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Art and Material Culture in the Making
Approaches to the Study of Greek Sculpture

Sheila Dillon

Professor and Chair, Department of Art, Art History & Visual Studies, Duke University (sheila.dillon@duke.edu)

In a 2005 paper entitled ‘The Study of Greek Sculpture in the Twenty-first Century’, Brunilde Ridgway laid out what she considered to be some of the most significant changes in our thinking about and approaches to the subject.¹ Some of these recent scholarly shifts include an emphasis on context, the undermining of the notion of linear stylistic development, interest in the technical aspects of sculptural production, and the re-evaluation of Roman-period ‘copies’. As she rightly points out, until fairly recently the ways in which we study Greek sculpture have not changed radically since the discipline was established in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Indeed, one finds much that is familiar in a lecture on Greek sculpture delivered by A. J. B. Wace in 1935 in which he outlined an approach to its study.²

But much has also changed. Scientific analyses of sculpture are now much more common and have revolutionized what we know and the way we think about the material. Marble provenancing is an important advance and has produced some real surprises.³ The study of the polychromy of marble sculpture is perhaps one of the fastest growing areas of scientific research; it also has the capacity to shock and surprise.⁴ In addition, there have been a number of astounding new discoveries: the twin archaic kouroi made of Parian marble found near ancient Tènea in the Corinthiaid; the colossal kore found on the island of Thera; the numerous Hellenistic bronze statues fished out of the sea off the coast of Kalymnos; the Hellenistic funerary monument with high-quality sculpture in Parian marble discovered in Pydna in 2014; and, of course, in the same year, the excavation of a massive tumulus at Amphipolis, which has created a great deal of controversy in the Greek press.⁵ Moreover, many of the finds from the Athens Metro excavations still await final publication.⁶ It is an exciting moment in Greek sculpture studies.

The large number of publications on Greek sculpture that have appeared in the past few decades attests to the strength and vitality of the discipline. I highlight only a selection here, as any bibliography will swiftly be out of date.⁷ Important to note as sources of raw material for future research is the publication of major reference polychromy is quickly growing: basic are Brinkmann 2003; Brinkmann and others 2010; Posamentir 2011. See also the Ancient Polychromy Network at the University of Georgia <http://www.ancientpolychromynetwork.com> [accessed 1 March 2017] and the regular reports of the Tracking Colour project at the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek in Copenhagen <http://www.trackingcolour.com> [accessed 1 March 2017]. For a critique of the reconstructions, see Neer 2010, 75–76.

¹ Ridgway 2005. Still foundational to the study of Greek sculpture is Stewart 1990. See also the review of research methods and approaches in Kokkorou-Alevras 2007. Palagia forthcoming will be an important resource.
² Wace 1935.
³ For example, that the kouroi from Sounion are made of Parian marble, not Naxian as has long been thought: Palagia 2014–15, 104–05. The ASMOsIA (Association for the Study of Marble and other Stones in Antiquity) conferences, held yearly since 1988, and the published conference proceedings, have been a very important development in the study of Greek sculpture.
⁴ For example, that the Diadoumenos from Delos was gilded: Bourgeois and Jockey 2010, 230. The bibliography on
⁵ For a fuller accounting of more recent discoveries, see Palagia 2014–15.
⁶ Preliminary publication: Parlama and Stambolidis 2001. A few more in-depth studies of some of the findings have since appeared in Vlizos 2008.
⁷ Dyabola, the bibliographic database through the German Archaeological Institute, is an essential research tool, which is available by subscription. The free version of the Dyabola database is called Zenon, and is available at <http://opac.dainst.org/ALEPH/> [accessed 1 March 2017].
works, such as the significantly expanded collection of ancient sources in *Der Neue Overbeck,* and the comprehensive database of figured Attic funerary monuments through Projekt Dyabola. Catalogues of museum collections are also an important resource for research on Greek sculpture; noteworthy are the recent catalogues of the sculpture in Kavala, the archaic sculpture in the National Archaeological Museum in Athens, and the Hellenistic sculpture in the Rhodes museum. The same is true for exhibition catalogues, particularly those that include essays by leading scholars in the field and those that present sculpture not typically on display. Exemplary in this regard are the recent catalogues for the Hellenistic bronzes exhibit in 2015–16, the exhibition of the sculptures and other material from the Antikythera shipwreck in Athens in 2012, an exhibition on ancient portraiture in Rome in 2011, and the exhibition on polychromy in classical sculpture in 2007. Exhibitions and their accompanying catalogues even have the potential to generate scholarly controversy, as shown by the recent exchange in the *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* about bronze casting and the nature and extent of serial production in Greek bronze sculpture. This debate, the terms of which are spelled out in this series of responses, clearly shows how much we still do not fully understand about the production of hollow-cast bronze statues in classical antiquity. The technical aspects of sculptural production in both bronze and marble require further research and analysis. For example, while it has long been an article of faith that marble sculptors always travelled with their material — that is, that the presence of Parian or Naxian marble sculpture outside of Paros and Naxos means the existence of itinerant sculptors from these islands, a recent study has suggested a more complex model and a variety of practices, at least for the Roman period.

