

»You are all individuals!« Towards a phenomenology of sculpture production in the Roman provinces

Martin Dorka Moreno – Jochen Griesbach – Johannes Lipps

Abstract: This Introduction offers a brief summary of the history and current state of research on the ancient processes of reproducing Greek and Roman statues. It can be shown that those generally regarded as »Greek originals« and »Roman copies or variants«, respectively, instead are often better understood as products of artistic and creative appropriation. These appropriations were set up in different material, spatial, and functional contexts; while some kept the original semantic content of their respective models, others took on completely new meanings as a result. Deliberately skirting all value judgments about quality, this new perspective highlights the communicative function of these statues for ancient societies. In consequence, they acquire a specific and phenomenologically intrinsic value as concrete evidence for these appropriation processes themselves. With this Introduction and the individual contributions published in this conference volume, we aim to analyze the dynamics and transformative forces at play in these appropriation processes, using the archaeological record of the Roman provinces as a multifaceted test case. A synthesis of the contributions that highlights their results and seeks to weave them into »the big picture« concludes this Introduction.

*Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artis intulit agresti Latio*¹. Aphorisms such as this brilliant but infamous assertion from the *Epistulae* of Quintus Horatius Flaccus (65–8 BC; known to the English-speaking world as Horace) have long underpinned the *cliché* of a cultural one-way street from Greece to Rome and ensured its persistence in modern discourses on ancient art. From our contemporary perspective, Horace should have conceded that Rome's expansion ensured the distribution and high status of Greek art across all the urban and rural regions of the Mediterranean and beyond – especially if he had lived a few decades later than he did. On the surface, his aphorism seems to reduce the phenomenon to a single common denominator, at least in the western parts of the Roman Empire. Yet is the allure of an art strengthened or weakened by the presence and impact of an occupying power?

From the current archaeological perspective, the poetic image created by Horace's imagination seems to be inaccurate in several respects. Apart from the fact that his one-way street (to maintain the metaphor) was effectively open to two-way traffic and was furnished

with many turnoffs and exits, it is clear that the imports had to reach an already sympathetic public for them to be appreciated properly in the first place. And even then, the reception of formal principles developed elsewhere by no means implies that they were borrowed thoughtlessly and without alteration. Thus far, at least, art historical scholarship has reached a consensus. To some, Horace's aphorism also may seem to evoke the notion of »art landscapes« (*Kunstlandschaften*), still trending in archaeology, wherein organic processes of diffusion are at play. By doing so, however, it shifts his (and our) attention away from the social actors whose agency and initiatives assign communicative potential to these artworks in the first place².

The conference whose proceedings are presented here took the latter premise as its starting point. Focusing on freestanding statues as the most prominent, prestigious, and long-lived products of ancient representational art, it brought together case studies that offer insights into the image-world (*Bilderwelt*) of the Roman provinces, which functioned both as centers of cultural and regional diversity, and as custodians of

We thank Martin Kovacs for generously discussing our work with us and commenting on a previous version of this paper. We are deeply grateful to Andrew Stewart for substantially correcting and improving our English by saving us from many errors and potential pitfalls. All remaining mistakes are our own.

1 Hor. epist. 2, 1, 156. 157: »Greece, the Captive, made her Savage Victor Captive, and brought the Arts into rustic Latium« (after Rushton Fairclough 1970, 408 f.).

2 Cf. Stewart 2008, 155–162 esp. 156 f.

shared, empire-wide cultural values. In the provinces, the archaeological record of statues in the round of differing formats, materials, and pretensions provides us with an excellent foundation for such inquiries. They range from excellent, Italian-made, marble copies after Classical Greek originals (or prototypes), to statues and reliefs of local stone that creatively modify available statuary models to different degrees, and in turn become prototypes or models for other artistic products. Before we elaborate upon our approach and delineate what sets it apart, however, it is necessary to look back on the long history of research into Roman sculpture and to highlight those among its current trends that converge with the theme of this volume.

