THE SETTING OF GREEK SCULPTURE *

TWO articles by C. C. Vermeule\(^1\) have recently discussed the various ways in which the Romans displayed the many copies of Greek works which today fill our museums. Our knowledge of statuary arrangements, already enlightened by the excavation of Hadrian’s Villa at Tivoli and of entire sites such as Pompeii and Herculaneum, constantly increases as more methodical and accurate research is carried out in many Asia Minor centers rich in sculpture, as for instance Aphrodisias and Side. But if we are reasonably well informed on Roman practices, the same cannot be said for Greek times despite the great wealth of ancient literary allusions to statuary.

Greek originals are seldom found, and when they are, they are mostly out of context. Whatever evidence is available is often hidden in excavation reports with no specific reference to sculptural setting, and ancient sources are rarely detailed enough to allow safe speculation on location and arrangement. The problem becomes even more complex when Greek works are known only through later replicas of various provenience, which in some cases may even involve transposition from one medium to another or conversion into a different form of artistic expression (such as, for instance, a relief reproducing a composition originally in the round, or a sculptural group made after a famous painting).

The present notes do not attempt to explore the subject with thoroughness but propose to set forth some suggestions as to the arrangements of Greek statuary in antiquity, emphasizing the difference in approach between the Classical and the Hellenistic periods. Much of what follows has already been stated in some form by others but is here reviewed from the specific point of view of sculptural setting; some theories which have at times been rejected will be reproposed, not because the issues have now been settled with greater certainty, but in the hope of promoting further study of this interesting topic.

I am mainly concerned with the outdoor setting of free-standing sculpture. Many statues, cult images or otherwise, were placed within buildings, but their loca-

---

* Some of the ideas in this paper were prompted by a visit to North African and Asia Minor sites during the Summer of 1969. I am most grateful to the National Endowment for the Humanities for their Summer Stipend, and to the American Philosophical Society for their grant from the Johnson Fund, which financed my travels. I have purposely refrained from illustrating my text in order that attention may focus not on the monuments *per se* but on their setting.

tion was determined by the available space in any given structure; statuary for interior decoration does not seem to have existed before Roman times.\(^2\) Similarly I shall not take into account architectural sculpture proper, because the setting of carved friezes, metopes or pediments was determined by the established sequence of parts in the Greek orders. The function of architectural sculpture was decorative from its very inception, but could not have existed without the underlying structural frame and should be studied only in conjunction with it.

Having thus delimited the field of my enquiry, I wish to state as a working hypothesis the following proposition. At first Greek sculpture in the round was purely "utilitarian," either in a religious or a civic sense, and the location of a monument was chosen in relation to its importance to the citizens at large. Toward the end of the fourth century B.C. sculpture became increasingly spectacular, and with the loosening of religious conventions and civic concern it tended to acquire a more decorative function. This aspect of "art for art's sake" was finally fully exploited during the Hellenistic period, when the formation of the Eastern monarchies and the creation of the great private estates provided at the same time the incentive and the funds for more elaborate displays. The densely populated Hellenistic cities prompted a desire for more pastoral surroundings, and the private villas of the wealthy furnished the necessary acreage; landscape became more physically involved in sculptural compositions, in which it finally formed an element *per se* rather than a purely neutral background. This concern with the environment eventually led to the great Roman villas filled with statuary in key positions, a pattern later copied and imitated not only in the Renaissance but down to our times.

The first impulse behind Greek monumental stone sculpture was religious. Aside from the making of cult statues, which did not necessarily require stone or bronze as their proper medium, and of funerary monuments, to be discussed below, the Archaic period saw the beginning of votive art in the form of marble figures of youths and girls,\(^3\) often over life-sized, which were dedicated in the major panhellenic sanctuaries as gifts to the divinity. In the majority of cases it is now impossible to determine where these statues originally stood, since they have been found in disturbed contexts, but some surmises are possible. Their setting must have varied according to their scale; small figures were often placed within the colonnades \(^4\) or

\(^2\) For the practice of apartment decoration in Hellenistic times see *infra*, p. 352. Honorary statues within public buildings are known through literary sources, but they cannot be considered decorative in the common sense of the word. Temples also were converted into storerooms or museums of statuary and other objects of revered antiquity, but these were cases of slow accumulation with no preliminary planning.


\(^4\) This practice, at first purely haphazard, may later on have inspired a systematic arrangement
on the steps of temples and propylaia, but by and large sizable statues were set up in the open air (as suggested by their weathering and their meniskoi for protection against the birds), in a scattered arrangement within the sacred precinct. Location in such instances must have largely been a case of "first come, first served," though the importance of the donor, or, more probably, the size of the dedication must have played a part in the choice.

It is tempting, for example, to suggest that the colossal Sounion kouros must have been placed in a specific relationship to the Archaic temple of Poseidon on the Attic promontory. All traces of their original position have now vanished, but a clue may be given by the fact that the statues' plinths are set at an angle within their bases, so that when the front of the base lies parallel to the spectator the kouros appears in a diagonal position. This device may have been adopted to impart an impression of three-dimensionality and movement to an otherwise frontally conceived statue, but it can also be surmised that the oblique setting is dependent on the arrangement of the colossi around the temple, perhaps on either side of the front, with an early attempt at a balancing composition. Triangular bases were also used for these first kouros perhaps to encourage all-around inspection, while female figures or fantastic beings often appeared on tall pedestals or columns. In such cases it is obvious that the statues may have stood anywhere in the sanctuary, without a conditioning background, and only rarely do we find an Archaic dedication that seems to presuppose a niche setting or, more probably, an architectural backdrop preventing a view of its back.

In some cases the pedestal itself was an important part of the dedication and had, so to speak, architectural connotations. I refer to the colossal Sphinx monument, a of statues within intercolumniations, such as we see in the Nereid Monument at Xanthos (e.g., Fouilles de Xanthos, III, 1969, I, pls. 3, 5, 6 for various reconstructions) or the Sarcophagus of the Mourning Women, probably a reflection of contemporary free-standing monuments (R. Lullies and M. Hirmer, Greek Sculpture, 1960, pl. 207).

A very interesting arrangement of statues on steps, though of terracotta rather than stone, occurs on the "theatral area" of a sanctuary of Demeter and Kore being excavated on the slopes of Akrokorinth. For a recent account of the shrine see N. Bookidis, Hesperia, XXXVIII, 1969, pp. 297-310; the terracotta statues and their possible arrangement were mentioned by Dr. Bookidis in a lecture at Bryn Mawr College in February 1970. The date of the statues seems to fall within the first half of the fifth century B.C.

Kouroi, nos. 2-3, 42-45, with additional references; ca. 600 B.C.

Vermeule, op. cit., has already emphasized that the typical Roman practice of balancing compositions through mirror-reversal replicas of the same work has its roots in the Greek past, though he does not trace it back quite as early.