It might, therefore, be productive to re-examine the issue of sculptors and material in earlier periods. Classical Athens and Hellenistic Delos are two contexts ripe for reassessment.

Finally, there have also been important publications that gather together specific categories of sculptural material, such as archaic korai and funerary sculpture from the Athenian Agora. Older studies that bring together Hellenistic grave monuments, Hellenistic sculpture from Kos and Samos, draped female statues, and draped male statues are still very useful; all provide a wealth of material evidence for future research projects on Greek sculpture. In the following section, I summarize four recent studies of Greek sculpture, three of which take a fresh look at evidence discovered long ago, while the fourth presents a completely new way to approach the study of sculpture. They represent a range of approaches that can be productively applied to the interpretation of other material and other contexts.

**Approaches to the Study of Greek Sculpture: Four Model Studies**

The following four contributions are exemplary in their approach to the study of Greek sculpture; each takes advantage of the full range of evidence available for their subjects, and each offers interpretations that are models of historical, art historical, and/or archaeological research. The first two, by R. R. R. Smith and Andrew Stewart, deal in different ways with the revolution in sculptural production in the first half of the fifth century BCE, a period of great interest to classical art historians and archaeologists. The third, by Peter Schultz, focuses on fourth-century architectural sculpture and explores in a novel way the link between artistic agency and stylistic change. The fourth, by Athanasia Kyriakou and Alexandros Tourtas, offers a very different perspective, one that shifts the focus from the sculpture found in sanctuary deposits as the object of study to an analysis of the process by which this sculpture enters the archaeological record.

---

8 Kansteiner and others 2014; see also the reviews by Osborne 2015 and Squire 2015.
9 Bergemann 1998.
10 Damakos 2013.
11 Despinis and Kaltzas 2014.
12 Machaira 2011.
13 Daehner and Lapatin 2015.
14 Kaltzas and others 2012.
15 La Rocca and others 2011.
16 Brinkmann and Wünsche 2007.
17 Ridgway 2015; Barr-Sharrar 2016; Ridgway 2016.
18 For the technical aspects of marble sculpture, see Palagia 2006.
19 Russell 2013.
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In a paper originally written for a 2002 seminar series in London, R. R. R. Smith looks at the history of the ancient Greek statue habit and the revolution in statue making in the first half of the fifth century BCE through the lens of athletic victor statues at Olympia. Smith first sketches out the importance of freestanding statues in the ancient Greek and Roman sculptural landscape; because of their prominence and ubiquity, they demand our serious attention. This long historical view, from about 600 BCE to 600 CE, is important for understanding the particular and historically specific role played by athlete statues in the period with which Smith is concerned. He discusses the radical changes that took place in image making from the late sixth to the early fifth centuries BCE, bringing to bear a wide range of evidence, from changes in technology, language, visual theory, and real life self-styling. The production, functions, and contexts of statues also change during this period, with the introduction of large-scale bronzes, multi-figure victory monuments, and the shift of aristocratic elite display from the cemetery to the sanctuary.