The Changing Image of the Original – Approaches to Roman Sculpture

In the Renaissance, scholarship largely was driven by a desire to connect specific works of sculpture in the round with literary evidence mentioning specific works of the great masters such as Lysippos and Praxiteles; thus identified, these sculptures were then taken to be the actual Greek originals mentioned in the texts³. In the 18th century, however, scholarship became more aware of the practice of copying⁴. Many sculptures previously believed to be from Classical and early Hellenistic times were unmasked as later reproductions. As a result, the focus of scholarship gradually shifted towards a comparative method that is still called *Kopienkritik* by its (mostly German) practitioners. Specialists in this method first collected Roman copies of the same sculptural type and then compared them with each other in order to reconstruct

the appearance of a supposed Greek original, the prototype for the various replicas⁵. In pursuit of this goal, they scoured the archaeological record for statues (or replicas, to be more precise) that resembled each other as closely as possible, which in turn signaled their degree of proximity to the (usually lost) original. Central to this approach was the notion that these late Hellenistic and Roman copies were usually intended to be as close to their (usually lost) Greek originals as possible: the real focus of this enterprise⁶.

This perspective changed significantly in the 20th century. In his seminal work of 1923, *Kopien und Umbildungen griechischer Statuen*, Georg Lippold had distinguished between replicas (*Repliken*), reproductions (*Wiederholungen*), modifications (*Umbildungen*), and variants (*Umschöpfungen, Weiterbildungen*). In doing so, he included statues into his research that to different degrees less precisely reproduced a given model. This approach meant that the nature of the relationship between a Roman statue and its assumed earlier prototype needed to be assessed afresh, on a case-by-case basis⁷. On the one hand, Lippold's work laid the cornerstone for the modifications and variants of a given prototype to be historically relevant in their own right. On the other hand, Greek art firmly kept its normative power within the framework of Lippold's approach and was still regarded as the exclusive reference point for these Roman statues⁸.

In the second half of the 20th century, a growing number of studies were devoted to the historical contextualization of statues of the Roman imperial period in their contemporary settings. One of the main objectives was to develop criteria for a nuanced chronological framework for those that were still dated (by and large) only generally to ›imperial times‹ (i.e., 30 BC – ca. 300 AD)⁹. Other research projects focused

3 Marvin 2008, 16–54.

4 For an early account, see Richardson 1728, 100 who used the Medici Venus as an example (cf. the recent discussion by Boschung 2017, 345–364) and most prominently: Winckelmann 1755. See, in addition, the summarizing remarks by Junker – Stähli 2008; compare: Stähli 2008; Barbanera 2008; Barbanera 2011.

5 The term ›type‹ appears to have been used in Roman times more or less in the same way scholars use it today, which is attested by an inscription on two portrait herms dating to the Severan period found in Dion in Northern Greece that once portrayed a certain Herennianos. Cf. Pandermalis 1999, 158; Fittschen 2010, 227 f.; Fittschen 2015, 53 f.

6 A distinguished example of this seminal approach is the synthesis of masterworks of Greek sculpture published by Furtwängler 1893, later criticized by Ridgway 1984 and Hoffer 2005, among others, on the grounds that absolutely certain reconstructions of such Greek masterpieces are not possible on a case-

by-case basis; cf. Stähli 2008. Yet the occasional efficacy of *Kopienkritik* as a method is supported by subsequent finds of (fragmentary) Greek originals that had been previously reconstructed using the copies alone (Despinis 2008), or the well-known Roman plaster casts of a number of these originals found at Baiae in 1954 (Landwehr 1985; Landwehr 2010).

7 Lippold 1923.

8 Lippold leaves no doubt that ›Greek art is far more valuable‹ (›... die griechische Kunst die weit wertvollere ist ...‹), and ›the more autonomous products of Roman art do not deserve the same level of interest‹ (›hinter der ... die selbständigeren Erzeugnisse der römischen (Zeit) im Interesse zurücktreten‹ müssen): Lippold 1923, 6.

9 Lauter 1966, for example, attempted to establish a solid basis for dating later versions of Greek statues from the 5th cent. BC, thereby opening up a historical perspective for further study.

on the Roman »statue habit« by investigating the wider contexts of the statues' provenances and their public reception¹⁰. This line of research primarily aimed to identify the semantic content of the individual works, which, in many cases, determined the suitability of a specific statue for a specific context. As such, it could be established that public baths, for example, showed a noticeable concentration of statues with aquatic themes in the widest sense; statues found in *palaestrae* were often concerned with athletics; those from theatres with masks and similar themes; and so on¹¹.

