follows, very faithfully, the available ancient written sources; indeed, his entire approach to Greek art is deeply literary.⁴¹ His reliance on a specific group of ancient sources has serious historiographic implications. Potts's closely argued assertion of Winckelmann's originality plays down or overlooks several important aspects of his methods and conclusions that require clarification.

Potts contends that Winckelmann's scheme of four periods differs profoundly in intention and structure from those offered by Vasari and Bellori. He notes that Vasari's intention is to celebrate the art of his own age, an aim that yields not so much a cycle of rise and decline as a chronicle of steady progress to a plateau of continuing achievement.⁴² The implication is that Winckelmann had no such agenda. Winckelmann, however, does have a clear agenda, which was de-

veloped throughout his career. The *Geschichte* serves as an amplification and demonstration of the principles enumerated in the *Gedancken*, which attacked Baroque style and established ancient Greek art as the sole expression of perfect beauty. In the *Geschichte* Winckelmann is never far from the controversies over the achievements and aims of modern art, and the many value-laden terms he uses — "improvers," "perfection," "decline," and so forth — make it clear that his history of ancient art is by no means a disinterested formulation.

With respect to structure, Potts believes that Winckelmann's explanation of the change from the Grand to the Beautiful Style, from grandeur to grace, entails a concept of stylistic development different from the "conventional patterns of progress or decline" derived from Vasari.⁴³ In this connection he discounts Vasari's reference in the preface to the third part of the *Vite* to a change from hardness to grace:

These things had not been done by Giotto or by the other early craftsmen, although they had discovered the rudiments of all these difficulties, and had touched them on the surface; as in their drawing, which was sounder and more true to nature than it had been before, and likewise in harmony of colouring and in the grouping of figures in scenes, and in many other respects of which enough has been said. Now although the masters of the second age improved our arts greatly with regard to all the qualities mentioned above, yet these were not made by them so perfect as to succeed in attaining to complete perfection, for there was wanting in their rule a certain freedom which, without being of the rule, might be directed by the rule and might be able to exist without causing confusion or spoiling the order; which order had need of an invention abundant in every respect, and of a certain beauty maintained in every least detail, so as to reveal all that order with more adornment. In proportion there was wanting a certain correctness of judgment, by means of which their figures, without having been measured, might have, in due relation to their dimensions, a grace exceeding measurement. In their drawing there was not the perfection of finish, because, although they made an arm round and a leg straight, the muscles in these were not revealed with that sweet and facile grace which hovers midway between the seen and the unseen, as is the case with the flesh of living figures; nay, they were crude and excoriated, which made them displeasing to the eye and gave hardness to the manner. This last was wanting in the delicacy that comes from making all figures light and graceful, particularly those of women and children, with the limbs true to nature, as in the case of men, but veiled with a plumpness and fleshiness that should not be awkward, as they are in nature, but refined by draughtsmanship and judgment.⁴⁴

This passage cannot be dismissed as a source for Winckelmann's ideas: the conception and wording are clear, and the similarity obviously

stems from the use by both Vasari and Winckelmann of common sources, Classical writers such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who made “grace” an almost quantifiable characteristic.⁴⁵ To say that Winckelmann’s scheme at this point does not reflect any idea of progress is not correct: just as he explicitly calls the artists of the Grand Style “*Verbesserer*,” in his discussion of the beginning of decline he makes it clear that the artists of the Beautiful Style had pushed art to its highest point, a point from which decline was inevitable.

Potts also asserts that whereas Winckelmann offers a complete cycle of rise and fall, Vasari ends with the achievement of perfection.⁴⁶ Vasari’s vision, however, encompasses quite a complete cycle in which five stages can be recognized: the antique, which fell; the old, so-called Greek; and the three beginning with Giotto, Masaccio, and Leonardo respectively. Vasari also alludes in the preface to the first part of the *Vite* to the possibility of a future decline in art:

Up to the present, I have discoursed upon the origin of sculpture and painting, perhaps more at length than was necessary at this stage. I have done so, not so much because I have been carried away by my love for the arts, as because I wish to be of service to the artists of our own day, by showing them how a small beginning leads to the highest elevation, and how from so noble a situation it is possible to fall to utterest ruin, and consequently, how these arts resemble nature as shown in our human bodies; and have their birth, growth, age and death, and I hope by this means they will be enabled more easily to recognise the progress of the renaissance of the arts, and the perfection to which they have attained in our own time. And again, if ever it happens, which God forbid, that the arts should once more fall to a like ruin and disorder, through the negligence of man, the malignity of the age, or the decree of Heaven, which does not appear to wish that the things of this world should remain stationary, these labours of mine, such as they are (if they are worthy of a happier fate), by means of the things discussed before, and by those which remain to be said, may maintain the arts in life, or, at any rate, encourage the better spirits to provide them with every assistance, so that, by my good will and the labours of such men, they may have an abundance of those aids and embellishments which, if I may speak the truth freely, they have lacked until now.⁴⁷

In dismissing Bellori as a comparison for Winckelmann, Potts contends that although Bellori does offer some notion of a decline after Raphael, it was not central to his work.⁴⁸ Central or not, the idea cannot be discounted, and Winckelmann did seize upon it, asserting that modern art suffered a quick decline after reaching its height.

Thus the case for Winckelmann’s originality in devising a cycle of rise and decline should not be overstated. His scheme is not out of line with earlier formulations; in fact, he seems to have bor-

rowed from them and sometimes to rely on common sources.⁴⁹

Potts also argues that Winckelmann’s conclusions drawn empirically from visual evidence were central to the formulation of his historical structure.⁵⁰ The reverse, however, would seem to be the case. Although Winckelmann frequently insists on the necessity of looking long and often at the works of art themselves, his approach to visual material is far from empirical. An obvious example is his analysis of the Laocoön. In the *Gedancken* of 1755, he sees in the straining muscles of the figure writhing in the coils of the serpents the perfect embodiment of the Greek qualities of noble simplicity and quiet grandeur and of the greatness of the Greek soul — not simply in Laocoön’s face, but distributed over his entire body. Winckelmann reached this appreciation before he saw the original statue.⁵¹ Indeed, all the judgments in the *Gedancken* represent the view of the Greeks he formed before he ever left Germany, and they have less to do with the Classical material he saw in Dresden than with the idealized view of the Greek spirit that he had drawn from Classical texts, from the books that had provided his only spiritual nourishment during the barren years of his early life.⁵² The treatment of the Laocoön in the *Geschichte*, while acknowledging the depiction of the physical agonies more openly, nonetheless preserves the idea that the main figure expresses a balance between pain and resistance to pain, the face “complaining but not clamoring.”⁵³ Winckelmann’s engagement with works of art is on an intensely emotional level, one that does not lead to accurate stylistic judgments. Some of the most discriminating stylistic distinctions in the *Geschichte* are those established by others — for example, antiquarian scholars like Caylus.⁵⁴

Winckelmann’s *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums* is essentially literary in conception and approach, and even its descriptions and visual analyses of monuments are based on conceptions derived from literature rather than empirical observation. The very production of the work shows its origin in written sources. Throughout the *Geschichte*, Winckelmann insists on the necessity for extended first-hand study of the monuments, and he severely criticizes scholars whom he finds deficient in such experience. For how else but by long personal involvement with the works of art themselves can one hope to detect restorations and forgeries, let alone form any appreciation of the nature and meaning of art?⁵⁵ Yet Winckelmann’s own aesthetic program was set while he was still in Dresden, far from the range of works that

would, in theory, be necessary for the distillation of such general principles. So convinced was Winckelmann of the truth of his vision of Greek character and Greek art, and so firmly was he able to impose it on the monuments that he finally saw in Italy, that the outlines and initial execution of the *Geschichte* were accomplished in a remarkably short time.⁵⁶ The first evidence that Winckelmann planned to write such a history is his letter to Ludovico Bianconi of August 29, 1756, in which he speaks of the descriptions of statues which he is preparing: "Il m'est venuë de là l'idée de travailler à une Histoire de l'Art; j'y ai pensé et j'en cherche les materiaux. Je serois presque tenté de l'écrire en Latin."⁵⁷ In 1757 there appeared a three-page notice in the *Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften und der freyen Künste* announcing the near completion and listing the contents of Winckelmann's "Versuch einer Historie der Kunst." H. C. Hatfield has drawn attention to this notice as confirmation of the widely held belief that Winckelmann's conception of Greek art reflects preconceived ideas.⁵⁸ It is difficult to think otherwise. The negotiations for the publication of the initial version of the *Geschichte* were complicated and fruitless; Winckelmann withdrew the manuscript and recast it throughout 1759–61.⁵⁹ The years 1758 and 1759 were largely devoted to his stay in Florence to catalogue the Stosch collection, which was published in 1760.⁶⁰ The reworked version of the *Geschichte* appeared at the end of 1763. Thus, while the production of the first edition of the *Geschichte* was coextensive with the Seven Years' War, the short time that passed between its conception and the establishment of at least its basic outline shows that long familiarity with the monuments could not have been the primary element in its design.

Where there does exist evidence of long, sustained familiarity is in Winckelmann's readings of the Classical authors. His profound debt to them is obvious in the most critical feature of his formulation of periods: his explanation of the decline of Greek art.

Potts sees Winckelmann's formulation of this decline as his signal contribution to the historiography of art (and to some extent, to historical thought in general). He asserts that Winckelmann took the generalized patterns of rise and decline that were common currency in his time, transformed them by tying them to specific historical events and to stylistic and aesthetic judgments, and in so doing produced a new historical synthesis.⁶¹

Potts, while emphasizing the position of Graeco-Roman art in Winckelmann's scheme,

correctly notes the importance of his placement of the beginning of the decline at the death of Alexander the Great in 323 B.C., with the result that what is now called the Hellenistic period is equated with the period of decline. He notes, again rightly, that Winckelmann made that assignment with no real evidence: no securely dated works of art, and no explicit testimony from antiquity. He discounts Pliny's problematic assertion (*N.H.* 34.52) that art ended in the 121st Olympiad (296–293 B.C.) and was reborn in the 156th (156–153 B.C.) as too slight an indication. Potts instead accounts for Winckelmann's formulation by appealing to the *Zeitgeist*: the idea of decline was "quite an obsession among enlightenment thinkers," as was the belief that only in conditions of political liberty did—in fact, could—the arts flourish.⁶² Potts also credits Winckelmann's own, unspecified, "study of ancient literature and history" with contributing to his conviction that Greek art would have thrived in Greek liberty and perished together with the independence of the Greek city-states during the formation of the great Hellenistic kingdoms after Alexander's death.⁶³ If Potts is correct, Winckelmann would have produced an independent synthesis of great power and originality. Such synthesis, however, is not characteristic of Winckelmann's methods, and the text tells a different story.

Winckelmann's patterns of work and thought argue strongly against the claim of originality in synthetic thought. A good case in point is furnished by the dicta by which he is best known, the fundamental insights and assertions that have become his hallmarks. The following three examples, all from the *Gedancken* of 1755, are recognized illustrations of such borrowings.

The opening section of the *Gedancken* carries Winckelmann's famous pronouncement that "The only path for us to become great, indeed, if it is possible, inimitable, is the imitation of the ancients." This statement recalls a line from La Bruyère's *Caractères* of 1688, which Winckelmann excerpted during his early schoolmastering days: "One cannot . . . find the perfect, and if it may be possible, surpass the ancients except by imitating them."⁶⁴

Later in the *Gedancken* Winckelmann says that "The general and most distinctive characteristics of the Greek masterpieces are, finally, a noble simplicity and a quiet grandeur, both in posture and expression. Just as the depths of the sea always remain calm however much the surface may rage, so does the expression of the figures of the Greeks reveal a great and composed soul even in the midst of passion." These words were quoted by

Lessing at the beginning of his *Laocoön* and have attained, in their own way, a quiet grandeur. The maritime simile must, however, be credited to the *Memoirs* of Queen Christina of Sweden, which Winckelmann also excerpted: "The sea is the image of great souls — no matter how disturbed they appear, their depth is always quiet."⁶⁵

The formulation of *eine edle Einfalt und eine stille Grösse* has long been assumed to result from Winckelmann's association with Adam Friedrich Oeser, but M. L. Baeumer has argued that this connection would account only for the simplicity; the combination of simplicity with grandeur he would give to the antiquarian Caylus, who speaks of the noble and simple manner of the *bel antique*, and perhaps ultimately to Nicolas Boileau, whose translation in 1674 of Pseudo-Longinus' rhetorical tract *On the Sublime* made this formulation a commonplace.⁶⁶

Dicta, of course, may easily become common currency; what happens when Winckelmann confronts a specific historical problem? A good example comes from the *Geschichte*, where he outlines the early stages of Greek sculpture. Even today, scholars wrestle with the problem of explaining the sudden appearance of monumental stone statuary in the seventh century B.C. The accepted answer is essentially Winckelmann's: the earliest Greek statuary was devoted to the gods and consisted of aniconic monuments — that is, objects that represent but do not purport to show the appearance of the gods, such as stones, pillars, and wooden stocks. These monuments were primitive because art was not advanced, but as time went on there was a dual evolution. Aniconic representations developed into anthropomorphic ones and were able to show the forms of the gods, and the improvement of artistic technique led to the replacement of wood by stone. Winckelmann supports his explanation with testimonia for the various kinds of primitive monuments: sacred stones mentioned by Pausanias, wooden statues cited by Plutarch, and unworked stones noted by Clement of Alexandria. On the surface, his argument looks like an inspired reconstruction from scattered hints of a complex historical process. A closer examination, however, shows a rather different picture. The testimonia are not bare mentions of monuments; the references come furnished with explicit historical information and evolutionary explanations. Pausanias asserts that in early times all the Greeks worshiped unworked stones instead of images; Plutarch says that in the beginning all statues were made of wood; Clement explains that the early aniconic stocks and stones began to take on human likeness when art

developed. The intellectual contexts of these accounts are clear, too: Pausanias and Plutarch are antiquarians who subscribe fully to the Classical theories regarding the simplicity of the past; Clement, the Christian, employs an iconoclastic rhetoric, derived partly from Jewish thought, of which the aim is to undercut the immense aesthetic appeal of the pagan images by pointing out the deficiencies in their artistic pedigree. What Winckelmann has done, therefore, is not to offer an original synthesis, but to assemble, very faithfully, all the ancient sources that explicitly spell out the evolution of early Greek sculpture.⁶⁷

A similar process can be traced in Winckelmann's formulation of the periods of Greek art. Two points are especially significant: the link between decline and imitation; and the onset of decline with the death of Alexander the Great.

In both points Winckelmann's work differs significantly from post-antique formulations. For example, Lorenzo Ghiberti, in the *Commentaries* of the 1450s, places the end of art in the time of Constantine and Pope Sylvester, giving the cause as the triumph of Christian iconoclasm, with its destruction of works and writings.⁶⁸ The fifteenth-century *Life of Brunelleschi* equates the decline of art with the decline of the Roman Empire due to barbarian invasions.⁶⁹ Vasari sees decline already present in the Roman Empire; he says that it is visible in the newer parts of the Arch of Constantine, and he argues that subsequent decline was due to iconoclasm, invasions, and the lack of models to imitate.⁷⁰ Imitation per se, then, does not always seem to be disreputable; indeed, Leon Battista Alberti maintains in *De pictura* of 1435 that the ancients found it easier than do the moderns to produce good work because they had many works to imitate.⁷¹

The post-antique writers, then, offer no help. Nor do the ancient writers on art provide explanations of the decline of art. A clear source for Winckelmann's formulation can be found, however, in the works of the ancient rhetoricians.

Probably the most important writer in this connection is the Greek author of Augustan times, Dionysius of Halicarnassus; it has already been seen that Dionysius' remarks on the style of Thucydides underlie Winckelmann's idea of individual styles within periods.⁷² In the introduction to the treatise *On the Ancient Orators*, Dionysius identifies the death of Alexander the Great as the point at which the Asiatic style of oratory arose. As a supporter of the Attic style in the well-known controversy over the merits of the two rival oratorical styles, Dionysius naturally sees the rise of the Asiatic as a decline:

We have need to be deeply thankful, my good Ammaeus, to the age we live in, for the improved practice of many arts, and especially for the great progress in the skills of oratory. In the period preceding our own, the old, philosophical rhetoric collapsed under the insults and grievous injuries it was forced to endure. Its slow wasting and expiration may be said to have begun with the death of Alexander of Macedon; by our own age it had almost completely disappeared. In its place arose another kind of rhetoric, intolerable in its melodramatic shamelessness, tasteless, innocent of philosophy or any other liberal study. Unnoticed and undetected by the ignorant vulgar, this rhetoric not only enjoyed an abundance, luxury, and elegance unknown to its predecessor, but attached to itself the honours and political supremacies which belonged by right to its philosophical sister. With its crudeness and vulgarity, it ended by making Greece like the household of some desperate roué, where the decent, respectable wife sits powerless in her own home, while some nitwit of a girl, there only to ruin the property, thinks she has a right to rule the roost, and bullies the wife and treats her like dirt. Just so, in every city, even—worst of all—in the highly cultivated, the old, native Attic Muse was in disgrace, cast out from her inheritance, while another, sprung from some Asian sewer the other day—some Mysian or Phrygian or, God help us, Carian plague—claimed the right to govern the cities of Hellas, and, in her ignorance and madness, to drive out her sane, philosophical rival.