The main part of Smith's chapter examines the evidence for athlete statues at Olympia. Literary and epigraphic evidence in the form of inscribed statue bases provide a great deal of information for the subject, but the fragmentary remains of sculpture in both bronze and marble are also used to great effect. As Smith points out, this evidence clearly shows that victor statues occupied a somewhat unusual space between votive statue, well known from the archaic period, and portrait statue, which is something new in this period. It seems to me that these athlete statues also represent an important but frankly neglected phase in the development of the honorific portrait statue, as statues of athletes tend not to figure in our histories of Greek portraiture. Other than the statues of the Tyrannicides, athlete statues are the earliest examples of images of historical individuals who were alive — as the Tyrannicides were not — at the time their statues were set up. With athlete statues, however, honorand and dedicatror were the same, a practice not seen, or at least not at all common, in later portrait practice. In any case, it would be productive to incorporate statues of athletes into our histories of portraiture just as it has been to include images of women.

Smith also considers the sculptors who made the statues as well as the statues' style. In contrast to other periods, a high percentage of athlete statues made in the first half of the fifth century were signed by their makers, all of whom were big names. And the statues they made were, by all measures, remarkably expensive. Because the actual physical evidence for the appearance of these statues is exceedingly fragmentary — only bits and pieces of the bronzes and battered marble torsos are preserved, Smith brings in a wide range of evidence to reconstruct what they may have looked like. From this evidence, he successfully evokes their appearance: powerful, aggressive, hard-hitting, finely shaped, precise, realistic, and eye-catching, much like the athletes themselves.

Figure 14.1. Grave kouros of Aristodikos. Athens, National Archaeological Museum inv. 3938. Photo by author.

28 Dillon 2010.
The styling of these figures did not only involve the careful delineation of the bold musculature of the hardened, disciplined body, but it also extended to the body’s hair. In a fascinating section, Smith brings in an appendix from a study by Christos Karouzos on the Aristodikos kouros to explore the social meanings of the elaborate and careful styling of the pubic hair on archaic and early classical male statues and the importance of male genital display in Greek art and life (fig. 14.1). This is a much more interesting analysis than the more usual explanations of ‘heroic nudity’ or ‘nudity as costume’.\(^{30}\)

In sum, Smith shows how these athlete statues represent ‘aristocratic body supremacy’ at a moment of dramatic change — historically, in the transition from the archaic to the early classical period and the world-changing event of the Persian Wars and, art-historically, in the emergence of a more sophisticated technology for casting large-scale bronzes and of a radically new style in Greek sculpture. Smith sees this revolution in style and statue making as part of much wider changes and one that took place over the course of the first half of the fifth century, while Andrew Stewart has recently suggested this revolution was an abrupt rupture. He ascribes the emergence of the early classical style to two sculptors: Kritios and Nesiotes.

In a series of groundbreaking articles published in 2008, Andrew Stewart addresses the issue of the date of the emergence of the early classical style (also known as the ‘Severe’ style) in Greek sculpture.\(^{31}\) This is a question with which art historians have long grappled, but Stewart is one of the first to approach the question from an archaeological perspective. He focuses on the sculptures and associated material found in debris deposits that have historically been connected with the Persian invasion of 480. His arguments are complex, densely argued, and even more densely footnoted — the amount of research represented here is vast, and I cannot do justice to this work in a brief summary. As his findings from the Athenian Acropolis and the Temple of Aphaia at Aegina have perhaps the most direct relevance to the study of Greek sculpture, I highlight them here, as well as the orientation to the problem with which he begins.

Stewart first summarizes the long history of scholarship on the date of the emergence of the early classical style, a question that goes back to Winckelmann and the origins of modern art history. Currently there are two basic positions: 1) the early classical style emerged in the immediate aftermath of the Persian Wars as a sort of Panhellenic response to their surprising defeat of a decadent but powerful Eastern empire;\(^{32}\) or 2) the early classical style emerged gradually during the first half of the fifth century, predating the Persian invasions and therefore not caused by them.\(^{33}\) In order to try to settle the issue, Stewart re-examined all the so-called Perserschutt deposits on the Athenian Acropolis but found only one that was pure Persian destruction debris: the famous ‘korai graveyard’ north-west of the Erechtheion, from which all of the sculptures were archaic in style. Severe-style sculptures are indeed found in other debris pits on the Acropolis, along with archaic material, but these are mixed deposits created during the massive cleaning, terracing, fortifying, and rebuilding that occurred on the Acropolis between 479 and 450, when the sanctuary was a vast building site. Stewart comes to the conclusion that the archaeological evidence supports the theory that the early classical style in Greek sculpture began just after the Persian sack of 480 and not before.