Euthykyrtides' base and Delos Kouros, G. Bakalakis, B.C.H., LXXXVIII, 1964, pp. 539-553. At the time of writing I was unable to consult the study by Margrit Jacob-Felsch, Die Entwicklung griechischer Statuenbasen und die Aufstellung der Statuen, Waldsassen-Bayern, 1969, which deals with some of the problems with which I am concerned.

E.g., the so-called Chian Kore, Akropolis 675, Korai, no. 123, figs. 394-397; ca. 525 B.C.
form of offering seemingly more appropriate for a community than for an individual. The most famous example is the Naxian Sphinx in Delphi, but the type must have been fairly popular, since several monuments of this kind have now been found or recognized elsewhere.\(^{10}\) Its typical feature, the tall Ionic column on which the animal sits, lifts the statue proper well above the level of the other dedications. Such monumental columns required their own important setting and must have commanded special attention and consideration; they may have even preceded, and prompted, the adoption of the Ionic order for temples or other architectural complexes.\(^{11}\) Of the extant examples of the type, only the Naxian Sphinx can be located with confidence within the Delphic sanctuary, though its initial relationship to its setting must have been altered, however slightly, by the changes in the general lay-out of the temenos after the fire of 548 B.C. For the others we are less certain, but can logically assume that they stood not far from the major temple, in a sort of architectural rivalry. After the Archaic period this monumental type seems to continue with variations: the sphinx may be replaced by a Nike\(^ {12}\) and, eventually, the Ionic column by a pedestal. The best known example of this latter kind is of course the Nike by Paionios, erected ca. 425 B.C. at Olympia on a tall triangular pedestal facing the Temple of Zeus.\(^ {13}\) Finally in the Hellenistic period the tall column or pedestal may be surmounted by the statue of the donor himself, perhaps on horseback, or of an honored person.\(^ {14}\)

Besides single statues, sanctuaries often received group compositions as dedica-

---


Delos: *Guide de Délos*, 1965, pp. 44-45, pl. 6; ca. 550 B.C.


\(^{11}\) As suggested by G. Gruben, *ibid.*, pp. 207-208.


\(^{13}\) G. Treu, *Die Bildwerke von Olympia in Stein und Ton (Olympia Ergebnisse, III)*, 1894, p. 182, pls. 46-48; Lullies and Hirmer, *Greek Sculpture*, pl. 178. The location of the Nike pedestal, SE of the ramp of the Temple of Zeus, is indicated in the plan of the sanctuary in *Olympia in der Antike* (Ausstellung Essen, June-Aug. 1960), folding plate opposite p. 33.

\(^{14}\) E.g., the Monument of Aemilius Paullus at Delphi, which was originally planned for Perseus of Macedon: H. Kähler, *Der Fries vom Reiterdenkmal des Aemilius Paulus in Delphi*, 1965. According to the study by H. B. Siedentopf, *Das hellenistische Reiterdenkmal*, Waldsassen-Bayern, 1968, pp. 63-64, the equestrian statue on a tall pillar seems to have been rare and almost entirely limited to Delphi, and to the early second century B.C. G. Roux, in his review of Siedentopf's book (*Rev. Arch.*, N.S., 1970, pp. 144-145) suggests that the high placement of these statues finds its justification in the peculiar nature of the Delphic terrain, since the horsemen would have been seen at eye level by a spectator standing on the terrace North of the temple.

For the tall Pergamene pedestals in front of the Stoa of Attalos and of the Propylaia in Athens (Agrippa monument) see *Hesperia*, XIX, 1950, pp. 317-318, where other column monuments are also mentioned. It is beyond the scope of this paper to deal with columns or pedestals supporting tripods or with dedicatory columns *per se*, since the focus is on sculpture.
tions. It is generally assumed that the Archaic period was incapable of producing complex arrangements of figures in interaction, and indeed sixth century groups appear mostly as single statues juxtaposed. But it is interesting to note that such “naive” arrangements continue well into the Hellenistic period, although much more intricate groupings had already been accomplished. It is obvious therefore that setting played a part in this matter. A “single file” composition, by its very nature, lends itself particularly well for alignment alongside a road; yet location near a road implies a great number of viewers and is therefore preferable to a more remote though more picturesque setting. A donor may, hence, select a paratactic composition, easily grasped even by a walking person, over a more complex arrangement with narrative content. The typical example for the Archaic period is Geneleos’ dedication in Samos, where an entire family (four standing figures between a seated female and a reclining male) occupied a long and narrow two-stepped base flanking the Sacred Street to the temple of Hera.  But Delphi offers comparable examples from the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., as well as the Hellenistic period. The bases with their “footprints” are particularly eloquent even if the statues they once supported are no longer preserved; variations on the paratactic theme may include arrangement on a semicircular base or on two levels within a niche, but sculptural bravura seems almost subordinate to the “parade” effect made possible by the road setting.

From the very beginning religious piety was accompanied by more human considerations. An offering was placed in a sanctuary not simply to honor the god but also to impress citizens and foreign visitors. Literary sources tell us of an extreme case of “display to the spectator”: the statues of Zeus (Zanes), which were set up by athletes as fines for cheating in the Olympic games, stood along the road to the Stadium as a constant source of humiliation for the culprits and of warning for fellow competitors. But a certain consideration for the viewer must have underscored every dedication, as suggested by the many inscriptions phrased as if the statue

18 H. Walter, Das griechische Heiligtum, Heraion von Samos, 1965, pp. 69-70, figs. 70-71, plan fig. 86.
19 For the Delphic bases see, e.g., J. Pouilloux and G. Roux, Enigmes à Delphes, 1963, especially p. 22, fig. 5. For debate on the proposed arrangements see, most recently, G. Roux, Rev. Arch., N.S., 1969, pp. 29-56. On group arrangements one may still read with profit H. Bulle, “Über Gruppenbildung,” Antike Plastik, Festschrift W. Amelung, 1928, pp. 42-49. F. Eckstein, Anathemata, Studien zu den Weihgeschenken strengen Stils im Heiligtum von Olympia, Berlin, 1969, especially pp. 98-102, suggests that the change from a paratactic display on a straight base to that on a curved base is a conquest of the Sever period and implies a different conception of space in the display of statuary. Notice, however, that the examples in Delphi post-date those studied by Eckstein. It is also interesting to see that single monuments could be intentionally arranged so as to form paratactic “groups,” as for instance in the case of what Siedentopf calls “Reitergalerie,” especially op. cit., p. 48, fig. 8, the many riders’ bases along the sacred road at Olympia.
17 Pausanias, V, xxi, 2-7. See the plan of Olympia cited supra, note 13. The first Zanes
itself were addressing the passerby, and by compositions taking the spectator into account even when this meant breaking the Archaic "Law of Frontality." 18 It is therefore understandable that location along a sanctuary road should be preferred to a setting elsewhere within the temenos, but also that a limited amount of space should be available there at any given time. 19 Other settings were chosen probably on the basis of accessibility, without specific consideration being given to the adornment of the sanctuary per se. In summary, statuary within a Classical shrine was set up by donors (individuals or towns) for religious reasons, to be seen by as many as possible, and therefore either in an elevated position (e.g. on a column) or a location of prominence (e.g. along the sacred road or near the temple), and finally wherever feasible, without any intentional "landscaping" of the sanctuary itself in the modern sense of the word.