The archaeological record therefore broadly supports statements preserved in Cicero and Vitruvius that called for an appropriate *decor* for different contexts and display settings¹². In another seminal study, Paul Zanker showed that in many cases Roman works did not attempt to copy a specific Greek predecessor. Instead, he emphasized that Roman sculpture followed a tendency generally to adopt a Greek formal vocabulary *per se*¹³. This process often led in turn to a further development of the repertoire of forms that were being borrowed. In other words, this generation of scholars wholeheartedly abandoned the allegedly direct Roman dependency on Greek sculpture highlighted in the past in favor of a more complex model of artistic reception. From this point onwards, the traditional understanding of Roman art as a »form of life« that was limited to mere imitation was no longer tenable. In addition, it could be shown that in some cases Roman sculptors actually underscored the fact that they were copying a statue by including obvious – and often exaggerated – clues such as protruding marble supports or »overlooked« measuring points¹⁴, and by inscriptions naming the sculptors of the originals¹⁵. These insights ultimately rehabilitated the often much maligned Roman »copyist« as a skillful and self-aware practitioner in his own right¹⁶.

Recently, like philologists constructing manuscript genealogies and *stemmata*, researchers have begun to track the use and reuse of ancient statuary forms by focusing on specific statue schemata (see below) and tracing these in detail across different periods¹⁷. The potential of this approach for the development of a new understanding of ancient art has long been recognized¹⁸. The databank necessary to support such assessments, however, has been created only in recent years through the collection and digital publication of numerous hitherto unpublished statues¹⁹. It is now possible to conclude (in line with recent work in art historical research and other disciplines)²⁰ that individual »copies« could have maintained their original semantic content and significance but also could have been subject to changes shaped by their chronological, regional, or cultural contexts, giving them an entirely new meaning. As Christopher Hallett has put it, such artworks were »resemanticized«²¹.

To turn to early Hellenistic times, when it was certainly not the intention of the artists and clients to replicate their prototypes accurately²², Kathrin Zimmer (for example) has shown that the original meaning and significance of Praxiteles' Aphrodite of Knidos remained the decisive element for its Hellenistic imitators. In other words, contemporary audiences recognized the statue as a famous work of art from Asia Minor and in many cases ordered reproductions of the work for precisely this reason. The Louvre-Naples (so-called Genetrix) Aphrodite type, on the other hand, shows a development of specific motifs without any direct reference to the original prototype. These formal appropriations changed the semantic content of the statue²³. Another example is the schema of the so-called Thorn-Puller Boy. Conceived probably in the 3rd cent. BC as a votive figure of a naked, youthful shepherd who has stepped on a thorn, has sat down, and

10 On the term »statue habit« see Smith 2007, 84–94; Smith – Ward-Perkins 2016 *passim*. Cf. Bergmann 2005, 157 with n. 2 and Hallett 2017.

11 See Manderscheid 1981 (thermae); Neudecker 1988; Raeder 1983 (villas); Fuchs 1987 (theatres). Syntheses: Zanker 1992; Koortbojian 2002; Stewart 2003; Perry 2005, 28–49.

12 E.g., Cic. Att. 1, 4, 3; 1, 6, 2. Vit. 7, 5. On the Roman concept of *décor*, see Horn-Oncken 1967, esp. 29–31; Bravi 2014, 15–22; Hölscher 2018, 322–333; Haug 2020, 1–4.

13 Zanker 1974. See also Wünsche 1972.

14 Preißhofen – Zanker 1970/1971; Geominy 1998; Hallett 2005a; Anguissola 2018; Dietrich in press.

15 An exploration into both the inscriptions mentioning artists and the function of stone supports as ways to »stage« sculptors in the Roman provinces has yet to be undertaken.

16 In view of this problem, researchers began to investigate the working methods of Roman sculptors in detail; see Trillmich 1979; Pfanner 1989; Landwehr 1998.

17 For approaches that reach beyond the horizon of antiquity cf. Catoni et al. 2013.

18 This is repeatedly stated in review articles, e.g., Kraus 1960, 468; Linfert 1985. Cf. the seminal study by Bieber 1977.