Like the date of the emergence of the classical style, the date/s of the pedimental sculpture from the Temple of Aphaia at Aegina have long been at the centre of scholarly controversy: does the seemingly high number of pedimental figures suggest that a replacement set or two were at some point made? If so, what are the dates of these three or four pediments? Suggested dates for the preserved pediments, now on display in Munich, have varied widely, from 510 to 470 BCE, with the statues of the west pediment placed at least a decade earlier than those of the east. Indeed, a comparison between the fallen warrior of the west pediment and the one on the east is something I remember appearing on slide exams from my undergraduate days. Stewart instead argues for a single building campaign, a single decorative programme, and a date after 480, ideas other scholars have been moving towards as well; recently published textbooks have endorsed this redating.\(^{34}\) This lower date sits quite well with our ideas about the style of the more progressive-looking east pediment, but what about the more archaic-looking figures from the west pediment? In a study that is unfortunately still unpublished,\(^{35}\) Norbert Eschbach

\(^{30}\) Karouzos 1961, 72–83.

\(^{31}\) Stewart 2008a, 2008b.

\(^{32}\) See, for example, Ridgway 1993 and Hurwit 1999.

\(^{33}\) The position of Steskal 2004 and Neer 2010.

\(^{34}\) Neer 2012, 215; Barringer 2015, 198–201.

\(^{35}\) Eschbach forthcoming.
suggests that, while two different workshops were responsible for each pediment, similarities between the two show that the workshops were perhaps communicating with one another or at least observing what the other was doing. Given the differences in style, one workshop was probably more conservative and traditional, while the other was more cutting-edge and forward-looking. Rather than the difference in style indicating a difference in date, as has traditionally been assumed, we have a difference in artistic technique, outlook, and an interest in experimentation, ideas also engaged with in Schultz’s contribution discussed below. I find this notion of two differently minded workshops an attractive hypothesis, because it gives back a degree of agency and innovation to individuals, and in the end, it was individuals who made the statues we now have before us.36

Stewart concludes his analysis with an exploration of the motivations and meaning of the early classical style. He argues that, rather than emerging gradually over the course of the first half of the fifth century, the style develops suddenly, in Athens, and in a single, exceedingly important statue group: the replacement Tyrannicides by the sculptors Kritios and Nesiotes, set up in the Athenian Agora in 477/76. That the later Roman versions of these statues preserve some archaic stylistic mannerisms, such as the slight smile, makes them, in Stewart’s words, ‘truly cutting-edge stylistically’. In Stewart’s account, the sculptors are the innovators; while a committee must have overseen the commission of the replacement statue group, committees do not invent revolutionary new styles. Only artists, who understand the limits of their material and are willing to push the boundaries of their craft, can achieve this kind of dramatic change.

We find a related approach in Peter Schultz’s study, which focuses on the rich epigraphic and material evidence from the Temple of Asklepios at Epidaurus, where both the inscribed building accounts and the sculptural decoration are preserved.37 Like Stewart, Schultz is also interested in considering the impact of individual sculptors on stylistic changes in Greek art. The inscribed accounts from Epidaurus provide detailed information about the sculptors’ assignments and how much they were paid for their work. Schultz’s animating question is the following: why was the sculptor Timotheos, who made the temple’s three akroteria, paid four times as much per figure as the sculptor Hektoridas, who made the more numerous pedimental sculptures? Through a close and detailed examination of the material evidence, including consideration of logistics, raw materials, sculptural form, composition, and technique, Schultz constructs a compelling connection between sculptural style, experimental practice, virtuoso technique, and the artistic standing and economic power of individual sculptors.