But it is not only just men, as Pindar says, of whom 'time is the best preserver', but arts and pursuits and indeed all good things. Our own age is an illustration of this. Whether some god set it in train, or the revolution of nature itself recalled the old order, or human impulse guided multitudes to the same goal—whatever the cause, this generation has restored to the old, respectable rhetoric her just honour, and stopped the young fool enjoying a reputation which did not belong to her, and behaving extravagantly in another's house. Nor is the fact that men have *begun* to honour the better above the worse the only reason for praising this age and its philosophers. It is true of course that 'well begun is half done'; but the point is also that the change has been rapid and the progress great. Apart from some few cities in Asia, where ignorance makes good learning slow to penetrate, the liking for the vulgar, frigid, and tasteless in literature has ceased. Those who formerly took pride in such things are becoming ashamed and gradually deserting to the other side, apart from a few incurables, while recent beginners are despising that style and ridiculing the passion for it.

The cause and beginning of this great change lies in Rome. The mistress of the world makes all other cities look to her. Her own men of power, who govern their country on the highest moral principles, are men of education and fine judgement. The discipline they impose has strengthened the wiser elements of the community, and forced the foolish to learn sense. In consequence, many serious historical works are now being written, many elegant speeches published, while philosophical treatises which are far from contemptible, and many other excellent works, serious productions both of Romans and of Greeks, have appeared and will no doubt continue to appear. Such is the change in such a short time that it would not surprise me if the taste for the foolish style does not survive this one generation;

when something once universal has been contracted to such small properties, the step to its total disappearance is no great one.⁷³

In his treatise on the orator Dinarchus, who flourished after the death of Alexander, Dionysius characterizes him not as a discoverer, εὐρητής, and not as a "finisher" or "perfecter," τελειωτής, but as a constant imitator of other orators.

I said nothing about the orator Dinarchus in my writings on the ancient orators because he was neither the inventor of an individual style, as were Lysias, Isocrates and Isaeus, nor the perfecter of styles which others had invented, as I judge Demosthenes, Aeschines and Hyperides to have been. . . .

The orator Dinarchus was the son of Sostratus, and a Corinthian by birth. He came to Athens at the time when the philosophical schools were in their heyday, and attended the classes of Theophrastus and Demetrius of Phalerum. Having revealed a natural talent for political oratory, he began to write speeches when Demosthenes and his party were still at the height of their power, and gradually acquired a reputation. His finest period was after the death of Alexander, when Demosthenes and the other orators had been sentenced to permanent exile or death, and no other orator worthy of note was left to succeed them. . . .

Now that we have established the orator's life-time as accurately as possible for use as a criterion to distinguish which of his speeches are genuine and which are not, it is time to turn to his style. It is difficult to define, for he possessed no quality common to all his oratory, or any individual characteristic, either in his private or in his public speeches, but in some places he shows a close resemblance to Lysias, in others to Hyperides, and in others to Demosthenes. One could furnish many examples to illustrate this.⁷⁴

Dionysius is an extremely important figure among the ancient rhetoricians, and Winckelmann's notebooks show that he read him intensively, and apparently well before he conceived the *Geschichte*.⁷⁵ Dionysius evidently provided Winckelmann with several ideas: the notion of individual style, and several points regarding decline and imitation in relation to the death of Alexander. The excesses of the Asiatic style fitted well with Winckelmann's opinion of the Baroque style in art. The malign aspect of imitation emerges along with its historical position, as is seen in another passage on Dinarchus quoted above.⁷⁶ Most significantly, the link between artistic decline and political decline is explained. Dionysius, although a Greek, was pro-Roman, and his is a good example of an attitude not uncommon among Greek writers in the Roman milieu who saw Roman rule as a good thing for Greeks: its establishment saved Greece from the constant warfare of the years following Alexander's death as his successors secured their kingdoms. Winckelmann adopts without question this analysis of

the destructive effects of continual strife. It is worth noting that although he is committed to judging the art produced in or under Rome to be by definition an art of decline, he does refer to the promotion of the arts by certain emperors and even acknowledges some achievements.⁷⁷

Thus it is not general readings in the classics but specific texts that provided Winckelmann with the link between the state of art and the state of politics. There is a considerable body of rhetorical texts that explore the issues of style, development, decline, and liberty.⁷⁸ The tradition may or may not go back to Aristotle; certainly a connection between the practice of oratory and the state of public life appears in Cicero, but it has been argued that Tacitus was the first who explicitly connects the decline of oratory with the loss of political liberty.⁷⁹ For the purposes of this discussion it is sufficient to recognize that the idea of the decline of oratory exists in several topoi and is linked to the idea of overall decline that is a major theme of writers such as Seneca, Pliny, Petronius, and Longinus — all authors read early by Winckelmann. His notebooks in fact contain a special section of extracts, dating apparently from his days with Bünau, under the rubric “*de corrupta eloq.*”⁸⁰

Rhetorical sources may lie behind all the periods established by Winckelmann. The Grand Style would appear to reflect a misreading of Pseudo-Longinus’ *On the Sublime*, through Boileau’s inaccurate translation.⁸¹ The distinction between the Grand and Beautiful Styles seems to reflect Dionysius again, a passage quoted above in which the contrast between Isocrates and Lysias is a contrast between grandeur and grace and is amplified by a parallel from art.⁸² The Older Style too finds good analogies in the characterization of older orators found in many rhetorical treatises, but it is also possible that at work here is a more general belief in the harshness of the past; certainly such ideas are widespread in the literature of antiquity.⁸³

Winckelmann was familiar with the rhetorical writers of antiquity long before his eyes were opened to art. When he began to explore post-antique writings on the arts, he found in them critical and historical schemes that were based on the same ancient sources. The work of E. H. Gombrich and Michael Baxandall has demonstrated the crucial contribution of these rhetorical treatises to the Renaissance discourse on art; the famous topos of hardness of style present in Cicero and Quintilian has already been mentioned.⁸⁴ The process seems circular, but it is easy to see

how Winckelmann would have found confirmation in the modern writers on art of convictions he had already derived from the ancient sources they had in common. When he came at last to confront the monuments themselves, to a great extent his response had already been determined; he found in them confirmation of a construction of history that was in reality a repetition of the ancient theories of rise and decline, of the nature of style, and of the link between life and art.

Winckelmann’s contribution — and it is an immense one — was to make ancient art an urgent concern of educated people. Its study demands the careful consideration of what is taken to be its history. It seems clear that the existing structure is influenced, arguably even formed, by ancient sources on both the direct and the secondary levels. The question then arises, What is the nature of these sources on which the basic understanding of the history of Greek art is built? The case of Polyclitus is of considerable interest.

POLYCLITUS IN THE *GEDANCKEN* AND THE *GESCHICHTE*

The references to Polyclitus may be reviewed quickly. To begin with the Dresden *Gedancken*: “Laocoön was to the artists in ancient Rome exactly what he is to us: the Rule of Polyclitus; a perfect Rule of Art.” This remarkable allusion to Polyclitus’ Canon is the artist’s sole contribution to Winckelmann’s formulation of the aesthetic basis of Greek art.⁸⁵

In the first edition of the *Geschichte* there are but a handful of references to Polyclitus. They are distributed quite widely in its pages in accordance with the somewhat difficult structure of the work, which may be summarized as follows.⁸⁶

Winckelmann’s aim in writing the *Geschichte* was not to offer an objective or complete account of the art of antiquity. As the *Gedancken* had advanced its case against Baroque style by presenting Greek art as the standard of excellence, so the purpose of the *Geschichte* was to explain the nature of the perfect beauty of Greek art and to trace its rise and fall. The work is therefore divided into two parts dealing, roughly speaking, with the intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of art. An investigation of general principles⁸⁷ occupies Part I, while the particular historical circumstances of Greek art are considered in Part II.⁸⁸

In the first chapter of Part I,⁸⁹ the origins of Greek art are discussed in the context of the universal beginnings of art. According to Winckelmann, art everywhere arose independently, its initial forms simple and indistinguishable and en-

couraged or stunted by the geographical circumstances that shaped each culture.⁹⁰ The next two chapters deal exceedingly concisely with the art of the Egyptians, the Phoenicians, the Persians, and the Etruscans and their neighbors, not so much for want of knowledge as because of Winckelmann's conviction that art among these peoples never reached the highest point of beauty and thus displays only a truncated cycle of developmental stages.⁹¹ The attainment of perfect beauty and a complete cycle of rise and decline is the triumph of Greek art. The bulk of the *Geschichte* is accordingly devoted to art among the Greeks. Art among the Romans is considered only briefly after each of the two major discussions of Greek art.

The first of these discussions occupies the balance of Part I and concerns the internal workings of Greek art: the reasons for its superiority to the art of all other peoples; its beauty, expression, and proportion, which Winckelmann calls the "necessary" aspects; its technique; and the progress of its development. This last section is the backbone of the *Geschichte* in which Winckelmann explains the four stages, or styles, of Greek art.⁹²

Only in Part II does Winckelmann turn to external circumstances. In his attempt to show the development of Greek art in its historical setting, he provides the closest approximation to what would be recognized today as a history of art.⁹³ The *Geschichte* as history is hampered, however, by a fundamental contradiction. Despite his insistence that art is influenced by its circumstances, a position that should lead him to judge each production on its own terms, Winckelmann's purpose is to confirm Greek art as the sole expression of perfect beauty and hence as a universal and to some degree autonomous artistic norm. This aim has caused him to adopt a structure which, by repetition and fragmentation, quite severely undercuts historical coherence. Repetition and fragmentation accordingly characterize his treatment of Polyclitus.

In the course of explaining why Greek art is superior to all other art, Winckelmann states that the major media developed at different rates. "The Jupiter of Phidias and the Juno of Polyclitus, the most perfect statues which antiquity knew, already existed before light and shadow appeared in Greek paintings."⁹⁴ This passage reflects something of Cicero's aesthetic judgment in the *Brutus* and the *Orator*, wedded to Pliny's chronologies of artists and their achievements.⁹⁵

With respect to the steps leading to the conception of ideal beauty, Winckelmann states that

Phidias' Jupiter, Polyclitus' Juno, and the statues of Venus by Alcamenes and Praxiteles stood as models for later artists and were taken up and revered by all Greeks.⁹⁶

In an interesting passage on the consistent rules of proportion observed by all Greek artists, Winckelmann says that despite the differences in composition which the ancients remarked in the works of Myron, Polyclitus, and Lysippus, "nonetheless the ancient works seem to have been worked by a single school." This insistence on a single system directly contradicts Pliny's discussion of Lysippus' development of a new canon of proportions.⁹⁷

In the discussion of the four styles of Greek art, Winckelmann assigns Polyclitus to the Grand, which, although an "improvement" on the Older Style, failed to attain perfect beauty. In the age of the highest illumination and freedom in Greece, says Winckelmann, "through this improvement in art Phidias, Polyclitus, Scopas, Alcamenes, and Myron made themselves celebrated" as masters of the Grand Style.⁹⁸ The concern of masters like Polyclitus for proportion and the precise measure of each part would have caused them to sacrifice a certain degree of beautiful form for the sake of accuracy, and Winckelmann suspects that their works showed a certain hardness, such as that criticized in the work of Callon, Hegesias, Canachus, Calamis, and Myron. He places Canachus later than Phidias, as a pupil of Polyclitus.⁹⁹ These remarks combine information from Pliny, Pausanias, and the familiar passages in Cicero's *Brutus* and the twelfth book of Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* that compare the degrees of hardness visible in the works of the sculptors named.¹⁰⁰

Winckelmann considers the next style, the Beautiful, to be the best. Its main characteristic is χάρις, grace, and it is the style that prevailed not long before and during the time of Alexander the Great and his successors.¹⁰¹ This is also the age of the painter Apelles, who, according to Pliny and Quintilian, was praised for his grace by everyone, including himself.¹⁰² "As for drawing generally," says Winckelmann, "all angularity was avoided, which hitherto remained in the statues of the great artists, such as Polyclitus." Pliny, again, is the source of this comment, as he is for Winckelmann's crediting Lysippus with advancing sculpture by imitating Nature more than his predecessors and giving his figures wavelike forms where they had once been angular.¹⁰³

Despite this artistic advance, says Winckelmann, the forms of the Grand Style were not ut-

terly displaced, as is shown by the fact that Lucian's composite portrait of Panthea was able to unite without incongruity the Grand and the Beautiful Styles.¹⁰⁴ Editors have taken Winckelmann to task for misunderstanding Lucian by interpreting the phrase "hands of Polyclitus" to mean "the most beautiful hands"; Winckelmann, it must be admitted, is not always accurate in his understanding of the ancient texts.¹⁰⁵

The grace that characterizes the Beautiful Style was more sought after and better achieved, says Winckelmann, by the artists who came after Phidias, Polyclitus, and their contemporaries than by these masters of the previous style.¹⁰⁶ This is the extent of Polyclitus' illumination of the internal processes of Greek art.

Part II of the *Geschichte* deals with the fate of art among the Greeks in relation to the external circumstances that most influenced it. While Winckelmann repeats his insistence that he has no intention of giving mere lives of artists and listing their works,¹⁰⁷ a large part of this section is in fact taken up by bald references to artists and lists of works, interspersed with blocks of pure military and political history. The common thread that Winckelmann invites the reader to follow is the theme of liberty: "and from this entire history it is evident, that it was liberty, through which art was lifted."¹⁰⁸ The circumstances of Winckelmann's life gave special meaning to this preoccupation of the Enlightenment, and his concern with liberty had important consequences for the construction of the *Geschichte*.¹⁰⁹ Polyclitus also figures in this section in a chronological list as the pupil of Ageladas, who flourished in the 66th Olympiad.¹¹⁰

Winckelmann discusses the emergence of regional schools of art, a subject of special interest in connection with the literary tradition. Pliny is the basis for his comments on the painter Eupompus, whose influence was so great that he forced a division of the Helladic school of painting into three new schools, the Ionic, the Sicynian, and the Attic. Of that of Sicyon Winckelmann says that "Pamphilus and Polyclitus, Lysippus and Apelles . . . gave the school its ultimate brilliance."¹¹¹

Winckelmann returns to earlier times in order to discuss the rise of Athens, and Ageladas, as the teacher of Polyclitus, makes another brief appearance before Winckelmann describes the rapid progress of the arts during the Pentecontaetia.¹¹² Just as Sophocles leaped ahead of Aeschylus in tragedy, so too in art would pupil have outstripped master, and the Jupiter of Ageladas would have been as different from the Juno of

Polyclitus as Aeschylus' *Prometheus* from Sophocles' *Oedipus*.¹¹³

The outbreak of the Peloponnesian War did nothing to check the progress of the arts. In the first Olympiad of the war, says Winckelmann, several great artists flourished in addition to Phidias: Polyclitus, Myron, Scopas, Pythagoras, and Alcamenes. A short list of their works follows. "The largest and most famous work of Polyclitus was the colossal ivory and gold Juno at Argos, and the most noble in art were two statues of young male figures: one came to be called Doryphorus, probably from the spear which it held, and it was for all subsequent artists a Rule in proportion, and Lysippus trained himself according to it; the other is known under the name Diadoumenus, he who ties a band about himself." Winckelmann observes that a statue with Polyclitus' name is said to have been at Florence at the beginning of the sixteenth century, and that the sons of Polyclitus did not come close to their father in art.¹¹⁴

Polyclitus makes his last appearance in the *Geschichte* in a quotation from the great classical scholar of the sixteenth century, Pietro Vettori, who gave credence to stories of Hadrian's having himself turned his hand to art, saying that the emperor could stand beside Polyclitus and Euphranor. Winckelmann thinks this comment a shameless flattery.¹¹⁵

The overall peculiarity of Winckelmann's treatment of Polyclitus as judged by modern standards of art history must, I think, simply be accepted. It is impossible to engage him in scholarly dialogue, pointless to take him to task for his lapses, futile to try to make his concerns our own. For the purpose of historiography, however, the very remoteness of his discussion shows its more important points to advantage.