19 See, e.g., the Arachne database: <<https://arachne.uni-koeln.de/drupal/>> (26.10.2020).

20 Goodman 1998; Lachmann 2000; Boehm 2007; Bronfen 2009.

21 Cf. Nick 2002, 113–205; Kousser 2008; Trimble 2011; Lipps 2021. »Resemanticization«: Hallett 2018, 280–281.

22 See, for earlier examples, Lippold 1923, 6–15; Strocka 1979; Schmidt 1996 and Gagliano 2014/2015.

23 Zimmer 2014.

is preoccupied in pulling it out of his left foot, it was adapted into different versions as early as the 2nd cent. BC²⁴. Amongst numerous other examples, a terracotta statuette from Priene found in a private house offers a case in point²⁵. It shows a man in the same pose, but in a clear parody of the original, he is negligently dressed, has somewhat ugly and deformed facial features, and oversized genitals²⁶.

In turn, an interest in the complexity of the appropriation of Classical and early Hellenistic artworks in Roman visual culture is documented by a growing number of publications, the latest of which is the collection of essays titled *Restaging Greek Artworks in Roman Times*, in which different authors discuss the afterlives of Greek art works in their new Roman contexts²⁷. In his afterword to this volume, Hallett counters the clear-cut references to the so-called *opera nobilia* (or ›Classics‹) in the Roman literary sources, and their ostentatious display in various contexts, with the wholehearted (and sometimes quite blatant) Roman repurposing of Greek art works that completely neglected their (Greek) origins and original contexts. More often than previous scholarship would like to admit, such examples betray the utter erasure of the work's earlier life. In fact, this seems to have been the rule rather than the exception²⁸.

A case in point is the cult statue of Apollo in Augustus's temple of Apollo Palatinus. Pliny reports that it was a work of Skopas of Paros, a great master; but even so, the process of appropriation disengaged the statue from its original meaning and function. Firmly embedded into its new, Roman, cultural context, it acquired a new identity and content²⁹. But Roman restaging of Greek art works went beyond this: Nero, famously, ordered a statue of Alexander the Great to be gilded with a thick layer of gold, which led to its degradation in the eyes of contemporaries – including Nero himself!³⁰ Any art historian who adheres to the polar opposites of original and copy, archetype and imitation, can only dismiss such extreme repurposing as utterly reckless and abhorrent.

The same processes also apply to sculptural programs that were disseminated and adapted throughout the Roman Empire, such as that of the Forum of Augustus in Rome. Its appropriation across Italy and the Empire, however, has been investigated only in recent years and in the form of individual case studies³¹. The so-called Aeneas-Anchises group is a case in point. Its appropriation in the Forum at Pompeii is attested by fragments of an inscription mentioning »epitaphs« (*Elogia*) for Romulus and Aeneas; unfortunately, however, the exact position of the group within the Forum cannot securely be reconstructed³². Moreover, a wall painting in a nearby villa at Stabiae even caricatured it, replacing the heads of Aeneas, Anchises, and Askanios with those of animals, most likely bears³³.

In the Roman provinces the group is frequently reproduced in southern Spain and the Rhine Basin, but with instructive differences in time, media, and context, and in addition, its semantic content can differ significantly in each region. In southern Spain it is appropriated mainly in the Forum and in private housing contexts of the 1st century AD and most likely referenced the original in Rome. In the Rhine Basin, however, and especially in high Imperial times it was appropriated as an acroterion for built tombs, underscoring its inherent allusion to *pietas* (filial piety) and upstaging and probably masking any reference to its Augustan original in Rome³⁴.

Our approach

As has previously been shown in scholarship, a specific statue that was created at a certain time, for example Polykleitos's Diadoumenos (ca. 430 BC), was reproduced over the span of many centuries, and displayed in different material, spatial, and functional contexts³⁵. The appropriation of a type as well as its incorporation in new contexts and the use of different materials in the process of its reproduction were guided by an array of intentions and choices: aesthetic, political, and/

24 Zanker 1974, 71–83.

25 For a recent discussion see, most conveniently, von den Hoff 2019, 149–163 figs. 23–25. Cf. Rumscheid 2006, 497 f. no. 278 pl. 119; and Meinecke 2016.

26 Maischberger 2012.

27 Adornato et al. 2018; cf. Hallett 2005b. See, in addition: Fullerton 1997; Gazda 2002; Trimble – Elsner 2006; Kousser 2008; Habetzeder 2012.