This conclusion does not imply that all dedicatory sculpture was either "portraits" 20 or monotonous paratactic groups. Toward the end of the Archaic period sculptural narrative expanded beyond the limits of architectural sculpture, and mythological groups, presumably somewhat metope-like in composition, appeared in all the major sanctuaries. Unfortunately they are mostly known to us through literary sources: Theseus and the Minotaur on the Athenian Akropolis, Herakles and Apollo struggling for the Tripod at Delphi, Herakles' introduction to Olympos at Samos, and many others. 21 At Olympia, statues of victorious athletes may have graphically however were erected only after the 98th Olympiad, that is shortly after 338 B.C. For a brief discussion of the Zanes bases, Olympia Bericht, II, 1937-38, p. 43.

18 E.g., equestrian statues, which aesthetically require a profile pose to present the horse's main view, show the rider turning his head to look at the onlooker; cf. the Rampin Horseman, Lullies and Hirmer, pls. 30-31; especially H. Payne, Archaic Marble Sculpture from the Acropolis, 2nd ed., New York, 1950, pp. 7-8, where this discrepancy between the "practical" and the "important" viewpoint is discussed. That riders' statue bases were set with one short side to the street which they bordered is stressed by Siedentopf, op. cit.

19 Note the Rhodian decree forbidding the erection of dedications where they would prevent passage, Sokolowski, Lois sacrées des cités grecques, no. 107, p. 175, lines 16-18.

20 The term is here used in a very wide sense to mean any single male or female statue, whether kouros or kore, athletic figure, specific individual or even hero or divinity, outside of a narrative context.

21 Our major source of information on these monuments is Pausanias. Some of these groups consist of individual figures not always physically connected, but they cannot be considered on a par with the Hellenistic "groups in space" mentioned infra, pp. 346-356, because their basic composition is linear and the figures are ranged along a single plane. A possible exception may be the group of Athena and Marsyas as reconstructed at present (G. M. A. Richter, Sculpture and Sculptors of the Greeks, 1950, fig. 593). Or should this consideration further endanger the Myronian attribution of the single figures, already questioned by Carpenter (M.A.A.R., XVIII, 1941, pp. 5-18)? Another, and very remarkable, exception, occurs at Olympia, in the dedication made by the Achaianas after the end of the Persian war. According to Pausanias (V, xxv, 8-10), nine Homeric heroes stood on a pedestal, having cast lots to decide who was to fight with Hektor, while on a separate pedestal stood Nestor holding the helmet which contained the lots. The monument was the work of Onatas of Aegina and is therefore securely dated within the Severe
portrayed the event for which the victory was won. Finally other single statues may not have involved the human figure at all: we hear, for instance, of the Corcyran Bull at Delphi, the Areopagus Bull on the Athenian Akropolis, and on this latter sanctuary we have even found the base of Strongylion’s Trojan Horse. But even in such cases we are bound to assume that narrative groups, athletes and animal sculptures were placed wherever possible, without intimate relationship to their surroundings.

I do not wish to imply that some statues were not very effective in their setting. Stevens’ reconstruction of the Akropolis as seen from the Propylaia reveals how impressive the Athena Promachos must have looked against the Mycenaean terrace, or the Areopagus Bull by the flight of steps west of the Parthenon. But the major criterion for the choice of setting remained one of visibility rather than of coordination to the environment, and the general lay-out of the sanctuary would be judged over-crowded by a modern observer. In contrast with the definite planning and inter-relation of architectural structures, the setting of free-standing sculpture of the Archaic-Classical period must have been fairly haphazard, and a statue could be moved from any given location to another without detriment to itself or to the overall arrangement. The only possible exception to this state of affairs may have been the statue of Ge praying for rain, seen by Pausanias and attested North of the Parthenon by a rock-cut inscription. The statue has been visualized as emerging from the ground, in a partial rendering comparable to the representation of Ge on the Pergamon Altar. But Pausanias does not mention the date of the monument, and the extant inscription seems of Roman date; the statue could possibly have been erected in Hellenistic times.

Second only to sanctuaries in their wealth of statuary were the cemeteries of ancient Greece. Here too the predominant criteria were the availability of space and the desire to impress. Polyandria erected at public expense carried the additional message that death for the country was highly honorable and officially rewarded. Only the Kerameikos in Athens gives us a more or less complete picture of Greek burial grounds, but literary sources suggest that also elsewhere tombs were set

period. F. Eckstein (op. cit., pp. 27-32) has recently discussed the composition of the group on the basis of the available evidence: a round statue base aligned on the axis of a semicircular pedestal at a distance of ca. 8 m. (p. 28, text ill. 3). Eckstein stresses Onatas’ innovation in establishing a number of figures on the periphery of a circle, with their glances directed toward the center into which the spectator himself is drawn. The separation onto two pedestals of the elements of a single composition qualifies this work for a potential “group in space,” but the attempt seems never to have been repeated, and once again we marvel at the many links which join the Severe to the Hellenistic period, bypassing the classical era.

22 On monuments of the Athenian Akropolis see I. T. Hill, The Ancient City of Athens, 1953, Ch. XVII, with bibliography and special reference to G. P. Stevens’ articles.
23 G. P. Stevens, Classical Buildings, 1955, pls. V, VIII.
24 Whatever evidence we have from elsewhere (e.g. Olynthos) suggests however that the
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alongside major roads, mostly outside, but at times also within, the city walls. Decorative purposes are obviously present in individual monuments and within family plots, but the overall effect is a mixture of levels and styles inevitably determined by the passing of time. An interesting but uncommon attempt at reconciling the funerary monument with the terrain is the plot of Dexileos’ family, which was given a triangular shape to fit at the meeting point of two roads, while the knight’s stele, with its unusual concave shape, formed a dramatic backdrop delimiting the area.25

Attic funerary monuments were drastically curbed by the well-known anti-luxury decree of 317 B.C., and therefore information for the Hellenistic period is proportionately scanty. But it is interesting to note how “illusionistic” effects had begun to infiltrate the fairly conservative world of grave reliefs prior to their cessation. Statues in the round were set within architectural frames to give the impression of very high relief at first,26 then perhaps even of tableaux vivants; warrior stelai, which traditionally showed the deceased triumphing over an enemy, may omit the opponent and show the dead charging forth from his naiskos against an imaginary adversary supplied by the passerby’s imagination. This device, though still not binding the monument to a specific setting, can be nonetheless considered an attempt to relate the sculpture to its environment, within which the second element of the composition was mentally located.27

Finally the third location within a city where sculpture could be expected were the civic areas such as the agora and the theater. Statues of poets and dramatists were set up in the latter, but apparently more for edification and educational purposes than for the actual decoration of the theater. Even this practice, however, was established rather late in the fourth century, to continue in Hellenistic times.28

From epigraphical as well as literary evidence we know that the agora in

Athenian cemetery may have been more splendid than customary. We do, of course, recognize the funerary nature of many splendid kouroi from Attica (e.g., Ch. Karousos, Aristodikos, Stuttgart, 1961) or elsewhere, but they represent isolated finds which cannot give us an idea of entire cemeteries and often came from family plots rather than public burial grounds.