36 See the important new study by D’Angour 2011.
37 Schultz 2009.
His analysis considers a variety of potential factors that might have led to the differentiation in price. Was the quality of the Pentelic marble used for the pedimental figures less fine than that used for the akroteria? By looking closely at the material and describing its qualities, he concludes that both sets of sculpture were made from the same high-quality marble, so this cannot account for the difference in wages paid. Was the large payment made to Timotheos for other aspects of the project that are not detailed in the building accounts? This seems unlikely, as other peripheral aspects of the decorative programme were listed separately, and another craftsman is paid for the decoration (setting and painting?) of the akroteria. Perhaps the akroteria were gilded? Here, Schultz brings together a range of interesting evidence on the costs of gilding to show that — surprisingly — it was relatively cheap.

Schultz then turns to the style and the virtuoso carving of the akroteria in comparison with the perfectly adequate workmanship of the pedimental figures. Here, the descriptive power of his prose really shines. Timotheos’s akroterial Nike are complex in composition and form and dramatic in pose (figs 14.2–14.3). The drapery of the Nike shows deeply carved pockets of shadow and folds that billow up and project out from the slender body. The marble wing curves up dramatically into the air, with an eggshell-thin swoop of fabric that swirls out behind it. This is a theatrical, virtuoso piece of sculpture in which the sculptor has pushed the physical properties of the material to their very limits. It was for his exceptional skill, marvellous technique, and cutting-edge style that Timotheos was compensated so handsomely. As Schultz argues, he was clearly a master sculptor, recognized as such by his contemporaries, and therefore paid appropriately for his talents.

Schultz’s study is a model for analysing the relationship in antiquity between individual artistic agency, aesthetic achievement, and the high social standing — among both patrons and other artists — that might accrue to a particular sculptor as a result. In considering the potential impact that individual sculptors may have had on the development of Greek sculpture, he puts the artist at the centre of inquiry, which is a most welcome move. While much of Greek sculpture, such as classical Attic tombstones or votive reliefs, might well be ‘an anonymous product of an impersonal craft’, this is certainly not the case here. Schultz’s argument is multi-stranded, and he does not shy away from questioning existing interpretive paradigms, such as the traditional

38 Carpenter 1960, v.
how such pits themselves were formed.\textsuperscript{39} They analyse four refuse pits located inside and around Temple II in the Sanctuary of Eukleia at Vergina. I focus here on the large so-called ‘statuary pit’, which contained a marble statue and three marble heads, in addition to pottery associated with ritual feasting and evidence for burning (fig. 14.4). The construction of the pit itself is dated to the first century BCE–first century CE, while the sculpture it contains is dated to the fourth century BCE. The fragmentary statuary was carefully placed in the pit; breakage appears to have occurred before deposition and not as a result of it. The placement of the female statue body would have required significant collaboration, as the piece is estimated to weigh about a ton. The statue was then covered with fieldstones. An inscribed marble base, probably belonging to the statue, was found next to it. Part of the head, including the face of the female statue, was positioned face up in the pit, and the two additional heads, one male and one female, were buried face down. All three were then carefully encircled with fieldstones. According to Kyriakou and Tourtas, the way in which the statuary was deposited closely follows mortuary practices; that is, while this is a pit with refuse from the sanctuary — a well-known feature of many Greek sanctuary contexts, the statuary was not haphazardly discarded but carefully buried with appropriate ritual activity as if this were a tomb.

The date of the pit appears to coincide with the decline of the sanctuary as well as the city of Aegae in which the sanctuary is located. The authors hypothesize that the burial of the statuary may therefore be a material indication of a period of crisis in the city’s history, and evidence of one way in which social groups reacted to or managed such crisis and decline. While they admit that more analysis is necessary, Kyriakou and Tourtas suggest that the careful burial of the sculpture — objects that represent the city’s distant and glorious past — may perhaps be linked to newly emerging elite groups who are attempting to establish their identity within a new context through this intervention in the sanctuary and the ritualized manipulation of its remains. Although their conclusions are necessarily preliminary, their study has opened up a new way of thinking about and analysing the archaeology of sculpture. By broadening the focus from the objects found within such deposits to consider the processes by which the deposits were formed, this perspective adds an exciting new dimension to the approaches we might take in studying Greek sculpture.

\textsuperscript{39} Kyriakou and Tourtas 2015.