28 The rare exceptions, such as Vespasian's Templum Pacis in which Greek statues of high renown appear to have been given inscribed bases that mentioned the Greek sculptors who made them, prove the rule: Hallett 2018, 277 f.; cf. La Rocca 2001, 195–207; Bravi 2014, 203–226.

29 Plin. nat. 36, 25. On Skopas' Apollo see Stewart 1977, 93 f. Appendix 2; cf. Hallett 2018, 277 f.

30 Plin. nat. 34, 64; see, most recently Hallett 2018, 278.

31 Boschung 2003, 1–12; Goldbeck 2015; Boschung 2014; Boschung 2017, 287–290.

32 Kockel 2005, 69–72; cf. Fröhlich 1991, 54 f., discussing other depictions of the group in Pompeii itself.

33 Zanker 2009, 212; cf. Boschung 2014, 148 f. fig. 14.

34 For the appropriation of the so-called Aeneas group see, *inter alia*, Noelke 1976 and Dardenay 2012.

35 Varner 2006, esp. 289 f. See, in addition, Kunze 2015.

or religious etc. Occasionally, mere practical reasons such as the accessibility of a model or simple convenience led to the creation of a statue in a specific guise. It could keep the semantic content that was originally ascribed to it, either completely or partially, or be associated with new meanings. In light of this, it is not necessarily important whether the starting point was a famous masterpiece of the Greek Classical period, a prominent contemporary public statue, or a template from a workshop.

To describe these highly dynamic appropriation processes we advance a new, less normative term: the statue schema (*pl schemata*). This allows a modified perspective on ancient sculpture, enabling us to inquire theoretically into the multifaceted forms of appropriation of Greek (and Roman) models in the Roman provinces, without distorting or misusing traditional terminologies and approaches. A given »statue schema« thus comprises all those statues that are formally interdependent and can be cross-referenced with each other, including all its »copies«, »modifications«, and »variants«. Lippold's terminology, conceived as means of art historical classification, is valid and certainly useful but laden with the traditional baggage discussed above³⁶. Since Lippold exclusively approaches Roman statues from the perspective of imitation, it seems more adequate to us to here use the term »schema«, thereby shifting attention to their makers' creative appropriation of their models. This shift of perspective is prompted by an interest in the dynamic process of communicating through and by images, circumventing the popular view of art history as a sequence of masterpieces and imitations. By emphatically putting not a reconstructed original but the creative process of appropriation at its center, and by using the intentionally open-minded term »schema« in order to focus on the phenomenology of semantic, material, functional, and spatial appropriation, our approach calls for a different art historical parlance³⁷.

As outlined above, an appropriation of a given statue schema in the Roman provinces could vary ac-

cording to context and client, and could differ from its model to a greater or lesser extent. In the case of a portrait statue of the recently deceased Antinous from Leptis Magna (fig. 1) the use of the body of the Apollo Lykeios is most likely inspired by the notion of the god's celebrated youth and beauty³⁸. The characteristic pose of the arms, especially the raised right arm resting on the head, as well as the attributes of the statue's marble support (tripod with omphalos, laurel wreath, and snake/python) practically compel the association with the god (cf. fig. 2), without, however, inevitably evoking the original context of the prototype in the eponymous Athenian Gymnasium³⁹. Of course, this form of appropriation is not a singular case, but part of an elite practice of mourning on a macroscopic level, as well as a veneration of the emperor and an expression of solidarity with him, in which different peer groups in Rome, but also in the provinces (especially the eastern ones) participated, even in Africa⁴⁰.

Equally unambiguous are artworks that reference imperial monuments in Rome such as the Ara Pacis⁴¹. In Rome and in the provinces these images conveyed the promise of the Golden Age or *aurea aetas*, but as a rule the latter were made more legible for particular local audiences. The Tellus relief from Carthage is a prime example of this practice (fig. 3). In place of the Breezes (Aurae) that accompany the figure of Tellus/Pax in Rome, cosmological personifications of the sky/night and the ocean/triton were substituted because they were more easily comprehensible to the inhabitants of this north African city.

Such a disengagement of artworks from their models for the purpose of clarity can be detected – to a different extent – at all levels of provincial art production. In reliefs from the North-Western provinces, for example, the owl of Athena was sometimes very prominently staged, and surely facilitated the goddess's identification (fig. 4). This is the case on a Divine Quartet relief from Godramstein in the Palatinate with a Hercules resembling the Farnese type that – in contrast to the late Classical statue – does not hide the

36 Lippold 1923, 2–4. For a thorough discussion of his (sometimes biased and thus problematic) terminology, see esp. Stähli 2008, 28.