27 Cf. Aristaonutes’ stele in Athens, Lippold, Griechische Plastik, 1950, pl. 79, 4. This attempt to make statues reach out, as it were, from their physical boundaries may be the result of a natural development in artistic experimentation and theory. As the earlier sculptors strove to incorporate space within their compositions (Polykleitos, e.g., on either side of his Diadoumenos, and Praxiteles in front of his Wine Pourer), so Lysippus introduced space around his figures, thus beginning the trend for centrifugal poses and for compositions extending into their surrounding space and thus ultimately relating to their setting.

28 E.g., M. Bieber, The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age², 1961, pp. 58-60.
Athens received honorary statues, but with discretion; indeed, for political purposes, Konon was the first to be thus immortalized after Harmodios and Aristogeiton (no. 261), whose statues were set up approximately a hundred years earlier (nos. 269, 271). The location of the Tyrannicides is known and was emphasized in antiquity by the prohibition to erect other monuments in their vicinity (nos. 278, 279); exception was made only in 307 B.C. for Antigonus and Demetrius who were set up in a chariot nearby (no. 264), and in Roman times for Brutus and Cassius (no. 262). Honorary statues became increasingly frequent toward the end of the fourth century, but no special arrangement seems to have been established for the majority of cases; at times an inscription states that the monument should be erected “wherever seems suitable” (nos. 279, 296, 701); in other instances a previous monument is given as a reference point for location (no. 696) but no “landscaping” or decorative intentions seem implied. An anecdote tells us that a soldier placed some money within the clasped hands of a statue of Demosthenes (set up in 280/279 B.C.), and that he later recovered it since it had been safely hidden by the falling leaves of a plane tree (no. 697). The location of Demosthenes’ statue can be approximately determined within the agora, but the plane tree rather than the sculpture forms part of an embellishing program, since Plutarch states that Kimon “adorned the agora by planting planes and making walks” (no. 718).

Another statue of which the location is approximately known is the group of Eirene holding the child Ploutos (nos. 158, 159), erected around 374 B.C. on the west slope of the agora, and Pausanias mentions statues of gods and mythological heroes. We also know of a statue of Demokratia set up within the market place (no. 696). By and large the Athenian agora contained statues of generals, political figures and benefactors, while other cities seem to have preferred athletic monuments (no. 268). The basic arrangement apparently was to erect statues in front of buildings, where they would best be seen, leaving empty the large central area. It is interesting to know that monuments could also be relocated, as the new evidence for the Eponymous Heroes in Athens indicates. But this specific group had particular importance, since it was used as a sort of bulletin board for current events, and therefore may have been shifted from its original position to follow civic offices.

This picture of sculpture within the city of the Classical period can be rounded out by mentioning the many herms in front of gates or houses, in the streets, and the Hekataia at crossroads. Fountains existed for communal use and normally re-

\footnotesize All references to statues in the Athenian Agora have been culled from R. E. Wycherley, Athenian Agora, III, Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia, 1957; in my text, numbers in parentheses refer to his catalogue.

\footnotesize For statues of benefactors in the Agora (and the Peiraeus) see, e.g., Hesperia, V, 1936, pp. 419-428, decree in honor of Kephisodoros dated 196/5 B.C. These comments on the types of statues set up in the Athenian Agora apply, of course, also to the Hellenistic period.

ceived no sculptural adornment except for their lion-head spouts. Natural springs and grottoes were often considered shrines and filled with dedications, but these usually took the form of small plaques inserted within niches cut into the rock in a haphazard fashion, without decorative intent or specific correlation to the surroundings.

The Hellenistic period is much more difficult to study. Evidence of location is mostly unavailable and the line between Hellenistic creations and Roman adaptations or additions is hard to draw. Most of the following notes are therefore purely speculative, and a systematic survey of sculptural distribution and uses will not be attempted.

In many ways the period continued earlier practices. More and more honorary statues were set up in the Athenian agora or on the Akropolis; many dedications were offered at Delphi and Olympia, and they often took the form of the paratactic composition on a long base which had first appeared almost three centuries earlier. But the different demands of the times, the emphasis on the individual rather than the state, the contact with other civilizations on a ruler-subject basis, and especially the virtually limitless skill of the sculptors prompted an expanded repertoire of subjects and compositions and gave statuary a different aim and a new relationship to its surrounding.

One aspect of this phenomenon is increased pictorialism and illusionism. Already apparent in funerary art, it extends now to votive monuments, where a good example is offered by the so-called Kraters’ Hunt at Delphi. The episode of Alexander threatened by a lion and saved by his faithful general was immortalized in a bronze group made by Lysippos and Leochares (ca. 320-315 B.C.) and described by Plutarch as a lively action scene with the attacking lion, dogs, Alexander on horseback, and other figures. The composition stood within a deep niche along the Iscig-aiion wall, northwest of the Temple of Apollo. Although composed of single statues, the group certainly did not have a paratactic arrangement but the individual figures must have stood in some kind of spatial and narrative relation to each other within the large niche. It has been suggested that the so-called Alexander Sarcophagus in Istanbul derived its inspiration from the Delphic group, and another echo of the composition can perhaps be recognized in the deer hunt mosaic excavated at Pella in Macedonia. Interdependence among the artistic media and specifically the impressionistic possibilities of painting and mosaic (which because of their two-dimensionality were forced to employ illusionistic devices) must have in turn influenced the conception of sculptural ensembles.

32 Supra, note 16.
34 Alexander Sarcophagus: Lullies and Hirmer, pl. 232. Pella mosaic: Archaeology, XVII, 1964, colored cover of fasc. 2 (Summer) and p. 81, fig. 9; signed by Gnosis. On the relationship between the Alexander group in Delphi and the other monuments see, e.g., C. M. Robertson, J.H.S., LXXXV, 1965, pp. 80-81.
We thus find two kinds of Hellenistic groups: the tightly knit composition in which each figure is physically connected with the others from which it cannot be intelligibly separated, and the loosely built group of individual figures juxtaposed \textit{in space} and linked purely by gestures, glances or subject. Krateros’ Hunt is an example of this second type, but confined within an enframing niche. Other monuments may have been more freely arranged within a garden or other natural setting, away from the systematic display of a public sanctuary.