Winckelmann's treatment of Polyclitus is remarkably arid. He gives no real sense of the artist or his work, no real explanation of his position in the development of Greek art. Why this is so is clear from the nature of his references to works by the artist. Winckelmann must naturally depend on the literary sources for knowledge of the oeuvre of Polyclitus. These are lost works of which he, and at times even his sources, had no direct experience; this limitation, however, is not the controlling factor in his treatment. For even when he deals with a work such as the great chryselephantine Hera at Argos that Pausanias (2.17.4) describes in some detail, Winckelmann does no more than offer a bare statement of its prestige. He makes no attempt to engage the work

as an object, but treats it only as a token. That Winckelmann's lack of focus on monuments reflects a deliberate approach is further demonstrated by his remarks on the Hercules and Antaeus in the introduction to the *Geschichte*, which show him to be aware of extant statuary that was attributed to Polyclitus. The curiously remote character of Winckelmann's treatment cannot be completely explained by his intentional playing down of individual artists in favor of the universal development of Greek ideal beauty.¹¹⁶ The reasons lie instead in his methodology and ultimately in his sources.

WINCKELMANN'S *GESCHICHTE* AND THE ANCIENT LITERARY TRADITION FOR POLYCLITUS

Generally speaking, in the ancient literary tradition Polyclitus does not emerge as the most colorful of the great masters. Few anecdotes attach to his name: Aelian provides one of the few, a rather chilly version of the ever-popular topos of the expert who squelches the crowd.¹¹⁷ There are the references to his Canon.¹¹⁸ Plutarch twice quotes him on the difficulty of work when the clay is on the nail, but repetition makes the dictum no less gnomic.¹¹⁹ Often, however, Polyclitus' name is simply attached to such-and-such a work, and often it appears, either alone or in company with those of Phidias or other masters, in contexts where it seems that any major name will suffice. A good example of such a reference is in Lucian's *Iuppiter tragoedus*, when Hermes ponders the protocol for an assembly of the gods, drolly conceived as a gathering of their images. "If one of them is gold and heavy," asks Hermes, "but mediocre in workmanship and proportions, should he sit in front of the bronzes of Myron and Polyclitus and the marbles of Phidias and Alcamenes, or should *technē* [craft] take precedence?"¹²⁰ This passage is cited, but not printed, by J. Overbeck,¹²¹ although it vividly illustrates a not uncommon tendency for writers to lump the most famous artists together; it suggests too the level of what might today be fashionably called cultural literacy within which the most specialized writings on art had also to function.

It is, however, specialized literature that provides Winckelmann with most of his information about Polyclitus. His three major sources are Pliny, Cicero, and Quintilian. In accordance with the scholarly consensus evolved since the nineteenth century and mercifully summarized and improved by E. Sellers and J. J. Pollitt,¹²² these sources may be explained in terms of their preserving two kinds of traditions. The first, which has been associated with Xenocrates, a sculptor

of the third century B.C. connected with Sicyon, seems to be represented in Pliny.¹²³ Pliny's chronological list of sculptors in Book 34 assigns Polyclitus to the 90th Olympiad, along with Phradmon, Myron, Pythagoras, Scopas, and Perellus.¹²⁴ Pliny then summarizes the works and achievements of "the most celebrated" artists. The achievements follow a technical progression, so that Polyclitus the Sicyonian "is judged to have perfected this science and to have refined *toρευτική*, just as Phidias is judged to have revealed it."¹²⁵ This section of capsule evaluations follows the same odd chronological order of artists as the preceding list, continuing to Lysippus and his pupils before the text changes direction. Because the comments focus on formal problems and because the progression culminates with the achievements of Lysippus of Sicyon, it is generally thought that the source is ultimately the treatise by Xenocrates. Pliny mentions that Xenocrates wrote books on his art and was a pupil either of Tisicrates, the pupil of Euthycrates, or of Euthycrates himself, who was a son and pupil of Lysippus.¹²⁶ The ascription to Xenocrates would thus account for both the emphasis on formal questions and the bias in favor of the Sicyonian school. Pliny also preserves a similar evolutionary scheme for painting, which culminates with the achievements of Apelles.¹²⁷

The comments of Cicero and Quintilian in which Polyclitus figures are thought to reflect a different tradition, one based in rhetorical criticism, perhaps mixed in Quintilian with some technical criticism of the kind just mentioned.¹²⁸ The major passages in question have already been quoted: Cicero's *Brutus* 70–71 and Book 12, 10.7–9 of Quintilian, which compare sculptors on the basis of the degree of hardness displayed in their statues and seem to favor masters of the fifth century B.C.¹²⁹ Canachus comes first in Cicero's scale of hardness, with the statues of Calamis, Myron, and Polyclitus becoming progressively softer in form. Cicero finds the statues of Polyclitus "in my estimation quite perfect," but Quintilian, whose list differs slightly, notes that critics find his works lacking in grandeur: he is able to give perfect grace to human figures but fails to represent the *auctoritas* of the gods. It is Phidias, says Quintilian, who is thought to be better at representing gods than men.

The context in both cases is a discussion of the particular "virtues" (*virtutes* in Latin, ἀρεταί in Greek) of particular styles of oratory in which comparisons—short in Cicero, longer in Quintilian—are drawn with the styles of painters and sculptors. The general basis of the artistic evalua-

tions in the rhetorical tradition of assigning specific virtues to styles is clear. Other features of the discussions can also be paralleled in rhetorical contexts. For example, Felix Preisshofen called attention to the similarity of Quintilian's remarks on Polyclitus and Phidias to Dionysius' comparison of them with Isocrates, and D. A. Russell to a comment in Longinus on Homer, who is held to have made men into gods and vice versa.¹³⁰

It has also been thought since the late nineteenth century that these rhetorically based judgments show the influence of canons, specifically of canons of orators developed in the second century B.C. at Pergamon or Alexandria or both cities, and a comparative canon of orators and artists.¹³¹ Various texts have been adduced in support of this idea: for example, Dionysius' proposal to compare the rhetoric of Isocrates to the art of Polyclitus and Phidias for grandeur and dignity and that of Lysias to the art of Calamis and Callimachus for subtlety and grace.¹³²

The distinction between "Xenocratic" and "rhetorical" lines of critical tradition is certainly helpful in categorizing the differences between the texts, but the situation would seem to be more complex. Two points may be mentioned: the question of canons; and the independence of the tradition of technical art criticism.

The existence of canons of orators and artists of the kind that have been suggested to stand behind Cicero, Dionysius, and Quintilian has long been doubted. With regard to the testimonia involving Polyclitus, the thorough skepticism of A. E. Douglas, who finds no evidence that such a canon of orators existed before the second century after Christ, is more convincing than the attempts (which R. G. Austin has justly characterized as Procrustean) to squeeze eleven painters into ten slots, to rationalize the inclusion or omission of specific names (where is Phidias in Cicero's version of the scale of hardness?), and to reconcile grossly contradictory information.¹³³ Historians of literature recognize the term "canon" in this connection as an eighteenth-century invention and make a good case for seeing the kind of authoritative structure it represents as a reflection of nineteenth-century authoritarian scholarship. Historians of art should be willing to reconsider the texts in light of their inconsistencies, contradictions, and lapses of sense. It is likely that the rhetoricians' remarks on artists and art owe more to the rhetorical context itself, to the demands of specific arguments that needed to succeed within a framework of knowledge held by the intended audience, than to the kind of specialized and coherent systems demanded by the scholarship of

identifying precise lost sources on the slenderest indications.¹³⁴ When Calamis can stand as a representative on the one hand of comparative hardness of style and on the other of grace and subtlety, it is time to think again.

Part of the weakness of Winckelmann's treatment of Polyclitus results from a major inconsistency of this kind. For in relying on the opinions of the ancient authorities, he is forced to recognize Polyclitus' achievement as the highest, but at the same time assign him to a style that is only preliminary to the subsequent attainments of Lysippus. Because Winckelmann takes all the literary sources as furnishing accurate facts about the history of Greek art, he does not consider the possibility that their contradictory information may result from their belonging to incompatible traditions of discourse, let alone that they represent systems of criticism and theory that develop separately from the monuments: he strives instead to reconcile the differences. The question that arises is the nature of the contradictions. At first glance it would appear that Winckelmann has simply been caught between the "rhetorical" bias toward the fifth century and the "Xenocratic" bias toward Sicyonian artists. A different explanation, however, is suggested by a consideration of the full extent of Winckelmann's dilemma. One of the major themes of the *Geschichte* (and indeed of his life's work) is the link between artistic achievement and political liberty. He believes that the Greek tradition of liberty is the cause of the greatness of Greek art; specific examples such as the healthy state of the arts in Periclean Athens fit the theory and confirm the connection of art with freedom.¹³⁵ But what is he to do when the independence of the Greek city-states falls victim to Alexander? Art ought to decline, and yet its greatest representatives inconsiderately flourish during the consolidation of the Macedonian empire. Winckelmann's solution is of extreme interest.

What Winckelmann does is to shift the grounds that define the decline of liberty and, consequently, the chronology of decline. He attributes the decline to the disorder of the war-filled period following the death of Alexander. While he had asserted that the Peloponnesian War caused no disruption in the arts, he now maintains that it was the struggles for Alexander's disintegrating empire that caused "the loss of freedom from which art had as it were received its life" and which "was necessarily followed by its decline and fall."¹³⁶ In adopting this explanation and in placing the decline of art after the death of Alexander, Winckelmann is, as shown above, simply following good ancient authority: Dionysius of

Halicarnassus, who provides for the history of rhetoric both the chronology of decline and the link between decline and imitation.

Winckelmann's attempt to salvage his ideal of art flourishing in liberty thus reflects his dependence on the rhetorical authors with whom he had long been familiar. These same sources suggest a far deeper connection between rhetoric and the criticism and history of art than is immediately obvious. Sellers long ago noted the similarity between Pliny's accounts of artists' achievements and Dionysius' categories of *heuretai* and *teleiotai*.¹³⁷ Preissshofen, in an extremely important article, drew attention to the similar schemes of decline and revival in Dionysius' discussion of rhetoric and Pliny's assertion of the death and rebirth of *ars* in Book 34, and to a parallel statement in Quintilian's Book 10 that history declined and was restored to credit by Timagenes — a chronology, as noted by G. Bowersock, that places that revival at the beginning of the principate.¹³⁸ The similarities in structure are clear, but should they be taken only as indications of structures common to several critical traditions?

There is some evidence to suggest that the influence of rhetorical schemes of development penetrates far into what appear to be independent traditions for the development of art. The subject has already been touched on of the "Xenocratic" tradition of technical progress as identified in Pliny, with its emphasis on formal problems and its bias toward Sicyonian artists. The formal and technical emphasis may be a sound criterion; that these comments in Pliny show a Sicyonian bias, however, is open to question.

While there exists a variety of testimony for the eminence of Sicyonian art, certain features of Pliny's treatment suggest that the idea of city schools may not be as sound for Greek art as it is for the Italian Renaissance. The special prominence of Sicyon is explained by Pliny in Book 35. The influence of Eupompus was "so powerful that he made a fresh division of painting; it had previously been divided into two schools, called the Helladic and the Asiatic, but because of Eupompus, who was a Sicyonian, the Helladic school was divided into three, the Ionic, the Sicyonian, and the Attic."¹³⁹ This explanation in Book 12 is extremely close to Quintilian's description of the rise of the three kinds of oratory. The division between the Attic and the Asiatic, he says, is of great antiquity. Later a third style, the Rhodian, arose when Aeschines moved from Athens to Rhodes.¹⁴⁰ The subdivision of regional styles through the influence of a single important figure

may simply be a common structural element; the opposition of an Attic or Helladic "school" to an Asiatic, however, makes sense only in the context of the rhetorical debate over Atticism that flared in Cicero's time and was periodically revived.¹⁴¹

The passages in Pliny dealing with Lysippus fail to display a focus on Sicyon. In the chronological list in Book 34, Pliny says simply that Lysippus was in the 113th Olympiad, as was Alexander the Great.¹⁴² In the discussion of the achievements of Lysippus and his sons, what is emphasized over and over is the sculptor's connection with Alexander.¹⁴³ The bias that accounts for the elevation of Lysippus seems to be his association not with Sicyon, but with Alexander. The same is true in the case of Apelles, the other great artist in Alexander's circle, who occupies a comparable position in Pliny's account of painting.¹⁴⁴ Quintilian, in his capsule history of painting, says outright that "*pictura* flourished from about the period of Philip down to the successors of Alexander."¹⁴⁵ It is Alexander himself, then, who guarantees the greatness of the art of his time, and it is Alexander's death that signals the decline of rhetoric and art. This is the reason Pliny's chronology of sculptors breaks at the 121st Olympiad, the date of Euthykrates, the son of Lysippus. *Cessavit deinde ars.*

The explanations that are generally offered for Pliny's curious declaration of the decline of *ars* have tended to focus on possibilities within an isolated realm of art: Hellenistic style was not liked, for example, or technical treatises were no longer written.¹⁴⁶ The true explanation may be simpler: Alexander died, rhetoric died, and art died. For Dionysius, rhetoric revived in his own, Augustan age, and Quintilian places the restoration of history near the start of the principate. Pliny puts the revival of *ars* in the 156th Olympiad, 156–153 B.C., between Pydna and the sack of Corinth, just at the time when Rome was starting to become familiar with Greek art on a large scale and had begun the long process of assimilating it.¹⁴⁷ For some Romans the taking up of Greek art marked the start of a decadence, a decadence loudly bemoaned. But for more Romans the fascination of the Greek was irresistible, and what may survive are traces of a rhetoric in defense of their view. Dionysius writes as a pro-Roman Greek in the age of Augustus, the time when Greek art was first put to systematic, programmatic use. It is understandable that Dionysius would praise Rome as the savior of Greece through the restoration of order. Rome is seen as the second non-Greek empire to preside over the flourishing not only of rhetoric, but also of his-

tory and philosophy. Good works of all kinds, says Dionysius, are being produced under the benevolent supervision of well-educated and discerning Romans.¹⁴⁸ Dionysius has revived the Atticist controversy of Cicero's day to portray the Romans essentially as the new Athenians. He evidently sees nothing odd in making their empire at the same time into the new empire of Alexander—an implication evidently avoided in the formulation of Augustan iconography itself.¹⁴⁹

Thus Winckelmann's Polyclitan dilemma may help, in a roundabout way, to explain an old crux in the history of ancient art. Certainly his literal reliance on the written sources puts into clearer perspective the kinds of difficulties they present and at the same time clarifies the historiographic situation. It is important to recognize the role played by the ancient literary sources in the formation of the accepted history of Greek art. Winckelmann himself acknowledged his literary bias: in the introduction to the *Anmerkungen über die Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums* of 1767, he says that his chief delight in explaining works of art is when through them he is able to explain or emend an ancient author.¹⁵⁰ There is no reason to disbelieve him. To recognize the basis of Winckelmann's methodology is not to denigrate his achievements. The authority and cachet of the ancient sources remain strong even for hardened skeptics of the late twentieth century. Winckelmann had no reason not to accept the authority of the sources; on the contrary, he had every reason to use them, for they provide concrete information in a coherent historical structure. It simply happens that their coherence rests not so much on the truth of any historical situation as on the interlocking of several systems of critical tradition. Much remains to untangle in the various threads of tradition: even the question of the degree to which the sources created a history of art rather than preserving one is far from closed. We may no longer share many of Winckelmann's concerns, but we do well to remember that had he not written as he did, we would probably not think it worthwhile even to pose such questions.

NOTES

The following essay was presented in abbreviated form at the Madison symposium. By kind permission of the Editor, I am able to give the relevant texts both in translation and in the original languages and to quote *in extenso* from the first edition of Winckelmann's *Geschichte* which, unlike the many revised and augmented versions in which the work is most widely available, reveals the structure and method of his approach. Much of the research for this essay was accomplished in 1987–88, while I held a J. Paul Getty Fellowship. For valuable discussions, suggestions,

and references, I am indebted to E. Angelicoussis, A. B. Brownlee, D. Cast, G. Ferrari, T. C. Loening, G. Merker, C. Paul, and C. M. Soussloff.

H. Beck, P. C. Bol, and M. Bückling eds., *Polyklet: Der Bildhauer der griechischen Klassik* (Mainz am Rhein 1990) appeared after this essay was completed.

Greek texts are taken from the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. For permission to retain the various Latinized and inconsistent spellings of Greek names used by Winckelmann and other sources, I thank the Editor.