\section*{Studying Greek Sculpture: Some Practical Considerations and Personal Suggestions}

My own approach to studying Greek sculpture begins with the material itself. This may seem self-evident, but it deserves stating up front. Examining sculpture first hand has always played a central role in my research; while I have not always been able to hold to this rule, I try not to write about something that I have not seen for myself.\textsuperscript{40} This was the way I was trained as a graduate student: any interpretation must be grounded in and evolve out of direct and sustained engagement with the material remains. I have also learned that one needs to give as much attention to the battered and fragmentary pieces, the second and even third-rate examples, as to the better-preserved and aesthetically spectacular ones. To do otherwise is to cherry-pick the data. For example, many synthetic studies of figured classical Attic tombstones and their social and historical significance tend to rely on a very small number of examples to support their interpretation.\textsuperscript{41} In order to really understand this body of material, one would need to take into account many more of the nearly three thousand examples of these monuments that survive.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{40} How does one go about getting permission to study sculpture, either from an excavation or in a museum collection? The process of securing permissions will undoubtedly vary from country to country and institution to institution. I have found that most museums in the United States and Europe are very happy to accommodate requests, as long as you give them enough lead-time and are flexible in your scheduling. Formal letters to see objects in museums should state clearly who you are, the nature of your project, and your institutional affiliation. They should include the museum inventory numbers of the pieces you wish to see with their most recent publication information and be addressed to the curator in charge of the collection. In addition, it is very helpful to include images of the pieces with your request; this can help museum staff locate objects more easily, particularly in museums that have very large collections and might have a great deal of material also in storage. For material from excavations, you must contact the excavation director; the formal request should include the information detailed above. In Greece, the system with which I am most familiar, permit applications are typically made through the foreign archaeological school with which you are affiliated. In any case, be sure to plan ahead: securing permissions and scheduling to see material can sometimes take months.

\textsuperscript{41} For example, Leader 1997; Osborne 1996; 1997; Stears 1995.

\textsuperscript{42} The material has been catalogued in Clairmont 1993 and Bergemann 1998. Any such study should also take into account the many inscribed funerary stelai without figural decoration. For a comprehensive study of inscribed Attic epitaphs, see Meyer 1993.
Whenever possible, I believe it is best to deal with sculpture from an excavated context. Focusing on material that comes from an archaeological excavation forces you to engage with the full range of evidence, to consider the mass of sculptural fragments that form the necessary background against which those examples that are better preserved and of outstanding quality need to be evaluated and understood. The task of working through this material also requires you to organize and categorize the sculpture — at least initially — according to established conventions. Through this process, one not only discovers how well or how poorly individual sculptures and fragments perform in relation to these conventions, that is, how easy or how difficult it is to fit them into already established categories, but also how the material might be organized or thought about differently. You need to fully understand and engage with any master narrative in order to critique it effectively. For example, it was because of the difficulties we encountered in deciding, based on their appearance, which female heads from Aphrodisias belonged in the portrait volume and which did not, and the fact that this was not a problem we encountered with male heads, that I first began to think about female portraits and the issue of likeness. This line of research led to my book project on female portraiture in the Greek world.\footnote{Smith and others 2006, esp. 7.}

Working with sculpture and sculptural fragments from an excavation also opens up a less-often considered axis of archaeological analysis in the study of sculpture: patterns of deposition. Such an analysis would include the painstaking study of excavation notebooks, the mapping of the find-spots of sculpture, and the consideration of what has survived, and how it has survived. While find-spots may tell us nothing about a sculpture’s original date of manufacture, they can reveal a great deal about a statue’s life and later history which, I would argue, is just as important as the date that it was made. In my current project on the portrait sculpture from the Athenian Agora,\footnote{Dillon forthcoming.} for example, the portraits found either in debris deposits from the Herulian sack in 267 CE (figs 14.5–14.6) or built into the post-Herulian wall provide important information that can help us to reconstruct the statuary landscape of Athens in the third century CE. Sculpture found in these contexts is also more likely to have been displayed in the Agora itself or somewhere close by.\footnote{Stewart 2012, 269.} In addition, it is possible that new
figures might be reassembled by identifying sculptural fragments found together or in close proximity, and that are of the same scale and carved with a similar technique and surface finish. This is where the patient reading of the excavation records and sustained work with fragments in storage come into play. Reconstructing such figures is a time-consuming process, but it is one that yielded good results at Aphrodisias.47