It is regrettable that so many Hellenistic monuments have survived only in Roman copies which can give us little or no help in visualizing the original setting of their prototypes. Archaeological studies have thus tended to concentrate on the sculptures \textit{per se} rather than on their possible locations, without even questioning their suitability for traditional purposes or settings. I shall attempt to assemble here a few Hellenistic monuments whose composition seems to require a specific arrangement in nature, trying to derive evidence, as it were, from the statues themselves. Unfortunately this “internal” evidence seems hardly substantiated by excavational or external evidence on gardens and landscape, and one must not underestimate the danger of letting our experience with Italian and English Romanticism color our notions of Hellenistic times. Whatever is known of ancient Greek gardens suggests that they were of the orderly variety, along the lines of today’s “Italian gardens,” rather than the romantic natural growth which seems implied by the “groups in space.” These latter, nonetheless, could have stood in “religious” gardens, associated with heroa, sanctuaries of the Nymphs or Muses, and perhaps even gymnasias and schools; some subjects may even have been appropriate for formalized parks, such as those known through the literary sources to have existed in Alexandria.  

The so-called Invitation to the Dance,\footnote{For ancient gardens see, e.g., the article in \textit{Encyclopedia Arte Antica}, s.v. Giardino. Particularly informative is the study by D. B. Thompson on the Garden of Hephastos around the temple in the Athenian Agora, \textit{Hesperia}, VI, 1937, pp. 396-425. A similar “potted” garden has been suggested for the temple at Gabii, H. Lauter, \textit{Arch. Anz.}, 1968, cols. 626-631.} known through numerous Roman copies, is usually thought to have been originally located in Kyzikos, since it appears on Severan coins of that city. This numismatic selection implies that the monument was well known and therefore must have stood in a public area within the city limits, perhaps near a fountain in the agora. But its subject is ideally suited for more pastoral surroundings, to which many Roman replicas were in fact adapted, and nothing excludes the possibility that this was also the case in the Hellenistic period.\footnote{Bieber, \textit{Hellenistic Age}, figs. 564-565. The latest discussion of the subject is by D. Brinkerhoff, \textit{A.J.A.}, LXIX, 1965, pp. 25-37.}

\footnote{The coin only suggests that the group was well known in Kyzikos \textit{in Severan times}, but by then a Roman replica of the original could have been set up within the city. That this original was of Hellenistic date is confirmed by iconographic details, which have prompted Brinkerhoff to assign it to \textit{ca. 225 B.C.} He points out that not one, but possibly several examples of the Invitation}
We may even suppose that the original group was in bronze, as compatible with the extant replicas and even desirable for the free gesturing of the satyr's arms. The nymph appears more compact, but her pose could be easily visualized in bronze, with a real rock perhaps serving as base for the statue.

This practice of setting a bronze figure over a natural rock is attested by originals with no extant support and confirmed by marble replicas of the same works where the rock is included. Many statues of this kind must have been set up in gardens, where natural boulders provided the necessary prop and increased the idyllic aspect of the composition, and several such examples have survived from Herculaneum and Pompeii, admittedly uncertainly dated between the late Hellenistic and the Roman period. It could be argued that this pictorial element of connection with landscape is a purely Magna Graecian feature which would therefore be at home in the two Italian towns without necessarily being common to the Hellenistic East, but contact among the Hellenistic states was frequent and crossbreeding of regional artistic trends comparable to reciprocal influence among the genres. The higher frequency of examples from Pompeii and Herculaneum as contrasted with Asia Minor may be determined purely by the sudden nature of their destruction.

In any case, whatever the original medium, the Satyr and Nymph of the Invitation to the Dance cannot have been set up according to canonical standards. Whether on a single base, along a shallow curve, or more freely placed in a natural environment, as I believe, the figures must have stood at some distance from each other and thus formed a "psychological" rather than a "physical" group, in which space was certainly one of the elements of the composition.

The same conclusion can be drawn about another famous group, similarly known only through Roman replicas: the Flaying of Marsyas. The problem is here com-
plicated by the fact that some scholars visualize the original as a three-figured composition, with the Hanging Marsyas, the Scythian Slave, and a seated Apollo, while others consider the Apollo a later addition.\(^{48}\) If a natural setting can be posited also for this group, the Apollo should be eliminated from the original arrangement. This would increase its similarity to the Invitation to the Dance (and in general to Hellenistic groups, which favored two-figured compositions), and would be psychologically more in keeping with Hellenistic tendencies to eliminate divine protagonists from mythological representations, thus reducing a religious or semi-religious parable of hybris punished to a genre episode.\(^{44}\)

Also for the Flaying of Marsyas a bronze original has sometimes been postulated, in which case one could assume that the tree trunk was not rendered in metal but was part of the natural setting. Probably the positioning of the figures was not simply a matter of a semicircle, since it is difficult to reconcile the glance of the Scythian Slave with a Marsyas at the apex of the curve.\(^{45}\) The Satyr must have been almost opposite the Slave, on a forward line; the viewer must have been able to move freely around the group and this explains why the seemingly two-dimensional pose of the Scythian offers so many interesting details from various points of view. If a group of two figures at a distance from each other were to be seen from a main angle, as would obviously be determined by a set base in a normal “city context,” the result would inevitably be somewhat one-sided, and it is for such settings that the more traditional compositions were created, with two figures closely interlocked and oriented toward a main direction.\(^{46}\) The “groups in space” were probably much more limited in range and application and are therefore proportionately fewer in number.

Two more instances can be cited of works composed of loose figures against a natural landscape, which is here attested by the lack of proper support. The first is a marble Andromeda, originally from Sperlonga, with her arms lifted and obviously chained to a background which is now missing and must have been the natural rock.


\(^{44}\) Cf. the similar conclusion reached by R. M. Cook, *Niobe and her Children*, 1964. This is not the place to discuss whether the so-called White or the so-called Red Marsyas should be grouped with the Scythian Slave, since I am mostly interested in the question of setting. For the controversy see, e.g., G. Mansuelli, *Uffizi*, I, 1961, nos. 55-57.


\(^{46}\) E.g., Patroklos and Menelaos (Bieber, fig. 275), Achilles and Penthesileia (Bieber, fig. 279), the Uffizi Wrestlers (Bieber, fig. 267), etc. Obviously these pyramidal groups could also be viewed from all around, but the composition coalesced, as it were, around a central point, while the “groups in space” which I postulate would have no such main focus.
The statue is a Roman work presumably of the second century after Christ, but the original idea of an Andromeda chained to a cliff goes back to Hellenistic times and so may the sculptural prototype. The second is another tableau vivant, the Freeing of Prometheus, and an undoubted Hellenistic original. The group is formed by a reclining male figure identified as Mount Kaukasos, a shooting Herakles, and a chained Prometheus without visible background all carved in the round. The figures have been interpreted as part of a relief-like composition set against the wall of the North Stoa in the temenos of Athena at Pergamon, and perhaps their small size demands a niche location. Schober has also suggested that fragments of other small-scale sculptures found in the vicinity, specifically one of a sea monster, should be interpreted as another labor of Herakles, perhaps the Freeing of Hesione, to be placed as a pendant in a similar niche. But the sea monster would be equally appropriate to a Freeing of Andromeda, and it is interesting to note that these two subjects (the Freeing of Prometheus and of Andromeda) had been painted by Euanthes and set up in the temple at Pelusium, Egypt. The two “reliefs” in Pergamon may have reflected these very paintings, and this would explain the surprising arrangements with figures in the round; it could however be surmised that the reliefs were patterned after sculptural compositions entirely in the round and set within a natural landscape, though in their turn perhaps dependent on, or simply inspired by, Euanthes’ pictures. This conclusion may be supported by the Andromeda from Sperlonga, and by the fact that the Pergamene figures of the Freeing of Prometheus were entirely finished in all their details. Not only Mount Kaukasos in the foreground, but even Herakles, on a more removed plane, show the same degree of finish and modeling, yet their front sides would have been totally invisible in a niche setting; this would not be remarkable, however, if they simply repeated, in reduced scale, a monumental “group in space.”