1. K. Friederichs, *Der Doryphoros des Polyklet* (Berlin 1863).

2. W. Senff ed., *Johann Joachim Winckelmann: Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums* (Weimar 1964) 11: "Herkules und Antäus im Palaste Pitti zu Florenz, eine Statue von niedrigem Range und über die Hälfte neu ergänzt, ist beim Maffei und bei ihm [Montfaucon] nichts weniger als eine Arbeit des Polycleus." For the group in the courtyard of the Palazzo Pitti: P. P. Bober and R. Rubinstein, *Renaissance Artists and Antique Sculpture: A Handbook of Sources* (London 1986) 172–74, no. 137.

3. W. A. P. Childs, "The Classic as Realism in Greek Art," *ArtJ* 47 (Spring 1988) 10–14.

4. This summary depends on the following accounts, to which the reader is referred for details and documentation: C. Justi, *Winckelmann und seine Zeitgenossen*, 3d ed. (Leipzig 1923); W. Rehm ed., *Johann Joachim Winckelmann: Briefe I* (Berlin 1952) [hereafter cited as *Briefe*]; *Quarterly Review* 136 (1874) 1–55 (anonymous review of the first edition of Justi, supra); *The History of Ancient Art, Translated from the German of John Winckelmann*, 2 vols., trans. G. H. Lodge (London 1881) 11–104 [hereafter cited as *Lodge*]; W. Leppmann, *Winckelmann* (London 1971). Lodge's translation incorporates reworkings and additions from later versions of the *Geschichte*; the extent and order of his text thus differ from those of the first edition, but the renderings of individual passages, while dated, are serviceable. Leppmann's work, a lively biography, is to be used with caution.

5. A. Tibal, *Inventaire des manuscrits de Winckelmann déposés à la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris 1911) [hereafter cited as *Tibal*]. References to this work give Tibal's page numbers, followed by the volume and folio numbers of the Winckelmann manuscripts and the date of the excerpt in question. See also W. Schadewaldt, "Winckelmann als Exzerptor und Selbstdarsteller," in *Neue Beiträge zur klassischen Altertumswissenschaft (Festschrift B. Schweitzer)* (Stuttgart and Cologne 1954) 391–409.

6. For the fragment, to be dated probably to the end of 1752, "Beschreibung der vorzüglichsten Gemälde der Dressdner Gallerie," see W. Rehm ed., *Johann Joachim Winckelmann: Kleine Schriften, Vorreden, Entwürfe* (Berlin 1968) 1–12, 303–17 [hereafter cited as *Rehm*]. Compare, e.g., Winckelmann's comments on Guido Reni's *Ninus Giving Semiramis His Crown* (then interpreted as Ahasuerus and Esther): "Ahasverus hat ein Jesusmässiges Gesicht: die übrige Carnaggione auch in dem Gesicht der Esther fällt zu sehr ins bläuliche | livide | wie sich dieses in den mehresten Werken von seiner letzten Art findet" (Rehm 4), with Roger de Piles, *Abrégé de la vie des peintres* (Paris 1699) 322, on Guido: "il négligea ses Carnations, ou peut-être, les voulant faire plus délicates, il donna dans un gris, qui alla souvent jusqu'au livide." For Winckelmann's excerpts from de Piles's *Abrégé*: *Tibal* (supra n. 5) 105; LXI, 61v (extracts from *de Gedanken*); G. Baumecker, *Winckelmann in seinen Dresdner Schriften* (Berlin 1933) 14–15, 22–28; Rehm 338, ad 38, 25.

7. Rehm (supra n. 6) 27–59; see 60–89, 97–144 for Winckelmann's own *Sendschreiben über die Gedanken von der Nachahmung* . . . (anonymously published), and subsequent *Erläuterung der Gedanken . . . und Beantwor-*

tung des Sendschreibens über diese Gedanken. These essays are conveniently collected in the translations of Henry Fusseli, *Reflections on the Painting and Sculpture of the Greeks* (London 1765; repr. Menston 1972). The second, 1756 edition of the *Gedancken* is available in bilingual format: E. Heyer and R. C. Norton trans., *Reflections on the Imitation of Greek Works in Painting and Sculpture* (La Salle 1987). For this aspect of the polemic intent of the *Gedancken* and its companion tracts, see Baumecker (supra n. 6) 105–106, 114–26; see 140–47 for the presence in the Dresden essays of the major themes of the *Geschichte*.

8. Senff (supra n. 2). The first, Dresden edition of the *Geschichte* appeared in December 1763, although it is regularly cited with the date of 1764: Justi (supra n. 4) III 83, 116–17; C. Habicht, “Zur Situation der klassischen Studien in Deutschland um 1763,” in *Der Aquädukt 1763–1988: Ein Almanach aus dem Verlag C. H. Beck im 225. Jahr seines Bestehens* (Munich n.d.) 287. I am grateful to Professor Habicht for a copy of this article.

9. See, e.g., D. Gerhard, “Periodization in European History,” *AHR* 61 (1955–56) 900–913; G. Boas, “Historical Periods,” *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 11 (1952–53) 248–54; J. Huizinga, “The Task of Cultural History,” in *Men and Ideas*, trans. J. S. Holmes and H. van Marle (1959; repr. Princeton 1984) 67–76; G. Kubler, *The Shape of Time* (New Haven and London 1960) 96–106, esp. 105 n. 10.

10. A recent interdisciplinary example is of interest: L. Gent, *Times Literary Supplement* 4460 (Sept. 23–29, 1988) 1056 (review of M. Roston, *Renaissance Perspectives in Literature and the Visual Arts* [Princeton 1987]). Roston “debates whether Chaucer should be seen as belonging to the Middle Ages or to the early Renaissance,” settling the question by citing affinities to the themes of artists such as Gentile da Fabriano, and finds in Shakespeare’s style something like “a transitional phase between High Renaissance and Mannerism.”

11. For the observation that style “provides a structure for the history of art”: J. S. Ackerman, “Style,” in J. S. Ackerman and R. Carpenter, *Art and Archaeology* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1963) 165. For the difficulty of dating Hellenistic sculpture by style: J. J. Pollitt, *Art in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge 1986) app. 1, “The Chronology of Hellenistic Sculpture,” 265–71; few of the twenty “fixed points” given there are listed without being qualified in some more or less important way.

12. See, e.g., Childs (supra n. 3) 10; A. Potts, “Winckelmann’s Construction of History,” *Art History* 5 (1982) 377–78, 379; F. M. Turner, *The Greek Heritage in Victorian Britain* (New Haven and London 1981) 43, for Winckelmann’s influence on nineteenth-century British critics. See Senff (supra n. 2) 476 n. 136, for some continuing difficulties in defining phases in Greek art.

13. Senff (supra n. 2) 180: “Die Kunst unter den Griechen hat wie ihre Dichtkunst, nach Scaligers Angaben, vier Hauptzeiten, und wir könnten deren fünf setzen. Denn so wie eine jede Handlung und Begebenheit fünf Teile und gleichsam Stufen hat, den Anfang, den Fortgang, den Stand, die Abnahme und das Ende, worin der Grund liegt von den fünf Auftritten oder Handlungen in theatralischen Stücken, ebenso verhält es sich mit der Zeitfolge derselben: da aber das Ende derselben ausser die Grenzen der Kunst geht, so sind hier eigentlich nur vier Zeiten derselben zu betrachten. Der ältere Stil hat bis auf den Phidias gedauert; durch ihn und durch die Künstler seiner Zeit erreichte die Kunst ihre Grösse, und man kann diesen Stil den grossen und hohen nennen; von dem Praxiteles an bis auf den Lysippus und Apelles erlangte die Kunst mehr Grazie und Gefälligkeit, und dieser Stil würde der schöne zu benennen sein. Einige Zeit nach diesen Künstlern und ihrer Schule fing die Kunst an zu sinken in den Nachahmern derselben,

und wir könnten einen dritten Stil der Nachahmer setzen, bis sie sich endlich nach und nach gegen ihren Fall neigte.” Lodge (supra n. 4) II 116–17. Winckelmann relies on J. J. Scaliger, *Epistolae* (Frankfurt 1628) 486 f., letter to Salmasius of 1607 (*non vidi*): R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from 1300 to 1850* (Oxford 1976) 119; Tibal (supra n. 5) 128: LXIX, 33–34v for extracts from Scaliger. For the five stages in drama, see, e.g., Aristotle, *Poet.* 12.1–3 1452b. The quoted passage shows one way in which Winckelmann cites and reconciles conflicting sources. For Winckelmann’s system of periods: Justi (supra n. 4) III 153–75.

14. Senff (supra n. 2) 186: “Wir können überhaupt die Kennzeichen und Eigenschaften dieses ältern Stils kürzlich also begreifen: die Zeichnung war nachdrücklich, aber hart; mächtig, aber ohne Grazie, und der starke Ausdruck verminderte die Schönheit. Dieses aber ist stufenweise zu verstehen, da wir unter dem ältern Stile den längsten Zeitlauf der griechischen Kunst begreifen; so dass die spätern Werke von den ersteren sehr verschieden gewesen sein werden.” Lodge (supra n. 4) II 124.

15. Senff (supra n. 2) 188–89: “Endlich, da die Zeiten der völligen Erleuchtung und Freiheit in Griechenland erschienen, wurde auch die Kunst freier und erhabner. Der ältere Stil war auf ein Systema gebaut, welches aus Regeln bestand, die von der Natur genommen waren und sich nachher von derselben entfernt hatten und idealisch geworden waren. Man arbeitete mehr nach der Vorschrift dieser Regeln als nach der Natur, die nachzuahmen war: denn die Kunst hatte sich eine eigene Natur gebildet. Über dieses angenommene Systema erhoben sich die Verbesserer der Kunst und näherten sich der Wahrheit der Natur. Diese lehrte aus der Härte und von hervorspringenden und jäh abgeschnittenen Teilen der Figur in feilsige Umrisse zu gehen, die gewaltsamen Stellungen und Handlungen gesitteter und weiser zu machen und sich weniger gelehrt als schön, erhaben und gross zu zeigen. Durch diese Verbesserung der Kunst haben sich Phidias, Polyclethus, Skopas, Alkamenes und Myron berühmt gemacht: der Stil derselben kann der grosse genannt werden, weil ausser der Schönheit die vornehmste Absicht dieser Künstler scheint die Grossheit gewesen zu sein. Hier ist in der Zeichnung das Harte von dem Scharfen wohl zu unterscheiden, damit man nicht z. B. die scharf gezogene Andeutung der Augenbrauen, die man beständig in Bildungen der höchsten Schönheit sieht, für eine unnatürliche Härte nehme, welche aus dem ältern Stile geblieben sei: denn diese scharfe Bezeichnung hat ihren Grund in den Begriffen der Schönheit, wie oben bemerkt worden.

“Es ist aber wahrscheinlich und aus einigen Anzeigen der Skribenten zu schliessen, dass der Zeichnung dieses hohen Stils das Gerade einigermaßen noch eigen geblieben, und dass die Umriss dadurch in Winkel gegangen, welches durch das Wort viereckig oder eckig scheint angedeutet zu werden. Denn da diese Meister wie Polyclethus Gesetzgeber in der Proportion waren und also das Mass eines jeden Teils auf dessen Punkt werden gesetzt haben, so ist nicht ungläublich, dass dieser grossen Richtigkeit ein gewisser Grad schöner Form aufgeopfert worden. Es bildet sich also in ihren Figuren die Grossheit, welche aber in Vergleichung gegen die wellenförmigen Umrisse der Nachfolger dieser grossen Meister eine gewisse Härte kann gezeigt haben. Dieses scheint die Härte zu sein, welche man am Kalon und am Hegias, am Kanachus und am Kalamis, ja selbst am Myron auszusetzen fand; unter welchen gleichwohl Kanachus jünger war als Phidias: denn er war des Polyclethus Schüler und blühte in der fünfundneunzigsten Olympias.” Lodge (supra n. 4) II 130–31.

16. J. J. Pollitt, *The Ancient View of Greek Art: Criticism, History, and Terminology* (New Haven and London 1974) 263–69.

17. Pliny, *N.H.* 34.56 (see infra n. 125); Pollitt (supra n. 16) 265, no. 8.

18. Pliny, *N.H.* 34.65: *non habet Latinum nomen symmetria, quam diligentissime custodit* [sc. Lysippus] *nova intactaque ratione quadratas veterum staturas permutando*. Pollitt (supra n. 16) 265–66, no. 9.

19. Cicero, *Brut.* 70–71: *Quis enim eorum qui haec minora animadvertunt non intellegit Canachi signa rigidiora esse quam ut imitentur veritatem; Calamidis dura illa quidem, sed tamen molliora quam Canachi; nondum Myronis satis ad veritatem adducta, iam tamen quae non dubites pulchra dicere; pulchriora etiam Polycliti et iam plane perfecta, ut mihi quidem videri solent? Similis in pictura ratio est; in qua Zeuximi et Polygnotum et Timanthem et eorum, qui non sunt usi plus quam quattuor coloribus, formas et liniamenta laudamus; at in Aetione Nicomacho Protogene Apelle iam perfecta sunt omnia. Et nescio an reliquis in rebus omnibus idem eveniat; nihil est enim simul et inventum et perfectum*. Trans. M. Winterbottom, in D. A. Russell and M. Winterbottom eds., *Ancient Literary Criticism* (Oxford 1972) 225–26.

20. Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* 12.10.7–9: *Similis in statuariis differentia. Nam duriora et Tuscanicis proxima Callon atque Hegesias, iam minus rigida Calamis, molliora adhuc supra dictis Myron fecit. Diligentia ac decor in Polyclito supra ceteros, cui quanquam a plerisque tribuitur palma, tamen, ne nihil detrahatur, deesse pondus putant. Nam ut humanae formae decorem addiderit supra verum, ita non explevisse deorum auctoritatem videtur. Quin aetatem quoque graviolem dicitur refugisse nihil ausus ultra leves genas. At quae Polyclito defuerunt, Phidiae atque Alcameni dantur. Phidias tamen diis quam hominibus effingendis melior artifex creditur in ebore vero longe citra aemulum*. Trans. M. Winterbottom, in Russell and Winterbottom (supra n. 19) 405.

21. E. H. Gombrich, "Vasari's *Lives* and Cicero's *Brutus*," *JWarb* 23 (1960) 309–11; E. H. Gombrich, "The Debate on Primitivism in Ancient Rhetoric," *JWarb* 29 (1966) 24–38. See infra, p. 338.

22. Senff (supra n. 2) 189: "Es wäre zu beweisen, dass die alten Skribenten sehr oft wie die neuern von der Kunst geurteilt, und die Sicherheit der Zeichnung, die richtig und strenge angegebene Figuren des Raffaels haben vielen gegen die Weichheit der Umriss und gegen die rundlich und sanft gehaltenen Formen des Correggio hart und steif geschienen; welcher Meinung überhaupt Malvasia, ein Geschichtsschreiber der holländischen Maler ohne Geschmack, ist. Ebenso wie unerleuchteten Sinnen der homerische Numerus und die alte Majestät des Lucretius und Catullus in Vergleichung mit dem Glanze des Virgilius und mit der süßen Lieblichkeit des Ovidius vernachlässigt und rauh klingt. Wenn hingegen des Lucianus Urteil in der Kunst gültig ist, so war die Statue der Amazone Sosandra, von der Hand des Kalamis, unter die vier vorzüglichsten Figuren weiblicher Schönheit zu setzen: denn zu Beschreibung seiner Schönheit nimmt er nicht allein den ganzen Anzug, sondern auch die züchtige Miene und ein behendes und verborgenes Lächeln von genannter Statue. Unter dessen kann der Stil von einer Zeit in der Kunst so wenig, als in der Art zu schreiben, allgemein sein. Wenn von den damaligen Skribenten nur allein Thukydides übrig wäre, so würden wir von dessen bis zur Dunkelheit getriebenen Kürze in den Reden seiner Geschichte einen irrigen Schluss auf den Platon, Lysias und Xenophon machen, dessen Worte wie ein sanfter Bach fortfließen." Lodge (supra n. 4) II 131–32.

23. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Thuc.* 51: *πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἐπὶ τὸν ἀρχαῖον βίον ἀναφέροντας τὴν Θουκυδίδου διάλεκτον ὡς δὴ τοῖς τότε ἀνθρώποις οὐσαν συνήθη, βραχὺς ἀπόχρη μοι λόγος καὶ σαφής, ὅτι πολλῶν γενομένων Ἀθήνησι κατὰ τὸν Πελοποννησιακὸν πόλεμον ῥητόρων τε*

καὶ φιλοσόφων οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν κέχρηται ταύτῃ τῇ διαλέκτῳ, οὐθ' οἱ περὶ Ἀνδοκίδην καὶ Ἀντιφῶντα καὶ Λυσίαν ῥήτορες οὐθ' οἱ περὶ Κριτίαν καὶ Ἀντισθένη καὶ Ξενοφῶντα Σωκρατικοί. ἐκ δὴ τούτων ἀπάντων δῆλός ἐστιν ἀνὴρ πρῶτος ἐπιτετηδευκὼς ταύτην τὴν ἔρμηνειαν, ἵνα δι-αλλάξῃ τοὺς ἄλλους συγγραφεῖς. Trans. S. Usher, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus: The Critical Essays* 1 (Loeb Classical Library 1974).