37 See Zimmer 2014, 8–16 for a discussion of other German terms introduced to describe similar sculptural appropriation processes and the various problems associated with them. The Greek term *σχῆμα* comprises a whole variety of meanings. Generally it is defined as »characteristic appearance«. The term's use in antiquity to describe a »rhythmical gesture« or »pose« (Aristot. poet. 1447a) or a »figure of speech« or »mental image« is best suited to pin-point what we conceive of it in connection to the statues: a corporeal habitus of high recognition value. Cf. Gödde 2001; Celentano

2004; Catoni 2008. In fact, the term »schema« has frequently been used in recent years to discuss recurring motifs of antique sculptures and in other genres. See, inter alia, Schneider 1994; Papini 2010; Vorster 2011; and also Roscino 2006; Ghedini – Colpo 2007; Verdon 2009; D'Agostino 2016.

38 Zanker 2010, 179. 182 f. fig. 108 a. b. The local fame and prominence of the schema is attested by its public installation in the temple of the Genius Coloniae in Oea; see Baratte – de Chaisemartin 2015, 510 fig. 5.3.2 (here fig. 2).

39 Cf. Schröder 1986.

40 Hallett 2005a, 204 f. App. B 180–196.

41 Zanker 2009, 294–328. Especially 310 f.



Fig. 1 Statue of Antinous from Leptis Magna (plaster cast, Munich), ca. AD 130. El-Beida, Archaeological Museum, inv. 12

Apples of the Hesperides behind his back, but carries them ostentatiously in front of him, presenting them to the beholder (fig. 5)⁴².

In gravestones such as a family one from Phrygia (fig. 6), established schemata from civic portraits such as the arm-sling type are often reproduced⁴³, but ambiguities such as the modestly wrapped and thus immobilized hands that were highly relevant for the semantic content of the model were deliberately omitted⁴⁴. The similar positions of the arms and the attributes



Fig. 2 Central part of the pediment of the Temple of Genius Civitatis of Oea depicting turreted Fortune between Apollo and Minerva, AD 183. Tripoli, Archaeological Museum



Fig. 3 «Tellus» relief from Carthago, 1st cent. AD. Paris, Louvre, inv. MA 1838

conforms to certain distinct social roles, appropriately evoking unity and dignity within the family.

In other cases, the conceptual distance from the model is considerably greater. The depiction of Nehalennia, a fertility goddess from the estuary of the river Scheldt, on the votive altar of one Vegisionius Martinus (fig. 7), most likely follows a late Classical sculptural type of Poseidon/Neptune⁴⁵ that (like certain warrior and hero types of the period) had been adapted for portraits of victorious late Republican mil-

42 Noelke 2021, 391–393 no. 60; on Roman monuments in stone from Godramstein see, in general, Traunmüller 2021.

43 See Zanker 2010, 176; Lochman 2019.

44 Zanker 1995, 49–55; Ma 2006.

45 The so-called Lateran type: Vorster 1993, 68–74 no. 27; LIMC VII (1994) 452 f. 456 nos. 34–38. 86–95 s. v. Poseidon (E. Simon); 485. 487 f. nos. 14. 47–49. 56–62 s. v. Poseidon/Neptunus (E. Simon).



Fig. 4 ›Viergötterstein‹ from Godramstein (Palatinate), early 3rd cent. AD: Athena/Minerva. Mannheim, Reiss-Engelhorn-Museen



Fig. 5 ›Viergötterstein‹ from Godramstein (Palatinate), Early 3rd cent. AD: Herakles/Hercules. Mannheim, Reiss-Engelhorn-Museen



Fig. 6 Funerary relief of Tatias for Lykiskos and Euty-chiane, AD 220–230. Basel, Antikenmuseum/Ludwig Collection, inv. Lu 262



Fig. 7 Votive altar of Vegisionius the Sequanian for Nehalennia from Colijnsplaat, late 2nd – early 3rd cent. AD. National Museum of Antiquities, Leiden, inv. 1970/12.13