Euanthes’ chronology is unknown. The Pergamene figures have been variously dated. Krahmer has seen in the Herakles the features of Mithradates VI and has

---

47 The statue was found in the Naples Museum by Dr. B. Conticello, who mentions it together with the other finds from Sperlonga in Apollo, March 1969, pp. 188-193. I am deeply grateful to him for showing me a photograph of this piece. According to K. M. Phillips (op. cit., pp. 12, 22) the motif of Andromeda chained to a rock rather than in between two posts is already established in South Italy by the end of the fourth century B.C.

48 Bieber, figs. 485-487; F. Winter, Altertümer von Pergamon, VII, 2, 1908, no. 168, pp. 175-180, Beil. 25, and fig. 168, a, pl. XXXVII.

49 A. Schober, Die Kunst von Pergamon, 1951, pp. 137-139, restores the composition within a niche approximately 1.50 x 1.00 m.

50 Achilles Tatius, III, 7; see the discussion in Phillips, op. cit., especially for the Andromeda theme, and, for the Prometheus, Ch. Dempsey, J. Warb., XXX, 1967, pp. 420-425.

51 We must also remember that a three-dimensional Prometheus must have been fairly familiar to theatrical audiences accustomed to seeing an actor chained to a rock on the stage of the Aeschylean drama.
therefore dated the group to 88-85 B.C.; Schober thinks the Herakles a portrait of Attalos III, which would move the date to 138-133 B.C.; and Horn considers the drapery close to the Zeus/Hero dedicated by Attalos II to be placed chronologically between 159 and 138 B.C.\(^{52}\) If the Pergamon group is already an adaptation of a larger composition, its prototype should date at least from the first half of the second century, but since both the Invitation to the Dance and the Flaying of Marsyas have been dated not far from 200 B.C., this supposition is still possible.

Hellenistic art may have become more daring with the passing of time. Starting with a two-figured composition, the “groups in space” may have acquired progressively more and more personages. The Freeing of Prometheus includes three, and at least nine must have been present in the Group of the Muses. This highly controversial work has been disputed since Roman times, and its problems cannot be reviewed here.\(^{53}\) Obviously Roman artists must have combined the various Muses differently, supplying a new type when the original was not available. What is of interest, however, is that such a group must have existed in Hellenistic times, since several of the known Muse types appear in the famous Apotheosis of Homer relief by Archelaos of Priene.\(^{54}\) This undoubted Hellenistic relief has provided our major source of information for the appearance of the Muses; can it be consulted also for their setting?

Statues of Muses are appropriate to Libraries and to private houses of wealthy scholars or rulers, but this indoor setting is beyond the scope of my paper. More pertinently, the various sanctuaries of Homer must have been adorned with similar figures, and there a paratactic arrangement of the group cannot be excluded. In Archelaos’ relief, however, the Muses are shown on the slope of a mountain (Parnassos or Helikon), in a scattered arrangement that places them well above the offering scene in the bottom register. This device may have been adopted by the artist purely to differentiate the two spheres of action; or, as Webster has suggested,\(^{55}\) the composition should be read like a Hellenistic poem, beginning with the invocation to Zeus and the Muses at the top and ending with the glorification of Homer at the bottom. But a third possibility is that the relief reflects an actual arrangement of a “group in space,” where the various Muses would be linked only by thematic significance and be otherwise scattered in a garden-like setting, as implied by the rocky

---


\(^{53}\) Recent treatment of the subject by D. Pinkwart (*Das Relief des Archelaos von Priene und die “Musen des Philiskos,”* 1965, especially pp. 157-158, fig. 6) recognizes three main groups of Muses, each dated approximately within the first half of the second century B.C. Though each group must have consisted of all nine Muses, only few members from each of them are known.


seats and ground lines of some of the replicas in the round. Archelaos' relief is usually dated around 130 B.C., but earlier and later dates have been suggested.

A second many-figured composition is the Niobid Group, perhaps as controversial in its reconstruction and chronology as that of the Muses. The problem is complicated by the fact that recent scholarship tends to attribute to the late fourth or early third century B.C. only the group of Niobe and her daughter (a closely knit composition), while the single Niobids are dated either in the first century B.C. or considered additions of Roman date. As for the setting of the group, a long para-
tactic arrangement has been suggested, as well as a compact, pyramidal composition on a single sloping base. I visualize a more scattered ensemble, with the figures placed at relatively wide intervals, in a natural setting such as a grove or garden. The element of terror would thus be emphasized as well as the undetermined origin of the lethal arrows. This psychological approach which leaves to the spectator's imagination, prompted by statuary poses, an important element of the story (the shooting divinities) is known through other Hellenistic works, such as, for instance, the Borghese Warrior. I therefore tend to date the Niobids to the first century B.C., perhaps being created then as additions around an earlier core (Niobe and her daughter) in response to current demands for more complex groupings compatible with sophisticated tastes and available settings.

Even more uncertain is the chronological origin of the many statues of Old Peasants and Fishermen known to us only through Roman replicas. It is usually assumed that they copy Hellenistic prototypes, and certainly the Hellenistic period was fully capable of producing such extreme emaciation and decay, both in terms of technical ability and psychological interest. But where would such statues have been erected? It is doubtful that they could have been votive offerings in sanctuaries, and they were certainly not appropriate for display in civic centers. The only possibility is that they were decorations for private gardens, though the taste that enjoyed a picture of indigent senility in the midst of a luxury villa may seem questionable to us. More pertinently, the question arises whether such statues are truly replicas of

58 For the latter position see Dohrn, op. cit.; for the former, Weber, op. cit.
59 Bieber, figs. 262-263.
61 E.g., Bieber, figs. 591-595. The subject has been investigated, in preliminary fashion, in an Honors paper by A. Rossner, 1969, for the B. A. Degree at Bryn Mawr College. According to her catalogue, none of the published examples can be dated with certainty within the Hellenistic period, but all seem to be Roman copies or are at least so considered by some scholars. A sharp distinction should be made between grotesque representations or simply portraits of old people and these statues of low class peasants and fishermen, which fall into a category of their own.
Hellenistic works or simply creations of Roman times in Hellenistic style. The problem deserves much lengthier and careful consideration.