24. Senff (supra n. 2) 191: "Zu einer deutlicheren Bestimmung der Kenntnisse und der Eigenschaften dieses hohen Stils der grossen Verbesserer der Kunst ist nach dem Verluste ihrer Werke nicht zu gelangen. Von dem Stile ihrer Nachfolger aber, welchen ich den schönen Stil nenne, kann man mit mehrerer Zuverlässigkeit reden: denn einige von den schönsten Figuren des Altertums sind ohne Zweifel in der Zeit, in welcher dieser Stil blühte, gemacht, und viele andere, von denen dieses nicht zu beweisen ist, sind wenigstens Nachahmungen von jenen. Der schöne Stil der Kunst hebt sich an von Praxiteles und erlangte seinen höchsten Glanz durch den Lysippus und Apelles, wovon unten die Zeugnisse angeführt werden; es ist also der Stil nicht lange vor und zur Zeit Alexanders des Grossen und seiner Nachfolger.

"Die vornehmste Eigenschaft, durch welche sich dieser von dem hohen Stile unterscheidet, ist die Grazie, und in Absicht derselben werden die zuletzt genannten Künstler sich gegen ihre Vorgänger verhalten haben, wie unter den Neuern Guido sich gegen den Raffael verhalten würde. Dieses wird sich deutlicher in Betrachtung der Zeichnung dieses Stils und des besondern Teils derselben, der Grazie, zeigen." Lodge (supra n. 4) II 132–33.

25. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Isoc.* 3: *δοκεῖ δὴ μοι μὴ ἀπὸ σκοποῦ τις ἀν εἰκάσαι τὴν μὲν Ἰσοκράτους ῥητορικὴν τῇ Πολυκλείτου τε καὶ Φειδίου τέχνῃ κατὰ τὸ σεμνὸν καὶ μεγαλότεχρον καὶ ἀξιωματικόν, τὴν δὲ Λυσίου τῇ Καλάμιδος καὶ Καλλιμάχου τῆς λεπτότητος ἕνεκα καὶ τῆς χάριτος. ὡς περ γὰρ ἐκείνων οἱ μὲν ἐν τοῖς ἐλάττωσι καὶ ἀνθρωπικοῖς ἔργοις εἰσὶν ἐπιτυχέστεροι τῶν ἑτέρων, οἱ δ' ἐν τοῖς μείζοσι καὶ θειοτέροις δεξιώτεροι, οὕτως καὶ τῶν ῥητόρων ὁ μὲν ἐν τοῖς μικροῖς ἐστὶ σοφώτερος, ὁ δ' ἐν τοῖς μεγάλοις περιτότερος, τάχα μὲν γὰρ καὶ τῇ φύσει μεγαλόφρων τις ὢν, εἰ δὲ μή, τῇ γε προαιρέσει πάντως τὸ σεμνὸν καὶ θαυμαστὸν διώκων. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν περὶ τῆς λέξεως τοῦ ῥήτορος. Trans. Usher (supra n. 23). Childs (supra n. 3) 10, cites this passage as an example of how Winckelmann's assessment of the Greek aesthetic of beauty "was drawn of course from his wide reading of ancient writers on art and has fairly close parallels in them."*

26. G. P. Bellori, *Le vite de' pittori, scultori e architetti moderni*, ed. E. Borea (Turin 1976) 17 [hereafter cited as *Vite*]: "Rafaele da Urbino il gran maestro di coloro che sanno, così scrive al Castiglione della sua Galatea: 'Per dipingere una bella mi bisognerebbe vedere più belle, ma per essere carestia di belle donne, io mi servo di una certa idea che mi viene in mente.' Guido Reni, che nella venusta ad ogni altro artefice del nostro secolo prevalse. . . ." Trans. K. Donahue in E. G. Holt, *Literary Sources of Art History* (Princeton 1947) 322 and n. 6. Winckelmann excerpted a 1728 edition of the *Vite* of 1672: Tibal (supra n. 5) 108–9: LXII, 52v (1754). For Winckelmann and Bellori: D. Mahon, *Studies in Seicento Art and Theory* (Studies of the Warburg Institute 16, London 1947) 152. See also infra n. 33.

27. For this text, see infra n. 33.

28. Senff (supra n. 2) 197–98: "Da nun die Verhältnisse und die Formen der Schönheit von den Künstlern des Altertums auf das höchste ausstudiert und die Umriss der Figuren so bestimmt waren, dass man ohne Fehler weder herausgehen noch hineinlenken konnte, so war der Begriff der Schönheit nicht höher zu treiben. Es musste also die Kunst, in welcher, wie in allen Wirkungen der Natur, kein

fester Punkt zu denken ist, da sie nicht weiter hinausging, zurückgehen. Die Vorstellungen der Götter und Helden waren in allen möglichen Arten und Stellungen gebildet, und es wurde schwer, neue zu erdenken, wodurch also der Nachahmung der Weg geöffnet wurde. Diese schränkt den Geist ein, und wenn es nicht möglich schien, einen Praxiteles und Apelles zu übertreffen, so wurde es schwer, dieselben zu erreichen, und der Nachahmer ist alle Zeit unter dem Nachgeahmten geblieben. Es wird auch der Kunst wie der Weltweisheit ergangen sein, dass, so wie hier, also auch unter den Künstlern Eclectici oder Sammler aufstanden, die, aus Mangel eigener Kräfte, das einzelne Schöne aus Vielen in Eins zu vereinigen suchten. Aber so wie die Eclectici nur als Kopisten von Weltweisen besonderer Schulen anzusehen sind und wenig oder nichts Ursprüngliches hervorgebracht haben, so war auch in der Kunst, wenn man eben den Weg nahm, nichts Ganzes, Eigenes und Übereinstimmendes zu erwarten; und wie durch Auszüge aus grossen Schriften der Alten diese verloren gingen, so werden durch die Werke der Sammler in der Kunst die grossen ursprünglichen Werke vernachlässigt worden sein. Die Nachahmung beförderte den Mangel eigener Wissenschaft, wodurch die Zeichnung furschtam wurde, und was der Wissenschaft abging, suchte man durch Fleiss zu ersetzen, welcher sich nach und nach in Kleinigkeiten zeigte, die in den blühenden Zeiten der Kunst übergangen und dem grossen Stile nachteilig geachtet worden sind. Hier gilt, was Quintilianus sagt, dass viele Künstler besser als Phidias die Zieraten an seinem Jupiter würden gearbeitet haben. Es wurden daher durch die Bemühung, alle vermeinte Härte zu vermeiden und alles weich und sanft zu machen, die Teile, welche von den vorigen Künstlern mächtig angedeutet waren, runder, aber stumpf, lieblicher, aber unbedeutender. Auf eben diesem Wege ist zu allen Zeiten auch das Verderbnis in der Schreibart eingeschlichen, und die Musik verliess das Männliche und verfiehl wie die Kunst in das Weibische; in dem Gekünstelten verliert sich oft das Gute eben dadurch, weil man immer das Bessere will." Lodge (supra n. 4) II 143–44.

29. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Dim.* 7: τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ περὶ Δημοσθένους ὑπολαμβάνομεν. εἰάν μὲν καὶ ἡ τῆς λέξεως μεγαλοπρέπεια καὶ ἡ τῆς συνθέσεως ἐξαλλαγή καὶ τὸ τῶν παθῶν ἔμψυχον καὶ τὸ διὰ πάσης κεραίας διήκον πικρὸν καὶ νοερὸν τὸ τε πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ δεινότης πᾶσι παρέπεται, μὴθὲν ἔτι τὸ κωλῶν ἔστω (ἐν τοῖς) Δημοσθένους αὐτοὺς ἀναγράφειν. εἰάν δ' ἐλλείπῃ τὸ ἐν ἐκάστῳ τούτων ἄκρον ἢ τὸ διὰ πάσης ἰδέας ὅμοιον μενέτωσαν ἐν τοῖς Λειναρχείοις. ὡς δὲ καθόλου εἰπεῖν, δύο τρόπους τῆς διαφορᾶς ὡς πρὸς τὰ ἀρχαῖα μιμήσεως εὔροι τις ἂν· ἂν ὁ μὲν φυσικὸς τέ ἐστι καὶ ἐκ πολλῆς κατηχήσεως καὶ συντροφίας λαμβανόμενος, ὁ δὲ τούτῳ προσεχῆς ἐκ τῶν τῆς τέχνης παραγεμάτων. περὶ μὲν οὖν τοῦ προτέρου τί ἂν τις καὶ λέγοι; περὶ δὲ τοῦ δευτέρου τί ἂν ἔχοι τις εἰπεῖν (ἢ) ὅτι πᾶσι μὲν τοῖς ἀρχετύποις αὐτοφύης τις ἐπιπέπει χάρις καὶ ὦρα, τοῖς δ' ἀπὸ τούτων κατεσκευασμένοις, κἂν ἐπ' ἄκρον μιμήσεως ἔλθωσι, πρόσεστί τι ὅμως τὸ ἐπιτετηδευμένον καὶ οὐκ ἐκ φύσεως ὑπάρχον. καὶ τούτῳ τῷ παραγγέλματι οὐ ῥήτορες μόνον ῥήτορας διακρίνουσιν ἀλλὰ καὶ ζωγράφοι τὰ Ἀπελλοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνων μιμησαμένων καὶ πλάσται τὰ Πολυκλείτου καὶ γλυφεῖς τὰ Φειδίου. Trans. Usher (supra n. 23) II (1985).

30. Mahon (supra n. 26) 212–14. H. Rüdiger, "Winckelmanns Geschichtsauffassung: Ein Dresdner Entwurf als Keimzelle seines historischen Denkens," *Euphorion* 62 (1968) 109, has drawn attention to an early example of Winckelmann's disdain for imitators, who are dismissed as second-rate minds, while inventors win admiration: "Subalterne Geister sind für ihn [W.] vor allem die *Kopisten* und *Sammler* unter den Gelehrten und Künstlern, während *Erfinder* und *Originale* allgemeine Bewunderung verdienen."

31. Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* 2.3.5–6: *Ego porro eum qui*

nolit in numero praecipientium non habeo, posse autem maxime, si velit, optimum quemque contendo; primum, quod eum, qui eloquentia ceteris praestet, illa quoque, per quae ad eloquentiam pervenitur, diligentissime percepisse credibile est; deinde, quia plurimum in praecipiendo valet ratio, quae doctissimo cuique plenissima est; postremo, quia nemo sic in maioribus eminent, ut eum minora deficient. Nisi forte Iovem quidem Phidias optime fecit, illa autem, quae in ornamentum operis eius accedunt, alius melius elaborasset, aut orator loqui nesciet aut leviores morbos curare non poterit praestantissimus medicus. "For my part I regard the teacher who is unwilling to attend to such details as being unworthy of the name of teacher: and as for the question of capacity, I maintain that it is the most capable man who, given the will, is able to do this with most efficiency. For in the first place it is a reasonable inference that a man blest with abnormal powers of eloquence will have made careful note of the various steps by which eloquence is attained, and in the second place the reasoning faculty, which is specially developed in learned men, is all-important in teaching, while finally no one is eminent in the greater things of his art if he be lacking in the lesser. Unless indeed we are asked to believe that while Phidias modelled his Jupiter to perfection, the decorative details of the statue would have been better executed by another artist, or that an orator does not know how to speak, or a distinguished physician is incapable of treating minor ailments." Trans. H. E. Butler, *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian* I (Loeb Classical Library 1921).

Winckelmann's misunderstanding may reflect some familiarity with the practice of his own time by which anonymous virtuoso specialists commonly executed spectacular details in sculptural projects; one such carver gained prominence in Rome at the end of the eighteenth century: see N. Penny, *Times Literary Supplement* 4537 (March 16–22, 1990) 278 (review of J. Montagu, *Roman Baroque Sculpture*).

32. Senff (supra n. 2) 206–7: "Um das Obige dieses dritten Stückes zu wiederholen und zusammenzufassen, so wird man in der Kunst der Griechen, sonderlich in der Bildhauerei, vier Stufen des Stils setzen, nämlich den geraden und harten, den grossen und eckigen, den schönen und fliessenden und den Stil der Nachahmer. Der erste wird mehrtheils gedauert haben bis auf den Phidias, der zweite bis auf den Praxiteles, Lysippus und Apelles, der dritte wird mit dieser ihrer Schule abgenommen haben, und der vierte wahrte bis zu dem Falle der Kunst. Es hat sich dieselbe in ihrem höchsten Flore nicht lange erhalten: denn es werden von den Zeiten des Perikles bis auf Alexanders Tode, mit welchem sich die Herrlichkeit der Kunst anfang zu neigen, etwa hundertundzwanzig Jahre sein. Das Schicksal der Kunst überhaupt in neuern Zeiten ist, in Absicht der Perioden, dem im Altertume gleich: es sind ebenfalls vier Hauptveränderungen in derselben vorgegangen, nur mit diesem Unterschiede, dass die Kunst nicht nach und nach wie bei den Griechen von ihrer Höhe heruntersank, sondern sobald sie den ihr damals möglichen Grad der Höhe in zwei grossen Männern erreicht hatte (ich rede hier allein von der Zeichnung), so fiel sie mit einem Male plötzlich wieder herunter. Der Stil war trocken und steif bis auf Michelangelo und Raffael; auf diesen beiden Männern besteht die Höhe der Kunst in ihrer Wiederherstellung: nach einem Zwischenraume, in welchem der üble Geschmack regierte, kam der Stil der Nachahmer; dieses waren die Caracci und ihre Schule mit deren Folge; und diese Periode geht bis auf Carl Maratta. Ist aber die Rede von der Bildhauerei insbesondere, so ist die Geschichte derselben sehr kurz. Sie blühte in Michelangelo und Sansovino und endigte mit ihnen; Algardi, Fiammingo und Rusconi kamen über hundert Jahre nachher." Lodge (supra n. 4) II 153–54.

33. G. P. Bellori, "Vita di Annibale Carracci, pittore bolognese," in *Vite* (supra n. 26) 31: "Allora la pittura venne in grandissima ammirazione de gli uomini e parve discesa dal cielo quando il divino Rafaele, con gli ultimi lineamenti dell'arte, accrebbe al sommo la sua bellezza, riprendola nell'antica maestà di tutte quelle grazie e di que' pregi arricchita, che già un tempo la resero gloriosissima appresso de' Greci e de' Romani. Ma perché le cose giù in terra non serbano mai uno stato medesimo, e quelle che sono giunte al sommo è forza di nuovo tornino a cadere con perpetua vicissitudine, l'arte, che da Cimabue e da Giotto, nel corso ben longo di anni ducento cinquanta erasi a poco a poco avanzata, tosto fu veduta declinare, e di regina divenne umile e vulgare. Siché, mancato quel felice secolo, dileguossi in breve ogni sua forma; e gli artefici, abbandonando lo studio della natura, viziarono l'arte con la maniera, o vogliamo dire fantastica idea, appoggiata alla pratica e non all'imitazione. Questo vizio distruttore della pittura cominciò da prima a germogliare in maestri di onorato grido, e si radicò nelle scuole che seguirono poi; onde non è credibile a raccontare quanto degenerassero non solo da Rafaele, ma da gli altri che alla maniera diedero cominciamento." Trans. C. Enggass, *The Lives of Annibale and Agostino Carracci by Giovanni Pietro Bellori* (University Park, Pa., and London 1968) 5.

34. Senff (supra n. 2) 281-82: "Nach Alexanders des Grossen Tode erhoben sich Empörungen und blutige Kriege in den eroberten Reichen desselben und auch in Mazedonien selbst, unter dessen nächsten Nachfolgern, die um die hundertundvierundzwanzigste Olympias alle schon mit Tod abgegangen waren, und die Kriege dauerten fort auch unter den Nachfolgern und Söhnen von diesen. Griechenland litt in kurzer Zeit durch feindlich Kriegs-heere, mit welchen es so oft überschwemmt wurde, durch die fast jährliche Veränderung der Regierung und durch die grossen Schatzungen, womit die Nation erschöpft wurde, mehr als in allen vorigen einheimischen Kriegen." Lodge (supra n. 4) II 240.