8 a



8 b

Fig. 8 a. b Two fragments of a votive relief from Godramstein (Palatinate), late 2nd – early 3rd cent. AD: Hermes/Mercury. Mannheim, Reiss-Engelhorn-Museen

itary commanders⁴⁶. The sole remaining trace of this tortuous pedigree, clearly familiar to the North-Western provinces⁴⁷, is the step-up pose with the raised foot resting on a ship's prow: a sign of divine control over



Fig. 9 Naked drunken woman, terracotta figurine from Egypt, Late Hellenistic? Martin von Wagner Museum, Würzburg, inv. A 1097

the fortunes of seafaring. Significantly, the conventional depiction of a warship remained unaltered, even though the clients that usually venerated Nehalennia were civilians associated with the British maritime trade, who chose the goddess as their patron⁴⁸.

Earlier, we spoke of a humorous adaptation of the Aeneas, Anchises, and Ascanius group in the Forum Augustum at Rome in a wall painting at Stabiae, which replaced their heads with those of bears. Another relief from Godramstein, a votive, offers a slightly different example of a possible humorous modification from the provinces. Its sculptor has carved a Hermes that closely resembles the famous Praxitelean one at Olympia, but instead of luring the infant he is carrying with a bunch of grapes, he uses a wallet (figs. 8 a. b)⁴⁹.

On the other hand, we submit that when the similarities to a suspected model are reduced to mere iconographic elements and details, the evidence for its appropriation in particular must be deemed insufficient.

46 Grassinger 1991, 64 f.; Böhm 1997, 29. 65–67; Hallett 2005a, 115–120; also Zanker 2009, 48–49.

47 Cf. *inter alia* LIMC VII (1994) 498 nos. 151. 152 s. v. Poseidon/Neptunus (N. Cambi).

48 Hijmans 2016, 92.

49 Flecker 2021, 479–482 no. 90; cf. Traunmüller 2021.



Fig. 10 Cavalry tombstone of Andes the Dalmatian from Mayence, c. AD 50. Landemuseum Mainz, inv. S 608



Fig. 11 Cavalry tombstone of Insus the Treveran from Lancaster, c. AD 100. Lancaster City Museum

A terracotta figurine from Egypt of a woman drinking (fig. 9) only vaguely and associatively recalls the famous statue type of the Drunken Old Woman (late 3rd cent. BC). The figurine (1st cent. BC?) depicts a seated woman cradling a vessel in her lap. As opposed to the woman of the famous statue type, however, this one is shown relatively young, with decidedly different facial features and a different hair style; in addition, she is completely naked and rather corpulent, and the vessel she is holding is an oversized metal *skyphos*, not a *lagynos*. In contrast to a large-scale replica of the type from Spain (see Janine Lehmann and Henner von Hesberg), it would be methodologically inappropriate to postulate a specific, visually secure appropriation process. On the contrary, it seems safe to assume that when the statuette was created, the relevant motifs had long been popularized and probably by then were

emancipated from any direct dependence on the prototype⁵⁰.

Finally, we must stress that pictorial conventions may have been shaped by local workshop and market practices in the provinces themselves; conventions that, in turn, proceeded to gain currency beyond their respective provincial borders. The gravestones of cavalrymen (and related monuments) in the Rhineland (fig. 10) exemplify this process; the respective schemata travelled, amongst other things, with the reassignment of the units to Britain⁵¹, but also as far as Rome⁵². Their migration to new socio-cultural contexts also prompted significant adaptations and modifications. Across the *Oceanus Britannicus*, for instance, the inclusion of brutal motifs such as a severed head and the trampling of enemies (fig. 11) recall similar motifs in Roman imperial reliefs⁵³.

50 Zanker 1989; Griesbach 2013, 153 Nr. 41 (C. Goll); Lembke – Martin 2017, 205 figs. 77–80.

51 Stewart 2010, paragraphs 30. 31.

52 Busch 2003.

53 Cassibry 2015, 479 f. fig. 5.1.3; see, for example, Coarelli 1999, 66 f. pls. 22. 23.

Objectives and conclusions of the present book

Our intention in producing this volume is to pursue and understand the formal traditions of the Greco-Roman ›statue habit‹ and to trace the dynamic shifts in semantic content that the appropriation of a given statue schema brings about, as a dynamic, culturally determined process. By offering a series of case studies, we aim to explore the underlying conditions of these appropriation processes in the Roman provinces, as well as the local intentions behind the provincial (re)production of these works. To do this will, more generally, allow for a better understanding of the varying production mechanisms and distribution of these statue schemata. Conversely, it is not our aim to provide a systematic and comprehensive treatment of all the different forms of such appropriation in the Roman Empire for which prototypes and models previously had been developed in Greece and Rome, respectively. The present collection of articles (arranged somewhat like Strabo's *Geography*) offers a cross section of these underlying phenomena which, in turn, combine to form a big picture, albeit necessarily including some blind spots.