Definitely Hellenistic, and much more appealing as garden decoration, are the many statues of satyrs and nymphs preserved not only in Roman copies but also in unquestionable originals. Some have already been mentioned in connection with natural settings, but others must have carried their setting with them, so to speak, and incorporated the rocky seat within the composition. A most famous example is the so-called Barberini Faun in Munich, traditionally considered a Greek original though the type and pose are attested in bronze. A casual visitor, or the owner himself, must have been pleasantly surprised in suddenly coming upon a satyr asleep in his garden, perhaps under some trees or near a pool of water.

The presence of a pool or fountain seems also implied in some statues of nymphs sliding down their rocky perch to dip a foot in the water, as known through an original in Rhodes and Roman replicas elsewhere. Since the nymph is under life size, we can imagine it within a house garden or peristyle court. Unfortunately our evidence of Hellenistic houses does not speak in favor of house gardens or peristyle pools, but gardens may have been of the potted variety within the court and the fountain of the portable type. Moreover, our information on the Hellenistic house is mostly derived from Delos which suffered from lack of water; Rhodes may have been better equipped, and indeed Vitruvius refers to a specific type of colonnaded court as the Rhodian peristyle, but we have no evidence on Rhodian habitations. Macedonia too is relatively unknown archaeologically, but it offers two of the basic prerequisites: abundance of water and a strong aristocracy which could have facilitated or even required the making of such garden sculpture.

We know positively, however, that peristyles at Delos were adorned with sculptures, and statuettes have been found in apartment rooms at Priene, therefore justifying the supposition that by Hellenistic times art had penetrated the private house as pure decoration. Many athletic monuments also adorned Hellenistic gym-

---

62 Supra, note 38.
63 Bieber, figs. 450-451.
64 The suggestion is made by A. Maiuri, Clara Rhodos, II, 1932, no. 7, fig. 10, because the feet of the Rhodian statuette are broken off and he visualizes them unshod. The Vicenza and the Vatican replicas wear sandals, but the Vicenza figure is known to have stood near water since it was adapted into a fountain. The supposition is likely to be correct for the original. The precarious position is best seen in a detail photograph of the Vicenza replica, G. Gualandi, Rev. Arch., N.S., 1969, p. 270, fig. 28.
65 Vitruvius, De Arch., VI, 7, 3. Most information on this subject can be found in R. E. Wycherley, How the Greeks Built Cities (1949, 2nd ed. 1962; Doubleday Paperback 1969), Ch. VII. Note also the evidence of a private house in Delos (the so-called Maison de Fourni), which, built against sloping ground, utilized the natural rock for a nymphaeum within a peristyle: Guide de Délos, 1965, pp. 165-166. A strong distinction should moreover be made between house gardens of ordinary citizens, which probably emphasized the utilitarian aspect of the commodity, and those of the wealthy rulers, which afforded more scope for decoration.
66 E.g., T. Wiegand and H. Schrader, Priene, 1904, p. 321, where there is a suggestion that a
nasia and palaestrae, no longer as victory dedications but probably as pure representations of athletic activities.\(^{67}\) Suburban gymnasia were also rich in vegetation and gardens filled with statues of gods and heroes. Water was an important element of every athletic field, and gymnasia, so often used also for scholarly purposes, abounded in pools and fountains. But fountains must have been also adornment for private houses despite our lack of excavational evidence. While the civic fountain for public use remained a relatively simple architectural structure, water organs and other interesting mechanical devices were employed for private fountains, obtaining motion and sound effects that were later imitated by humanistic fountains, obtaining motion and sound effects that were later imitated by humanistic fountains, obtaining motion and sound effects that were later imitated by humanistic fountains, obtaining motion and sound effects that were later imitated by humanistic fountains, obtaining motion and sound effects that were later imitated by humanistic fountains, obtaining motion and sound effects that were later imitated by humanistic.

Fountains also became more spectacular in sanctuaries or agoras whenever they rose to the importance of victory monuments with decorative, but no practical, utilitarian function. The most famous example is of course the Nike of Samothrace,\(^{68}\) which provides excellent demonstration of the illusionistic tendencies and landscape exploitation of the Hellenistic period. In its rocky basin, emerging, as it were, from its background so that only the prow of the ship was revealed, the Nike stood against the wind that also today blows from the North into the gully, in one of the most spectacular monuments of antiquity.

A presumably later example has now been re-erected in the Agora of Cyrene,\(^{70}\) in a less effective setting because surrounded by buildings, but still emerging from a niche and within a shallow pool of water, though the crowning statue could presumably be seen from all sides.\(^{71}\) The ship’s prow is flanked by two capering dolphins statuette of Aphrodite may have been kept in the upper storey. Nancy Winter, in an unpublished M. A. Dissertation, Bryn Mawr College 1970, has discussed a statuette of Aphrodite Anadyomene from Benghazi in the University Museum, Philadelphia, which must have formed a similar apartment decoration and must have stood in a pool of water or over a glass surface imitating the sea to suggest her rising from the waves; the statuette is a semi-statue, carved only to the beginning of the thighs and never meant to be attached to a lower section. Miss Winter will discuss the piece in a forthcoming article, which will take into account “impressionistic settings.” The Philadelphia statuette is particularly interesting in this respect because it shows that such illusions could be achieved also for small-scale works and not only for large compositions in outdoor locations.

\(^{67}\) Pliny, \textit{N.H.}, XXXIV, 18, speaks of naked statues of ephes in Greek Gymnasia called “Achilles”; and Cicero (\textit{Ad Atticum, I, 6, 2; I, 9, 2; I, 10, 3}) speaks repeatedly of statues and herms appropriate for palaestrae and gymnasia which he wants his friend to acquire for him in Greece.

\(^{68}\) For an interesting account, H. V. Morton, \textit{The Fountains of Rome}, 1966, pp. 24-26, and his description of Montaigne’s fountain at Tivoli, with whistling birds, a moving owl, pulleys, siphons and compressed air.


\(^{71}\) The unfinished appearance of the statue’s back is considered a recutting by Stucchi (op. cit.), an original feature by G. Gualandi, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 261, note 1.
and surmounted by a female figure variously interpreted as Nike or Athena, though against the first interpretation speaks the lack of wings, and against the second the lack of helmet. The date of the statue has been greatly disputed, especially because its connection with a naval monument is not clear; since its dependence on the Samothracian prototype seems logical, it should slightly postdate the Nike, usually attributed to ca. 180-150 B.C., but a date after Actium has also been suggested.\textsuperscript{72}

Quite similar in arrangement and location was a naval monument in the Agora of Thasos, which has also been attributed to the second century B.C., but here we lack information about the crowning statue.\textsuperscript{73} Finally, in Rhodes two such monuments exist. One, the traditional ship base, is a dedication by 288 sailors in the sanctuary of Athena Lindia, placed against the east wall of the stoa pointing toward the sea and surmounted by a statue now lost, presumably also a Nike. It is dated around 265-260 B.C. The second, probably ca. 180 B.C., is the well known honorary relief carved from the rock of the Lindian Akropolis and once supporting the statue of the honored man, Hagesandros son of Mikion; this time the stern of the ship was shown, illusionistically gliding out of sight behind the boulder marking the left edge of the relief.\textsuperscript{74}

This utilization of the natural landscape for honorary purposes emphasizes the difference in the Hellenistic approach. Rock-cut reliefs had existed in Greece since Archaic times, but they were usually of a more personal nature and generally connected with rustic shrines and votive offerings.\textsuperscript{75} The Rhodian ship is instead an official monument to an individual set up at public expense. That landscape could be utilized in even more grandiose ways is perhaps also expressed by an anecdote in Vitruvius (2, Introduction), according to which Deinokrates, the architect of Alexandria in Egypt, had at first impressed himself upon Alexander’s attention by suggesting the carving of Mount Athos into the statue of a man supporting a fortified city in his left hand and a bowl in his right, to collect all the mountain streams.