35. Senff (supra n. 2) 283: "Die Kunst, welche von der Freiheit gleichsam das Leben erhalten, musste also notwendig durch den Verlust derselben an dem Orte, wo dieselbe vornehmlich geblüht, sinken und fallen." Lodge (supra n. 4) II 241.

36. Senff (supra n. 2) 284: "Der Fall des Flors der Kunst ist zu verstehen von Künstlern, welche sich von neuem hervorgetan: denn diejenigen, welche, als Lysippus, Apelles und Protogenes, besagte Zeit überlebt, werden nach ihrem Flore gerechnet. Die grosse Veränderung nach Alexanders Tode äussert sich auch in der Sprache und Schreibart der Griechen: denn ihre Schriften sind von dieser Zeit an grösstenteils in dem sogenannten gemeinen Dialekt abgefasst, welcher zu keiner Zeit oder an irgendeinem Orte die Mundart des Volkes war; es war eine Sprache der Gelehrten, so wie es die lateinische jetzt ist." Lodge (supra n. 4) II 242-43.

37. The same basic scheme of rise and fall applied to Egyptian and Etruscan art, but in abbreviated form, since only Greek art achieved perfection: see *infra*, pp. 338-39.

38. A. Furtwängler, *Masterpieces of Greek Sculpture: A Series of Essays on the History of Art*, ed. E. Sellers (London 1895) vii.

39. Potts (supra n. 12) 380-86, esp. 384-85.

40. F. Haskell and N. Penny, *Taste and the Antique: The Lure of Classical Sculpture 1500-1900* (New Haven and London 1981, 1982) 102.

41. Historians concerned primarily with literature accept without difficulty Winckelmann's reliance on written sources: see, e.g., Turner (supra n. 12) 43: "Following in detail the scheme of art history set forth by Quintilian and

Cicero, Winckelmann portrayed four periods in the development of Greek sculpture."

42. Potts (supra n. 12) 382.

43. *Ibid.*

44. G. Vasari, *Le vite de 'più eccellenti pittori, scultori e architettori*, ed. R. Bettarini (Florence 1966-) IV 4-5, preface to the third part (1568): "Queste cose non l'aveva fatte Giotto né que' primi artefici, se bene egli no avevano scoperto i principii di tutte queste difficoltà, e toccatele in superficie, come nel disegno, più vero che non era prima e più simile alla natura, e così l'unione de' colori et i componimenti delle figure nelle storie, e molte altre cose de quali abastanza s'è ragionato. Ma se bene i secondi agomentarono grandemente a queste arti tutte le cose dette di sopra, elle non erano però tanto perfette che elle finissimo di aggiugnere all'intero della perfezzione, mancandoci ancora nella regola una licenza, che, non essendo di regola, fosse ordinata nella regola e potesse stare senza fare confusione o guastare l'ordine; il quale aveva bisogno d'una invenzione di tutte le cose e d'una certa bellezza continuata in ogni minima cosa, che mostrasse tutto quell'ordine con più ornamento. Nelle misure mancava uno retto giudizio, che senza che le figure fussino misurate, avessero in quelle grandezze ch'elle eran fatte una grazia che eccedesse la misura. Nel disegno non v'erano gli estremi del fine suo, perché, se bene e' facevano un braccio tondo et una gamba diritta, non era ricerca con muscoli con quella facilità graziosa e dolce che apparisce fra 'l vedi e non vedi, come fanno la carne e le cose vive; ma elle erano crude e scorticate, che faceva difficoltà agli occhi e durezza nella maniera, alla quale mancava una leggiadria di fare svelte e graziose tutte le figure, e massimamente le femmine et i putti con le membra naturali come agli uomini, ma ricoperte di quelle grassesse e carnosità che non siano goffe come li naturali, ma arteficate dal disegno e dal giudizio." Trans. G. du C. de Vere, in E. G. Holt ed., *A Documentary History of Art II* (Garden City, N.Y., 1958) 26-27. Winckelmann excerpted an edition of the *Vite* published in Bologna in 1681: Tibal (supra n. 5) 106, 109: LXII, 8; pp. 107, 109: LXII, 15v (1754).

45. For χάρις, see Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Lys.* 10-11; *Isoc.* 3 (see supra n. 25); *Is.* 3-4. The charm he attributes to Lysias becomes a criterion for comparing the styles of the other orators.

46. Potts (supra n. 12) 382.

47. Vasari (supra n. 44) II. 1, 31-32, preface to the first part: "Sino a qui mi è parso discorrere dal principio della scultura e della pittura, e per avventura più largamente che in questo luogo non bisognava; il che ho io però fatto non tanto trasportato dall'affezione della arte, quanto mosso dal beneficio et utile comune degli artefici nostri; i quali, avendo veduto in che modo ella da piccol principio si conducesse a la somma altezza e come da grado si nobile precipitasse in ruina estrema e, per conseguente, la natura di questa arte, simile a quella dell'altre che, come i corpi umani, hanno il nascere, il crescere, lo invecchiare et il morire, potranno ora più facilmente conoscere il progresso della sua rinascita e di quella stessa perfezzione dove ella è risalita ne' tempi nostri. Et a cagione ancora che se mai (il che non acconsenta Dio) accadesse per alcun tempo, per la trascuraggine degli uomini o per la malignità de' secoli o pure per ordine de' cieli, i quali non pare che vogliano le cose di quaggiù mantenersi molto in uno essere, ella incorresse di nuovo nel medesimo disordine di rovina, possino queste fatiche mie qualunque elle si siano, se elle però saranno degne di più benigna fortuna, per le cose discorse innanzi e per quelle che hanno da dirsi mantenerla in vita o almeno dare animo ai più elevati ingegni di provelerle migliori aiuti: tanto che, con la buona volontà mia e con le opere di questi tali, ella abbondi di quelli aiuti et ornamenti

de' quali, siami lecito liberamente dire il vero, ha mancato sino a quest'ora." Trans. from W. Gaunt ed., *Giorgio Vasari: The Lives of the Painters, Sculptors and Architects* (New York n.d.) 118–19. For Vasari's cycle and his use of a biological model, see H. Belting, *The End of the History of Art?*, trans. C. S. Wood (Chicago and London 1987) 72–73. See also H. Weisinger, "Renaissance Theories of the Revival of the Fine Arts," *Italica* 20 (1943) 163–70; E. Panofsky, "The First Page of Giorgio Vasari's 'Libro': A Study on the Gothic Style in the Judgment of the Italian Renaissance" (1930), repr. in *Meaning in the Visual Arts* (Chicago 1955, 1982) 169–235; G. W. Trompf, *The Idea of Historical Recurrence in Western Thought from Antiquity to the Reformation* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London 1979), to list only three contributions to a large and varied bibliography.

48. Potts (supra n. 12) 383. See supra n. 33.

49. For Winckelmann's extracts from Bellori and Vasari, see supra nn. 26, 44.

50. Potts (supra n. 12) 385, 388, and passim; 388: "The descriptions are important from the point of view of Winckelmann's historical studies, not only because they were the starting point for his whole enterprise, the first serious attempt at a definition of the Greek ideal he then tried to reconstruct historically; they also elucidate the particular habits of visual analysis which were brought into play when he was fitting together this historical picture. As they refer to statues which have now rather fallen into disfavour among professional archaeologists, it is all too easy to read them simply as literary effusions that are to be appreciated without reference to the visual qualities of the Greco-Roman works they describe." For Winckelmann's descriptions in the *Gedanken* and related essays, see Baumecker (supra n. 6) 126–39, with analysis of his dependence on and departures from such descriptions by other authors.

51. Rehm (supra n. 6) 43; see 342–43 for Winckelmann's reliance on a plaster cast of the group. Baumecker (supra n. 6) 132–39, offers a comparison of Winckelmann's description with that of Richardson, which he had excerpted (Tibal [supra n. 5] 105: LXI, 33 [extracts for the *Gedanken*]); Baumecker (supra n. 6) 138, notes the contradiction between Winckelmann's view of the group and the later consensus on its baroque qualities, as does Potts (supra n. 12) 398.

52. See Justi (supra n. 4) 1 296, for the difficulties that arose in examining the ancient material in Dresden; Winckelmann's description of statues packed together like sardines comes from an essay of 1763, the "Abhandlung von der Fähigkeit der Empfindung des Schönen in der Kunst, und dem Unterrichte in derselben," Rehm (supra n. 6) 224: "weil die besten Statuen in einem Schuppen von Bretern, wie die Heringe gepacket, standen, und zu sehen, aber nicht zu betrachten waren."

53. Senff (supra n. 2) 277: "Sein Gesicht ist klagend, aber nicht schreiend."

54. Justi (supra n. 4) III 94–103; see 103 for Caylus' understanding of archaic and archaistic styles. For Winckelmann's correspondence with and debt to Caylus: M. L. Baeumer, "Simplicity and Grandeur: Winckelmann, French Classicism, and Jefferson," *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 7 (1978) 68–69.

55. E.g., Senff (supra n. 2) 10–14.

56. For the early stages of the *Geschichte*: Justi (supra n. 4) III 106–14; H. A. Stoll, *Winckelmann: Seine Verleger und seine Drucker* (Winckelmann-Gesellschaft Stendal, Jahrgabe 1960, Berlin 1960) 48–67.

57. *Briefe* 1 (supra n. 4) 242–43, no. 157; Winckelmann's orthography is preserved.

58. *Bibliothek* II (1757) 225–27 (*non vidi*): H. C. Hat-

field, *Winckelmann and His German Critics 1755–1781: A Prelude to the Classical Age* (Morningside Heights 1943) 31. Hatfield (19), citing Baumecker, notes that Winckelmann's method of autopsy is more "original" than his doctrine.

59. The confusion in the negotiations has been translated into conflicting chronologies in the accounts of the period: cf. Justi (supra n. 4) III 106–14; *Quarterly Review* 136 (supra n. 4) 44; Lodge (supra n. 4) 1 68–69; Leppmann (supra n. 4) 293–94.

60. *Description des pierres gravées du feu Baron de Stosch* (Florence 1760; facsimile repr., *Studien zur deutschen Kunstgeschichte* 348, Baden-Baden and Strasbourg 1970). The preface contains brief statements of many themes that appear in the *Geschichte*: e.g., the limited perfection of Etruscan art, the sublimity of Greek art, and the role of climate in preventing the Egyptians from achieving beauty in their art (x–xi).

61. Potts (supra n. 12) 384–85.

62. *Ibid.*, 385–86.

63. *Ibid.*, 386.

64. Rehm (supra n. 6) 29: "Der einzige Weg für uns, gross, ja, wenn es möglich ist, unnachahmlich zu werden, ist die Nachahmung der Alten." Baeumer (supra n. 54) 65–66, dismissing the assertion of Hatfield (supra n. 58) 7, that the notion is Winckelmann's "most original and daring thesis." For the dictum as one of the major theses of the essay: Baumecker (supra n. 6) 41–43. For Winckelmann's excerpts from the *Caractères*: Tibal (supra n. 5) 133: LXX, 1–20 (Seehausen).

65. Rehm (supra n. 6) 43: "Das allgemeine vorzügliche Kennzeichen der Griechischen Meisterstücke ist endlich eine edle Einfalt, und eine stille Grösse, so wohl in der Stellung als im Ausdruck. So wie die Tiefe des Meers allezeit ruhig bleibt, die Oberfläche mag noch so wüten, eben so zeigt der Ausdruck in den Figuren der Griechen bey allen Leidenschaften eine grosse und gesetzte Seele." Trans. Heyer and Norton (supra n. 7) 33. For discussion and references: Baeumer (supra n. 54) 66; Baumecker (supra n. 6) 57–68. For Winckelmann's excerpts from the *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de Christine, reine de Suède*, of 1751: Tibal (supra n. 5) 143, 144: LXXII, 148 (1752–55).

66. M. L. Baeumer, "Winckelmanns Formulierung der klassischen Schönheit," *Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht, deutsche Sprache und Literatur* 65.1 (1973) 61–75; Baeumer (supra n. 54) 66–69. Cf. Rehm (supra n. 6) 342–43. For Boileau: K. Maurer, "Boileaus Übersetzung der Schrift Περὶ ὕψους als Text des französischen 17. Jahrhunderts," in *Le classicisme à Rome aux Iers siècles avant et après J.-C.* (*EntrHardt* 25, Geneva 1979) 213–62.

67. A. A. Donohue, *Xoana and the Origins of Greek Sculpture* (American Classical Studies 15, Atlanta 1988) 177–91.

68. Convenient translation in Holt (supra n. 26) 84.

69. Holt (supra n. 26) 106.

70. Vasari, *Vite* (supra n. 44) II. I, 14, preface to the first part; Gaunt (supra n. 47) 6–12.

71. Holt (supra n. 26) 109.

72. *Supra*, p. 330.

73. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Orat. Vett.*, preface, 1–3: Ἰ. Πολλὴν χάριν ἦν εἰδέναι τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνῳ δίκαιον, ὃ κράτιστε Ἀμμαίε, καὶ ἄλλων μὲν τινων ἐπιτηδευμάτων ἕνεκα νῦν κάλλιον ἀσκουμένων ἢ πρότερον, οὐχ ἦκιστα δὲ τῆς περὶ τοὺς πολιτικούς λόγους ἐπιμελείας οὐ μικρὰν ἐπίδοσιν πεποιτημένης ἐπὶ τὰ κρείττω. ἐν γὰρ δὴ τοῖς πρὸ ἡμῶν χρόνοις ἢ μὲν ἀρχαία καὶ φιλόσοφος ῥητορικὴ προπληκτικὴ καὶ δεινὰς ὕβρεις ὑπομένουσα κατελύετο, ἀρξαμένη μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Μακεδόνα τελευτῆς ἐκπνεῖν καὶ μαραινεσθαι κατ' ὀλίγον, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς ἡλικίας μικροῦ δεήσασα εἰς τέλος ἠφανίσθαι· ἕτέρα δὲ τίς

ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκείνης παρελθούσα τάξιν, ἀφόρητος ἀναιδεῖα θεατρικὴ καὶ ἀνάγωγος καὶ οὔτε φιλοσοφίας οὔτε ἄλλου παιδεύματος οὐδενὸς μετεληφύια ἐλευθερίου, λαθούσα καὶ παρακρουσαμένη τὴν τῶν ὄχλων ἄνοιαν, οὐ μόνον ἐν εὐπορίᾳ καὶ τροφῇ καὶ μορφῇ πλείονι τῆς ἐτέρας διήγεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς τιμὰς καὶ τὰς προστάσις τῶν πόλεων, ὅς ἔδει τὴν φιλόσοφον ἔχειν, εἰς ἑαυτὴν ἀνηρτήσατο καὶ ἦν φορτικὴ τις πάνυ καὶ ὄχληρὰ καὶ τελευτώσα παραπλησίαν ἐποίησε γενέσθαι τὴν Ἑλλάδα ταῖς τῶν ἀσώτων καὶ κακοδαιμόνων οἰκίαις, ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν ἐκείναις ἡ μὲν ἐλευθέρᾳ καὶ σώφρονι γαμετῇ κάθηται μηδενὸς οὔσα τῶν αὐτῆς κυρία, ἑταῖρα δὲ τις ἄφρων ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ τοῦ βίου παρούσα πάσης ἀξιοῖ τῆς οὐσίας ἄρχειν, σκυβαλίζουσα καὶ δεδιτομένη τὴν ἑτέραν· τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ἐν πάσῃ πόλει καὶ οὐδεμιᾶς ἦτον ἐν ταῖς εὐπαιδευτοῖς (τοῦτι γὰρ ἀπάντων τῶν κακῶν ἔσχατον) ἢ μὲν Ἀττικὴ μοῦσα καὶ ἀρχαία καὶ αὐτόχθων ἄτιμον εἰλήφει σχῆμα, τῶν ἑαυτῆς ἐκπεσούσα ἀγαθῶν, ἢ δὲ ἐκ τινων βαρᾶθρων τῆς Ἀσίας ἐχθὲς καὶ πρῶην ἀφικόμενη, Μυσὴ ἢ Φρυγία τις ἢ Καρικόν τι κακόν, Ἑλληνίδας ἡξίου διοικεῖν πόλεις ἀπελάσασα τῶν κοινῶν τὴν ἑτέραν, ἢ ἀμαθῆς τὴν φιλόσοφον καὶ ἡ μαινομένη τὴν σώφρονα. 2. ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐ μόνον ἀνδρῶν δικαίων χρόνος σωτῆρ ἄριστος· κατὰ Πίνδαρον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τεχνῶν νῆ Δία καὶ ἐπιτηδευμάτων γε καὶ παντὸς ἄλλου σπουδαίου χρήματος. ἔδειξε δὲ ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνος, εἴτε θεῶν τινος ἀρξάντος εἴτε φυσικῆς περιόδου τὴν ἀρχαίαν τάξιν ἀνακυκλοῦσης εἴτε ἀνθρωπίνης ὁρμῆς ἐπὶ τὰ ὅμοια πολλοὺς ἀγούσης, καὶ ἀπέδωκε τῇ μὲν ἀρχαίᾳ καὶ σώφρονι ῥητορικῇ τὴν δικαίαν τιμὴν, ἦν καὶ πρότερον εἶχε καλῶς, ἀπολαβεῖν, τῇ δὲ νέᾳ καὶ ἀνοήτῳ παύσασθαι δόξαν οὐ προσήκουσαν καρπούμεν καὶ ἐν ἀλλοτρίοις ἀγαθοῖς τρυφῶσιν, καὶ οὐ καθ' ἑν ἴσως τοῦτο μόνον ἐπαινεῖν τὸν παρόντα χρόνον καὶ τοὺς συμφιλοσοφούντας ἀνθρώπους ἄξιον, ὅτι τὰ κρείττω τιμώτερα ποιεῖν τῶν χειρόνων ἤρξαντο (καίτοι μέρος γε τοῦ παντὸς ἡμῶν ἀρχὴ λέγεται τε καὶ ἔστιν), ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ ταχεῖαν τὴν μεταβολὴν καὶ μεγάλην τὴν ἐπίδοσιν αὐτῶν παρεσκευάσθη γενέσθαι. ἔξω γὰρ ὀλίγων τινῶν Ἀσιανῶν πόλεων, αἷς δι' ἀμοθίαν βραδείᾳ ἐστὶν ἡ τῶν καλῶν μάθησις, αἱ λοιπαὶ πέπαιναν τοὺς φορτικούς καὶ ψυχροὺς καὶ ἀναισθητοὺς ἀγαπῶσαι λόγους, τῶν μὲν πρότερον μέγα ἐπ' αὐτοῖς φρονούντων αἰδουμένων ἤδη καὶ κατὰ μικρὸν ἀπαντομολούντων πρὸς τοὺς ἐτέρους, εἰ μὴ τινες παντάπασιν ἀνιάτως ἔχουσι, τῶν δὲ νεωστὶ τοῦ μαθήματος ἀπτομένων εἰς καταφρόνησιν ἀγόντων τοὺς λόγους καὶ γέλωτα ποιουμένων τὴν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς σπουδὴν. 3. αἰτία δ' οἷμαι καὶ ἀρχὴ τῆς τοσαύτης μεταβολῆς ἐγένετο ἡ πάντων κρατούσα Ῥώμη πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἀναγκάζουσα τὰς ὅλας πόλεις ἀποβλέπειν καὶ ταυτῆς δὲ αὐτῆς οἱ δυναστεύοντες κατ' ἀρετὴν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ κρατίστου τὰ κοινὰ διοικούντες, εὐπαίδευτοι πάνυ καὶ γενναῖοι τὰς κρίσεις γενόμενοι, ὑφ' ὧν κοσμούμενον τό τε φρόνιμον τῆς πόλεως μέρος ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐπιδέδωκεν καὶ τὸ ἀνόητον ἠνάγκασται νοῦν ἔχειν. τοιγάρτοι πολλοὶ μὲν ἰστορίαι σπουδῆς ἄξια γράφονται τοῖς νῦν, πολλοὶ δὲ λόγοι πολιτικοὶ χαρίεντες ἐκφέρονται φιλόσοφοι τε συντάξεις οὐ μὰ Δία εὐκαταφρόνητοι ἄλλαι τε πολλοὶ καὶ καλοὶ πραγματεῖαι καὶ Ῥωμαίοις καὶ Ἑλλήσιν εὐ μάλα διεσπουδασμένοι προεληλύθασιν τε καὶ προελεύσονται κατὰ τὸ εἶκος, καὶ οὐκ ἂν θαυμάσαιμι τηλικαύτης μεταβολῆς ἐν τοῦτῳ τῷ βραχεῖ χρόνῳ γεγεννημένης, εἰ μηκέτι χωρήσει προσωτέρω μίας γενεᾶς ὁ ζῆλος ἐκείνος τῶν ἀνοήτων λόγων· τὸ γὰρ ἐκ παντὸς εἰς ἐλάχιστον συναχθὲν ῥᾶδιον ἐξ ὀλίγου μηδὲν εἶναι. Trans. D. A. Russell, in Russell and Winterbottom (supra n. 19) 305–307.

74. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Dim.* 1, 2, and 5: 1. Περὶ Δεινάρχου τοῦ ῥήτορος οὐδὲν εἰρηκῶς ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων γραφεῖσιν διὰ τὸ μήτε εὐρετὴν ἰδίου γεγονέναι χαρακτηριστῆρος τὸν ἀνδρα, ὥσπερ τὸν Λυσίαν καὶ τὸν Ἰσοκράτην καὶ τὸν Ἰσαῖον, μήτε τῶν εὐρημένων ἐτέροις τελευτωτῆν, ὥσπερ τὸν Δημοσθένην καὶ τὸν Αἰσχίνην καὶ (τὸν) Ὑπερείδην ἡμεῖς κρίνομεν. . . . 2. Δεινάρχος ὁ ῥήτωρ υἱὸς μὲν ἦν

Σωστράτου, Κορίνθιος δὲ τὸ γένος, ἀφικόμενος δὲ εἰς Ἀθήνας, καθ' ὃν χρόνον ἦνθουν αἱ τε τῶν φιλοσόφων καὶ ῥητόρων διατριβαί, Θεοφράστῳ τε συνεγένετο καὶ Δημητρίῳ τῷ Φαληρεῖ. εὐφύης δὲ περὶ τοὺς πολιτικούς λόγους γενόμενος ἀκμαζόντων ἐπὶ τῶν περὶ Δημοσθένην ἤρξατο λόγους γράφειν καὶ προῆει κατὰ μικρὸν εἰς δόξαν. μάλιστα δὲ ἤκμασε μετὰ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου τελευτῆν, Δημοσθένους μὲν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ῥητόρων φυγαῖς ἀιδίοις καὶ θανάτοις περιπεσόντων, οὐδενὸς δ' ὑπολειπομένου μετ' αὐτοὺς ἀνδρὸς ἀξίου λόγου. . . . 5. ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ χρόνος τάνδρὸς ὡς οἶόν τε ἀκριβέστατα εὐρηται, πρὸς ὃν καὶ τῶν λόγων τοὺς τε γνησίους καὶ μὴ διακρινόμενους, καιρὸς ἤδη καὶ περὶ τοῦ χαρακτήρος αὐτοῦ λέγειν. ἔστι δὲ δυσόριστον. οὐδὲν γὰρ οὔτε κοινὸν οὔτ' ἴδιον ἔσχεν οὔτ' ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις οὔτ' ἐν τοῖς δημοσίοις ἀγῶσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς Λυσίου παραπλησίως ἔστιν ὅπου γίνεται καὶ τοῖς Ὑπερείδου καὶ τοῖς Δημοσθένους λόγοις. Trans. Usher (supra n. 29).

75. Tibal (supra n. 5) 97–98: LIX, 252–73 (for the *Geschichte*, 1757); 102–103: LX, 286v–289v (Nöthnitz?); 112–13: LXIII, 66–115 (Seehausen?).

76. Supra, p. 331–32. For the inferiority of imitations, see also Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* 10.2.4–13.

77. E.g., Senff (supra n. 2) 316–20, on art under Hadrian, which Winckelmann sees as an invalid being kept alive. Potts (supra n. 12) 392–93, rightly notes the ambiguity in Winckelmann's treatment of the Hadrianic period, and (405 n. 39) offers a shrewd explanation for his subsequent, more positive assessment of it.

78. See, e.g., G. Williams, *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire* (Sather Classical Lectures 45, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London 1978) 6–51 and passim.

79. I am not competent to judge the merits of this argument, advanced by K. Heldmann, *Antike Theorien über Entwicklung und Verfall der Redekunst* (Munich 1982); see the comments by G. A. Kennedy in his review of Heldmann: *CJ* 79 (1983–84) 165–67.

80. Tibal (supra n. 5) 103: LX, 299 (Nöthnitz?).

81. Baeumer (supra nn. 54 and 66). For Winckelmann's excerpts from Longinus: Tibal (supra n. 5) 112–13: LXIII, 66–115 (Seehausen?); Boileau's translation is not specifically cited.

82. Supra, p. 331. Cf. Potts (supra n. 12) 393–400; he sees Winckelmann's distinction as derived essentially empirically.

83. For topoi on the nature of the past, see, e.g., W. K. C. Guthrie, *In the Beginning: Some Greek Views on the Origins of Life and the Early State of Man* (Ithaca, N. Y., 1957, 1965).

84. Supra, p. 330. See Tibal (supra n. 5) passim for the dates of the excerpts; 118: LXV, 72, 74, and 76v, for example, are extracts from Cicero's *Orator* and *Brutus* dated to the years in Seehausen or Nöthnitz. For Gombrich, see supra n. 21; M. Baxandall, *Giotto and the Orators* (Oxford 1971) 35–38 and passim.

85. Rehm (supra n. 6) 30: "Laocoon war den Künstlern im alten Rom eben das, was er uns ist; des Polyklets Regel; eine vollkommene Regel der Kunst." See *ibid.*, 41, for the other mention of Polykletus in the *Gedanken*, a quotation from Algarotti on the sculptor who made clay copies of the Herculaneum women, Lorenzo Mattioli, "dem Policlet das Maas, und Phidias das Eisen gab."

86. For summary and analysis of the contents of the *Geschichte*: Justi (supra n. 4) III 117–29; Leppmann (supra n. 4) 266–88.

87. "Untersuchung der Kunst nach dem Wesen derselben."

88. "Nach den äusseren Umständen der Zeit unter den Griechen betrachtet."

89. "Von dem Ursprung der Kunst und den Ursachen

ihrer Verschiedenheit unter den Völkern." Senff (supra n. 2) 21–41.

90. Ibid., 22, 32–41. For a similar notion in the *Gedancken* relating to the independence of Greek art, which is owed to Shaftesbury, see Baumecker (supra n. 6) 39–41; see 78–82 for the sources of Winckelmann's discussion of climate in the *Gedancken*, which include both ancient and modern writers.

91. Senff (supra n. 2) 42–113. Whereas Winckelmann finds four periods in the rise and fall of Greek art, "Der ganze Umfang der ägyptischen Kunst hat zwei Perioden" (ibid., 70). Etruscan art displays three periods, the third characterized by its imitation of Greek models (ibid., 98; this passage gives Egyptian art, too, such a third period).

92. Ibid., 114–234: "Von der Kunst unter den Griechen"; 123–79: "Von dem Wesentlichen der Kunst"; 180–206: "Von dem Wachstume und dem Falle der griechischen Kunst, in welcher vier Zeiten und vier Stile können gesetzt werden."

93. For Winckelmann's innovation in establishing such a separate historical section, see Justi (supra n. 4) III 125.

94. Senff (supra n. 2) 122: "Der Jupiter des Phidias und die Juno des Polycletus, die vollkommensten Statuen, welche das Altertum gekannt hat, waren schon, ehe Licht und Schatten in griechischen Gemälden erschien."

95. Cicero, *Brut.* 70; *Orat.* 8 (*Phidiae simulacris, quibus nihil in illo genere perfectius videmus*). For Cicero and Pliny, see supra, p. 330, and infra, p. 341.

96. Senff (supra n. 2) 144: "Der Jupiter des Phidias, die Juno des Polycletus, eine Venus des Alkamenes und nachher des Praxiteles werden allen ihren Nachfolgern die würdigsten Urbilder gewesen und in dieser Gestalt von allen Griechen angenommen und verehrt worden sein." Lodge (supra n. 4) 1354.

97. Senff (supra n. 2) 149: "Denn ungeachtet der Verschiedenheit in der Art der Ausarbeitung, welche auch die Alten bereits in den Werken des Myron, des Polycletus und des Lysippus bemerkt haben, scheinen die alten Werke dennoch wie von einer Schule gearbeitet zu sein." Cf. Lodge (supra n. 4) 1374; Pliny, *N.H.* 34.65.

98. Senff (supra n. 2) 188; see supra n. 15 for text.

99. Senff (supra n. 2) 189; see supra n. 15 for text.

100. Cicero, *Brut.* 70–71; Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* 12.10.7–9; Pliny, *N.H.* 34.56, 34.65; for these sources, see supra, p. 330, and infra, p. 341. See Pausanias 6.13.7 for Canachus II of Sicyon.

101. Senff (supra n. 2) 191; see supra n. 24 for text.

102. Pliny, *N.H.* 35.79; Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* 12.10.6.

103. Senff (supra n. 2) 191: "Was die Zeichnung allgemein betrifft, so wurde alles Eckige vermieden, was bisher noch in den Statuen grosser Künstler, als des Polycletus, geblieben war, und dieses Verdienst um die Kunst wird in der Bildhauerei sonderlich dem Lysippus, welcher die Natur mehr als dessen Vorgänger nachahmte, zugeeignet: dieser gab also seinen Figuren das Wellenförmige, wo gewisse Teile noch mit Winkeln angedeutet waren. Auf besagte Weise ist vermutlich, wie gesagt ist, dasjenige, was Plinius viereckige Statuen nennt, zu verstehen: denn eine viereckige Art zu zeichnen heisst man noch jetzt Quadratur." Cf. Lodge (supra n. 4) II 133; Pliny, *N.H.* 34.65, 34.61.

104. Senff (supra n. 2) 191–92: "Aber die Formen der Schönheit des vorigen Stils blieben auch in diesem zur Regel: denn die schönste Natur war der Lehrer gewesen. Daher nahm Lucianus in Beschreibung seiner Schönheit das Ganze und die Hauptteile von den Künstlern des hohen Stils und das Zierliche von ihren Nachfolgern. Die Form des Gesichts sollte wie an der Lemnischen Venus [*sic*] des Phidias sein; die Haare aber, die Augenbrauen und die Stirn wie an der Venus des Praxiteles; in den Augen wünschte er das Zärtliche und das Reizende wie an dieser.

Die Hände sollten nach der Venus des Alkamenes, eines Schülers des Phidias gemacht werden: und wenn in Beschreibung von Schönheiten Hände der Pallas angegeben werden, so ist vermutlich die Pallas des Phidias, als die berühmteste, zu verstehen; Hände des Polycletus deuten die schönsten Hände an." Lodge (supra n. 4) II 133–34; Lucian, *Imag.* 3–9.

105. Lodge (supra n. 4) II 134, 410 n. 5. For Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* 2.3.5–6, see supra p. 332 and n. 31; for Cicero, *Brut.* 296, see infra n. 114.

106. Senff (supra n. 2) 192: "von den Künstlern nach dem Phidias, Polycletus und nach ihren Zeitgenossen wurde sie mehr als zuvor gesucht und erreicht." Lodge (supra n. 4) II 134.

107. Senff (supra n. 2) 254: "Da ich nun eine Geschichte der Kunst und nicht der Künstler [habe] geben wollen, so haben die Leben von diesen, welche von vielen andern beschrieben sind, hier keinen Platz; aber ihre vornehmsten Werke sind angegeben, und einige sind nach der Kunst betrachtet. Aus angezeigtem Grunde habe ich auch nicht alle Künstler, deren Plinius und andere Skribenten gedenken, namhaft gemacht, zumal wenn die blosser Anzeige ihrer Namen und Werke, ohne andere Nachrichten, nichts lehren konnte." Lodge (supra n. 4) II 175. Cf. the opening words of the preface to the *Geschichte*, Senff (supra n. 2) 7: "Die Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums, welche ich zu schreiben unternommen habe, ist keine blosser Erzählung der Zeitfolge und der Veränderung in derselben, sondern ich nehme das Wort Geschichte in der weiteren Bedeutung, welche dasselbe in der griechischen Sprache hat, und meine Absicht ist, einen Versuch eines Lehrgebäudes zu liefern." Lodge (supra n. 4) 1107. Rüdiger (supra n. 30) 99–116 is important for understanding the aims of the *Geschichte*.

108. Senff (supra n. 2) 254: "Es war also nötig, die Umstände anzuzeigen, in welchen sich die Griechen von Zeit zu Zeit befunden haben, welches kürzlich und bloss in Absicht auf unser Vorhaben geschehen wird; und aus dieser ganzen Geschichte erhellt, dass es die Freiheit gewesen, durch welche die Kunst emporgebracht wurde." Lodge (supra n. 4) II 175.