My experience at Aphrodisias has profoundly shaped the way I study sculpture. In addition to producing find-spot plans, we were also encouraged to draw, as best we could, the pieces we had been assigned for publication, and to measure and describe each piece thoroughly. The process of drawing and describing forced us to look much more carefully than we might otherwise have done and helped us to observe details of surface finish, technique, or the patterning of hair and folds that could have gone unnoticed. Drawing was also the best way to train our eye to notice similar details in other sculpture, which would then help us to find fragments that might originally have belonged to the same statue or to have come from the same display context. In addition, the drawing of statue types or portraits known in multiple examples was helpful in recognizing similar types when we came in contact with them, either in other museums or through published photographs.48 The detailed descriptions we made while standing in front of the objects themselves formed the basis of the catalogue entries, in which we aimed to provide a full accounting of, for example, the piece’s condition, technical aspects, surface finish, any repairs or reworking, pose, and aesthetic impact. We also participated in the photographic campaign that documented each piece for publication; this experience helped to sharpen our understanding of how the portrait heads and statue bodies may have been displayed in antiquity, as we tried to determine how best to position the piece so that the maximum amount of information might be conveyed.

In closing, I would like to argue for a broader chronological conception of what is included in the study of Greek sculpture. While the strict division between Greek and Roman art has certainly begun to break down,49 scholars still tend to specialize in either one or the other. There are, of course, some real and distinct differences between the sculpture made in the Greek and Roman worlds, but there is also striking continuity in sculptural production, particularly in the Greek East, in terms of subject matter, style, and function, from the classical period onwards. And the divisions between periods are also built upon a chronology that is in many cases anything but secure. In Athens, for example, the divide between the late Hellenistic and early imperial periods, at least from a stylistic and materialist perspective, is exceedingly difficult to define. Late Hellenistic forms and styles continue in Attic pottery into the first half of the first century BCE,50 and some forms of Hellenistic-style gravestones persist well into the imperial period.51 Similar difficulties exist in the dating of portrait sculpture. The heavily idealized, ‘not-portrait’ style for portraits of women, first developed in the fourth century BCE, continues well into the Roman period.52 A portrait confidently identified as late Republican turns out to

---

47 For example, Lenaghan in Smith and others 2006, 197–99 and 206–07.
48 This was the process by which I was able to recognize the
49 For a new definition of Roman art and the importance of Greek art in understanding Roman visual culture, see Hallett 2015. For a well-reasoned critique of the counterproductive nature of the disciplinary separation between ‘Greek’ and ‘Roman’, a problem mostly confined to the Anglo-American context, see Squire 2011, 372–81.
50 Rottroff 1997; Habicht 1997, 15: ‘down to the battle of Actium, there was very little “Romanization” of Athens. The city was and basically remained Greek’.
51 Von Moock 1998, e.g. cat. 79 (Antonine); 114 (2nd quarter 1st c.); 119 (late 2nd c.); 120 (2nd half 1st c.); 122 (Julio-Claudian); 194 (2nd quarter 1st c.).
52 Dillon 2010, 135–63.
represent the early Hellenistic comic poet Poseidippos.\textsuperscript{53} A portrait in the Agora (fig. 14.7) that has been dated to the Trajanic period\textsuperscript{54} is remarkably similar in style and technique to the early first century BCE portrait bust (fig. 14.8) from the Skardhana House on Delos.\textsuperscript{55} Simply stated, the dating of most Greek sculpture based on the notion of gradual and constant stylistic change does not work.\textsuperscript{56} This is not to say that Greek sculpture does not change over its long history, from about 600 BCE to around 600 CE — of course it does. But a model that posits a single line (or even many parallel lines) of continuous development is inadequate to explain the historical, cultural, and aesthetic complexities of Greek sculptural production. These complexities are why the study of Greek sculpture continues to be an endlessly fascinating and productive area of research in classical archaeology.

\textsuperscript{53} Fritsch 1992.  
\textsuperscript{54} Harrison 1953, 28–30.  
\textsuperscript{55} Marcadé and others 1996, 218–19.  
\textsuperscript{56} See Smith 2002, esp. 69–72.
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