\textsuperscript{73} \textit{École Française d'Athènes, Guide de Thasos}, 1968, p. 27, plan, fig. 6.
\textsuperscript{74} Chr. Blinkenberg, \textit{Lindos}, II, 1941, nos. 88, 169. One should perhaps also mention in this context the two ships connected with the Sperlonga grotto, one fashioned around the living rock on the outside of the cave proper, the other, a work of sculpture, found in the interior and most likely placed against a background from which the ship appeared to emerge. The first ship, the Argo, is undoubtedly of Roman date; the second, probably depicting Odysseus escaping Charybdis, may be a Roman creation made expressly for the cave, a Roman adaptation or copy of a Greek original, or a Hellenistic original itself. While the sculpture is still being restored it is perhaps safer to suspend judgment. It is however interesting to note that, even if a Roman creation, this work can only be conceived as inspired by Hellenistic practices. For the latest opinions on Sperlonga see P. von Blanckenhagen, \textit{Arch Anz.}, 1969, cols. 256-275, with previous bibliography.

Though this ambitious but impractical project was never carried out and perhaps was not even suggested, the inclusion of the story by Vitruvius may imply that such colossal enterprises were considered within the realm of credibility.

In fact the Hellenistic period, from its inception, revived a use of the colossal in statuary that had predominated in the early sixth century but had then tapered off without ever being completely abandoned. Colossal statuary must in itself have altered or created a landscape, such as the enormous seated Herakles by Lysippos on the Akropolis of Tarentum. Pliny (N.H., XXXIV, 40) tells us that it was 40 cubits high (as contrasted with the Pheidian Parthenos which was only 26, N.H., XXXVI, 18) and that a column was located opposite it in order to break the force of the wind against the statue. The setting of such a huge monument must have required definite planning and was surely meant to be of a permanent nature. Similarly the Rhodian Colossus, even if not located astride the harbor, must have been one of its most distinctive features as it stood on a large area near by. Pliny (N.H., XXXIV, 41) gives its height as 70 cubits, ca. 105 feet, but calculations have gone as high as 120 feet. Destroyed by the earthquake of 224 B.C., after standing for 56 years, the Helios must have been completed in 280 B.C.78

Less colossal official dedications may have also had non-conventional setting. Suffice it here to remember the Attalid dedications on the Athenian Akropolis placed on the fortification wall overlooking the Theater of Dionysos. The under-life-sized figures represented mostly defeated enemies in reclining or semi-reclining positions;77 they therefore needed a rather tall pedestal but not so tall as to be above eye-level. The Akropolis wall may have been a choice dictated by necessity in an already cluttered sanctuary; on the other hand it may have forcibly suggested the fate of enemies scaling the walls of Athens, and, being different from a traditional statue base, may have added a touch of the pictorial to the arrangement. Finally the obvious thematic connection with the sculptures of the Parthenon must have been decisive in selecting this particular location for a monument emphasizing the victory of civilization over barbarism.78 Far from being a last-resort arrangement, location on the Akropolis wall would show the preferential treatment Attalos was granted in accommodating his offering in an overcrowded sanctuary.

Shrines of more recent establishment left more scope for planning, in keeping with the new tendencies of the period. We should here recall the evidence of the Sarapieion at Memphis, which goes back to the New Kingdom but received considerable additions in Ptolemaic times.79 These consisted basically of a semicircular exedra

76 For a recent reconstruction, H. Maryon, J.H.S., LXXVI, 1956, pp. 68-86.
77 Bieber, figs. 435-436.
78 For the possibility that also victorious opponents were represented with the defeated enemies see the episode in Plutarch, Antony, 60, about the statue of Dionysos from the “Battle of the Giants” which was blown into the Theater of Dionysos on the eve of the battle of Actium.
of seated statues facing an avenue lined by 380 Egyptian sphinxes and terminating a long dromos flanked by two low walls over which several Hellenistic statues stood. The visitor walking along the dromos would have been accompanied by a strange procession of lions, sirens, sphinxes, peacocks, pantheresses and even Cerberos, many of these animals straddled by figures of small boys and decked with grape leaves and bunches. Avenues flanked by sphinxes are traditional in Egyptian architecture, and the Greeks had once before borrowed a similar decorative idea for the unique row of archaic lions at Delos. But the unusual components of the Memphite procession are steeped in the new Dionysiac symbolism of the times and may have translated into stone some of the eccentric religious parades held under the Ptolemies.

The date of the Hellenistic additions is disputed and mostly rests on the identification of some of the seated statues in the Exedra. Lauer and Picard recognized in one figure Demetrios of Phaleron and therefore assumed that the statue had been erected prior to his fall from favor and death in 285 B.C. On the other hand Matz identifies Ptolemy Philometor in one of the heads from the complex and would therefore date it not later than 176, while Jucker prefers the second half of the second century B.C. There is no question, however, that manufacture and arrangement of all the statues took place under the Ptolemies, in the Hellenistic period.

It is therefore from the Hellenistic Greeks that the Romans received their love for spectacular arrangements and natural settings. The finds from Sperlonga have received so much attention that it would be superfluous to review them here, together with their dramatic location. Suffice it here to mention the less well known, and perhaps earlier, arrangement recently detected in the Blue Grotto at Capri, where a rocky ledge slightly under water level served as support for half-statues of Poseidon and other marine beings, represented as if emerging from the waves all around the interior of the cave.

These notes are inevitably sketchy and superficial, but may suffice to point out the complexity of the question presented by the setting of Hellenistic sculpture. What justifies my attempt, even with all its limitations, is the fact that any enquiry on Hellenistic inclinations and tastes as revealed by the specific location and composition of the monuments is bound to increase our understanding of the people and their period as a whole—an understanding which, after all, is the main purpose of Archaeology.

Bryn Mawr College

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

80 The Branchidai statues at Didyma do not fall into this category because they were erected in successive times and should rather rank with official monuments alongside roads, such as those of cemeteries or sanctuaries.
81 F. Matz, Gnomon, XXIX, 1957, pp. 84-93; this date is also accepted by H. von Heintze, Helbig, Führer, no. 1334. H. Jucker, Gnomon, XLI, 1969, p. 79, note 2.