109. For the theme of liberty in the *Geschichte*: Justi (supra n. 4) III 148–53. Leppmann, in noting the contemporary concern with political liberty (supra n. 4, 292–93), remarks the irony of its celebration by one who had been granted "a quite unusual degree of personal freedom" by a series of "crotchety autocrats." Rehm, in *Briefe* I (supra n. 4) 183, titles the section covering the years 1755 through 1758 in Rome "Die Freiheit." For Winckelmann's early thoughts on political liberty: Rüdiger (supra n. 30) 110. See also Potts (supra n. 12) 386.

110. Senff (supra n. 2) 256: "Ferner blühten Hegias und Ageladas, der Meister des Polycletus, welcher unter andern den Kleosthenes, der in der sechsundsechzigsten Olympias den Sieg erhielt, auf einem Wagen zu Elis vorstellte." Lodge (supra n. 4) II 178.

111. Senff (supra n. 2) 257: "Eupompus, der Meister des Pamphilus, dessen Schüler Apelles war, brachte es durch sein Ansehen dahin, dass sich die seit einiger Zeit unter dem Namen der helladischen vereinigten Schulen in Griechenland von neuem teilten, also dass nebst der ionischen Schule, unter den asiatischen Griechen, der zu Athen und zu Sikyon, eine jede besonderes für sich bestand. Pamphilus und Polycletus, Lysippus und Apelles, welcher nach Sikyon zu dem Pamphilus ging, sich in seiner Kunst vollkommener zu machen, gaben dieser Schule ihren letzten Glanz, und zur Zeit des Königs Ptolemäus Philadelphus in Ägypten scheint die berühmteste und beste Schule der Malerei in dieser Stadt gewesen zu sein." Cf. Lodge (supra n. 4) II 179–80. For Pliny, *N.H.* 35.75, see infra n. 139.

112. Senff (supra n. 2) 262: "Die berühmtesten Bild-

hauer dieser Zeit waren Ageladas von Argos, der Meister des Polykletus. . . .” Lodge (supra n. 4) II 186.

113. Senff (supra n. 2) 263: “Ebenso einen Sprung wird die Kunst von dem Meister bis auf den Schüler, von Ageladas bis auf den Polykletus gemacht haben, und es ist zu glauben, wenn uns die Zeit über beide Werke zu urteilen nicht beraubt hätte, dass der Unterschied von dem Herkules des Eladas auf den Jupiter des Phidias, und von dem Jupiter des Ageladas auf die Juno des Polykletus, wie von dem Prometheus des Äschylus auf den Ödipus des Sophokles sein würde.” Lodge (supra n. 4) II 190.

114. Senff (supra n. 2) 268–69: “Gleichwohl wird die erste Olympias, in welcher der Peloponnesische Krieg seinen Anfang nahm, für die Zeit angegeben, in welcher die andern grossen Künstler, nebst dem Phidias, Polykletus, Myron, Skopas, Pythagoras und Alkamenes, geblüht haben. Das grösste und berühmteste Werk des Polykletus war die kolossalische Statue der Juno zu Argos von Elfenbein und Gold, und das edelste in der Kunst waren zwei Statuen jugendlich-männlicher Figuren: die eine bekam den Namen Doryphoros, vermutlich von dem Spiesse, welchen sie führte, und sie war allen folgenden Künstlern eine Regel in der Proportion, und nach derselben übte sich Lysippus; die andere ist unter dem Namen Diadumenus bekannt, der sich ein Band umbindet, wie des Phidias Pantarces zu Elis war. Man gibt vor, dass zu Anfang des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts eine Statue mit dem Namen dieses Künstlers soll zu Florenz gewesen sein. Die Söhne des Polykletus kamen ihrem Vater in der Kunst nicht bei.” Cf. Lodge (supra n. 4) II 198–200. Pliny, N.H. 34.55–56 (infra n. 125); Pausanias 2.17.4; and, taken incorrectly, Cicero, *Brut.* 296: *De horum laudibus tibi prorsus assentior, sed tamen non isto modo: ut Polycliti Doryphorum sibi Lysippus aiebat, sic tu suasionem legis Serviliae tibi magistram fuisse.*

115. Senff (supra n. 2) 317: “Hadrian war nicht allein ein Kenner, sondern auch ein Künstler und hat wirklich mit eigener Hand Statuen gearbeitet. Aber Victor gibt uns ein Lob unverschämter Schmeichler, wenn er sagt, dass er neben dem Polykletus und Euphranor stehen könnte.” Lodge (supra n. 4) II 327. For Pietro Vettori (Petrus Victorius): Pfeiffer (supra n. 13) 135–36.

116. For Hercules and Antaeus, see supra, p. 327. For Winckelmann’s focus, see supra n. 107. The most extreme application of this principle in the field of ancient art, but one that is based on the evidence of the monuments rather than the literary sources, is probably R. Carpenter’s attempt to approach Greek sculpture as “an anonymous product of an impersonal craft”: *Greek Sculpture* (Chicago 1960) v.

117. Aelian, *Var. Hist.* 14.8; J. Overbeck, *Die antiken Schriftquellen zur Geschichte der bildenden Künste bei den Griechen* (Leipzig 1868) no. 977.

118. For these, see passim in this volume.

119. Plutarch, *De Prof. virt.* 17; Overbeck (supra n. 117) no. 970. *Quaest. Conv.* 2.3.2; Overbeck no. 971.

120. Lucian, *Iupp. Trag.* 7.

121. Overbeck (supra n. 117) *ad* no. 971; see p. 109, where the passage is listed together with other such collective citations in a note to no. 606, Lucian, *Somn.* 8. For the testimonia for Polykletus, see Overbeck nos. 929–77.

122. K. Jex-Blake, tr., and E. Sellers, *The Elder Pliny’s Chapters on the History of Art* (London 1896) xiii–xciv; Pollitt (supra n. 16) 99–111.

123. For Xenocrates: Jex-Blake and Sellers (supra n. 122) xvi–xxxvi; Pollitt (supra n. 16) 74–77 and passim.

124. Pliny, N.H. 34.49–52: [*Phidias*] *floruit autem olympiade LXXXIII, circiter CCC urbis nostrae annum, quo eodem tempore aemuli eius fuere Alkamenes, Critias, Nesiotes, Hegias, et deinde olympiade LXXXVII Hagelades, Callon, Gorgias Lacon; rursus LXXX Polykletus, Phradmon, Myron, Pythagoras, Scopas, Perellus.* 50. *ex iis Poly-*

clitus discipulos habuit Argium, Asopodorum, Alexim, Aristidem, Phrynonem, [Dinonem,] Athenodorum, De-mean Clitorium, Myron Lycium. LXXXV *olympiade florere Naucydes, Dinomenes, Canachus, Patroclus; CII Polycles, Cephisodotus, Leochares, Hypatodorus; CIIII Praxiteles, Euphranor; CVII Aetion, Therimachus.* 51. *CXIII Lysippus fuit, cum et Alexander Magnus, item Lysistratus frater eius, Sthenis, Euphron, Sostratus, Ion, Silanion—in hoc mirabile quod nullo doctore nobilis fuit; ipse discipulum habuit Zeuxiaden—; CXXI Eutychedes, Euthycrates, Laippus, Cephisodotus, Timarchus, Pyromachus.* 52. *cessavit deinde ars ac rursus olympiade CLVI revixit, cum fuere longe quidem infra praedictos probati tamen, Antaeus, Callistratus, Polycles Athenaeus, Callixenus, Pythocles, Pythias, Timocles.*

125. Pliny, N.H. 34.53: *Ita distinctis celeberrimorum aetatibus insignes raptim transcurram, reliqua multitudine passim dispersa.* 34.55–56: *Polyclitus Sicyonius, Hageladae discipulus, diadumenum fecit molliter iuvenem, centum talentis nobilitatum, idem et doryphorum viriliter puerum. fecit et quem canona artifices vocant liniamenta artis ex eo petentes veluti a lege quadam, solusque hominum artem ipsam fecisse artis opere iudicatur. fecit et destringentem se et nudum telo incessentem duosque pueros item nudos, talis ludentes, qui vocantur astragalizontes et sunt in Titi imperatoris atrio—hoc opere nullum absolutius plerique iudicant;—item Mercurium qui fuit Lysimacheae, Herculem, qui Romae, hagetera arma sumentem, Artemona, qui periphoretos appellatus est. hic consummasse hanc scientiam iudicatur et toreuticen sic erudisse, ut Phidias aperuisse. proprium eius est, uno crure ut insisterent signa, excogitasse, quadrata tamen esse ea ait Varro et paene ad exemplum.*

126. Pliny, N.H. 34.83: *Xenocrates, Tisicratis discipulus, ut alii, Euthycratis, vicit utrosque copia signorum. et de sua arte composuit volumina.* 34.66, 67: *Filios et discipulos reliquit [sc. Lysippus] laudatos artifices Laippum, Boëdan, sed ante omnes Euthycraten, quamquam is constantiam potius imitatus patris quam elegantiam austero maluit genere quam iucundo placere. . . . huius porro discipulus fuit Tisicrates, et ipse Sicyonius, sed Lysippi sectae propior, ut vix discernantur complura signa.*

127. Pliny, N.H., Book 35, beginning with section 50; for Apelles, see 35.79–97.

128. Pollitt (supra n. 16) 58–63, 81–84, and passim.

129. Supra, p. 330. For the bias in favor of fifth-century artists: Pollitt (supra n. 16) 83.

130. For the concept of virtues: Pollitt (supra n. 16) 60, 82–83. The application of the concept to artists may be implicit or explicit; see, e.g., Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* 12.10.6: *Floruit autem circa Philippum et usque ad successores Alexandri pictura praecipue, sed diversis virtutibus* (for this passage, see infra, p. 343). Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Isoc.* 3; supra, p. 331, n. 25. F. Preissshofen, “Kunsttheorie und Kunstbetrachtung,” in *Classicisme à Rome* (supra n. 66) 275; D. A. Russell, comment on Preissshofen’s paper, *ibid.*, 279. See also P. Gros, “Vie et mort de l’art hellénistique selon Vitruve et Pline,” *REL* 56 (1978) 289–313.

131. Pollitt (supra n. 16) 60–61, for summary and references.

132. Supra n. 25.

133. A. E. Douglas, “Cicero, Quintilian, and the Canon of Ten Attic Orators,” *Mnemosyne* 4, 9 (1956) 30–40; A. E. Douglas, “The Intellectual Background of Cicero’s Rhetorica: A Study in Method,” in *ANRW* 1, 3 (Berlin and New York 1973) 95–138; see 109–10 for the curious absence of Phidias; R. G. Austin, “Quintilian on Painting and Statuary,” *CQ* 38 (1944) 17–26 passim, for a decrease in canon-mindedness; see 25 for the methods by which canons are made to work.

134. R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from*

the *Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford 1968) 207, for the introduction of the term "canon" by David Ruhnken in 1768 and a discussion of why this now universal usage is alien to the Greek tradition. See also E. R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. W. R. Trask (Bollingen Series 36, Princeton 1953, 1990) 256 n. 24. For sociological observations on the popularity of canons in the late nineteenth century: Douglas, "Background" (supra n. 133) 108; see 113 for the need to assume "a general pattern of information about ancient art."

135. Senff (supra n. 2) 116–17, 254 (supra n. 108), 263–67.

136. *Ibid.*, 281–82, 283 (supra nn. 34, 35).

137. Jex-Blake and Sellers (supra n. 122) xix; cf. also Cicero, *Brut.* 71 (supra n. 19).

138. Preissshofen (supra n. 130) 263–77, esp. 269–76, and 278 for Bowersock; Pliny, *N.H.* 34.52: supra n. 124; Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* 10.1.75: *Longo post intervallo temporis natus Timagenes vel hoc est ipso probabilis, quod intermissam historias scribendi industriam nova laude reparavit.* "Timagenes was born long after these authors, but deserves our praise for the very fact that he revived the credit of history, the writing of which had fallen into neglect." Trans. Butler (supra n. 31) IV (Loeb Classical Library 1922, 1979).

139. Pliny, *N.H.* 35.75: *ipsius auctoritas tanta fuit, ut dividerit picturam: genera, quae ante eum duo fuere—Helladicum et Asiaticum appellabant—, propter hunc, qui erat Sicyonius, divisio Helladico tria facta sunt, Ionicum, Sicyonium, Atticum.*

140. Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* 12.10.16–19: 16. *Et antiqua quidem illa diuisio inter Atticos atque Asianos fuit, cum hi pressi et integri, contra inflati illi et inanes haberentur, in his nihil superflueret, illis iudicium maxime ac modus deesset. Quod quidam, quorum et Santra est, hoc putant accidisse, quod, paulatim sermone Graeco in proximas Asiae civitates influente, nondum satis periti loquendi facundiam concupierint, ideoque ea, quae proprie signari poterant circumcui coeperint emunari ac deinde in eo perseverarint.* 17. *Mihi autem orationis differentiam fecisse et dicentium et audientium naturae videntur, quod Attici limati quidam et emuncti nihil inane aut redundans ferebant, Asiana gens tumidior alioqui atque iactantior vaniore etiam dicendi gloria inflata est.* 18. *Tertium mox, qui haec dividebant, adiecerunt genus Rhodium, quod velut medium esse atque ex utroque mixtum volunt; neque enim Attice pressi neque Asiane sunt abundantes, ut aliquid habere uideantur gentis, aliquid auctoris.* 19. *Aeschines enim, qui hunc exilio delegerat locum, intulit eo studia Athenarum, quae, velut sata quaedam caelo terraque degenerant, saporem illum Atticum peregrino miscuerunt. Lenti ergo quidam ac remissi, non sine pondere tamen neque fontibus puris neque torrentibus turbidis, sed lenibus stagnis similes habentur.* "The distinction between the Attic and the Asiatic schools takes us back to antiquity. The former were regarded as concise and healthy, the latter as empty and inflated: the former were remarkable for the absence of all superfluity, while the latter were deficient alike in taste and restraint. The reason for this division, according to some authorities, among them Santra, is to be found in the fact that, as Greek

gradually extended its range into the neighbouring cities of Asia, there arose a class of men who desired to distinguish themselves as orators before they had acquired sufficient command of the language, and who consequently began to express by periphrases what could have been expressed directly, until finally this practice became an ingrained habit. My own view, however, is that the difference between the two styles is attributable to the character both of the orators and the audiences whom they addressed: the Athenians, with their polish and refinement, refused to tolerate emptiness and redundancy, while the Asiatics, being naturally given to bombast and ostentation, were puffed up with a passion for a more vainglorious style of eloquence. At a later period, the critics, to whom we owe this classification, added a third style, the Rhodian, which they asserted to lie midway between the two and to be a blend of both, since the orators of this school are neither so concise as the Attic nor redundant like the Asiatic school, but appear to derive their style in part from their national characteristics, in part from those of their founder. For it was Aeschines who introduced the culture of Athens at Rhodes, which he had chosen as his place of exile: and just as certain plants degenerate as a result of change of soil and climate, so the fine Attic flavour was marred by the admixture of foreign ingredients. Consequently certain of the orators of this school are regarded as somewhat slow and lacking in energy, though not devoid of a certain weight, and as resembling placid pools rather than the limpid springs of Athens or the turbid torrents of Asia." Trans. Butler (supra n. 138).

141. Douglas, "Background" (supra n. 133) 119–31.

142. Pliny, *N.H.* 34.51: supra n. 124.

143. Pliny, *N.H.* 34.61–67.

144. *Ibid.*, *N.H.* 35.79–97.

145. Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* 12.10.6: supra n. 130.

146. Summary of opinions in Pollitt (supra n. 16) 26–28, 95 n. 40; see also Gros (supra n. 130 and infra n. 147).

147. Gros (supra n. 130) has argued that Pliny's declaration is to be connected with his attitude toward the Roman conquest of Greece and the East and its moral consequences.

148. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Orat. Vett.* 3: supra n. 73.

149. See, e.g., P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, trans. A. Shapiro (Jerome Lectures 16, Ann Arbor 1988) 111, for the limitations on the kinds of models acceptable for Augustan iconography. While Octavian's seal could be the image of Alexander (79), as Augustus he set a different course. Zanker's discussion of "Antony Betrayed by His Own Image" (57–65) shows how Antony's embrace of Eastern imagery was turned against him; having identified himself with Dionysus, as had Alexander, he became an easy target for Roman ridicule. Zanker offers (65) some speculations on the possible directions of politics and iconography had Antony been victorious.

150. Senff (supra n. 2) 348: "Mein grösstes Vergnügen in Erläuterung der Werke alter Kunst ist gewesen, wenn ich durch dieselbe einen alten Skribenten [habe] erläutern oder verbessern können."