Several of the essays focus on the question of the **mediation** of specific formal traditions in the Roman Empire and how precisely they were disseminated⁵⁴. In addition, some of them highlight formal traits and characteristics to tap into **contact areas** in the provinces. Thus, Vibeke Goldbeck suspects the existence of available templates or pattern books (*Musterzeichnungen*) in Aquileia, Tergeste, Pula, and Celeia on the basis of Gorgoneia that belong to portico fronts and that show similarities in dimensions and motifs, yet differ significantly in style. Goldbeck points out that these images, being selective in character, are closer to their counterparts on forums in France and Spain than they are to the originals of the Forum of Augustus in Rome⁵⁵.

Pursuing this problem of sculptural models, Gabriele Kremer plausibly argues that a sculpture workshop from Mainz (in the modern Rhineland-Palatinate) moved to Carnuntum (Lower Austria) as part of the retinue of the 14th Legion, carrying its models along with it. As for sculptors from Aphrodisias, discussed by Julia Lenaghan, it is known that they themselves,

and not only their pattern-books and models, travelled to fulfil commissions. With respect to the local workshops in Aphrodisias, Lenaghan assumes the existence of sculptural models. Matteo Cadario highlights the important role of workshops in regional centers such as Luni and Parma for the distribution of models in northern Italy. In this specific case, however, it remains unclear whether these workshops operated from their home base or travelled to the cities that commissioned the work. Although signatures of sculptors are rare in local contexts, the archaeological record suggests that most of their works were commissioned and executed in the major cities of the respective regions, and were distributed to their individual destinations later according to demand. A case in point is Antoneinos of Alexandria (early 2nd cent. AD) who is mentioned in two inscriptions in far-off Gerasa in Arabia (Weber-Karyotakis)⁵⁶. In the case of Sosikles of Athens (Karanastasi), however, it seems plausible to assume that the sculptor personally carried out his commission in the theatre of Buthrotum; this is suggested by its importance and scale⁵⁷.

The coexistence of **imported and locally manufactured sculptures** seems to have been the rule. It is evident that in regions without resources in marble (or very few or undeveloped ones), sculptures were imported, as in the neighboring provinces of Arabia and Syria where marble sculpture is generally rare and where the existence of such workshops is improbable. In some cases laboratory testing (Weber-Karyotakis) allows for a more informed reconstruction of the established trade routes as well as trade relations, but the results can only incidentally provide answers to the questions of artistic authorship and the mobility of sculptural workshops (Buccino)⁵⁸. It is only very rarely that we find evidence for workshops that produced art works in both local stone and imported marble like it is the case in Virunum and, probably, Carnuntum (Kremer). It can hardly be a coincidence that sculptures made of local limestone more freely adapt their models than those made of marble. Often, this phenomenon corresponds with an unofficial function for the pieces in question: portrait statues in limestone were frequently set up in necropoleis, and marble ones in the public spaces of the inner city (Buccino/Cadario).

Often, the **immediate public presence** of certain artworks in a given city or region prompted their reproduction. As Semra Mägele demonstrated in her

54 See the recent important contribution by Van Voorhis 2018 on the sculptor's workshop at Aphrodisias, at present a unique archaeological context.

55 Goldbeck 2015, 68–116.

56 Der Neue Overbeck V (2014) 4239–4240 s. v. Antoninus aus Alexandria (S. Kansteiner).

57 Der Neue Overbeck V (2014) 4076 s. v. Sosikles der Ältere (S. Kansteiner).

58 Cf. the late Republican/Augustan sculptor and supplier C. Avianus Evander, who worked in Athens, Alexandria, and Rome (as evidenced in the literary sources); see Marx 1898.