Finally, there must be two questions about the publishers: first, why do they produce this text—which never has been nor will be studied for its own literary merit—without a translation? The commentary would be very useful to ‘Classical Studies’ students, if only the lemmata were in English, referring to an English translation. Secondly, L frequently refers to his commentary on Suetonius *Caligula* in the same series, published in 1993. To date I cannot recall having seen this book advertised, and my impression is that Duckworth’s could have done more to create some publicity profile for it in the learned world. Is there a tendency for Duckworth’s to hide its light under a bushel?

C.T.H.R. Ehrhardt
University of Otago

---


This is a volume of papers mostly delivered at a symposium held at the University of Wisconsin in October 1989. The Preface (xi-xii) states that the studies ‘are devoted to reconstructing and assessing the career, intellectual environment, and stylistic tradition of one of fifth-century Greece’s most renowned sculptors, Polykleitos of Argos’ (xi). It is beautifully and comprehensively illustrated with both black-and-white and colour photographs. In fact, the production values are first-rate: large, glossy pages and that wonderful ‘crack’ and smell of a strong new book as you open its pages. The chapters may be divided under four headings:

i) *Precedents and parallels for the intellectual and theoretical aspect of Polykleitos’ work* (Chapters 1-5).
In the first chapter ('The Doryphoros: Looking Backward', 3-18) Jeffrey Hurwit attempts to locate Polykleitos against the background of theoretical and practical ideas about sculptural design that existed in the Archaic and Early Classical periods. Hurwit examines the influence of local, i.e. Argive, sculpture upon Polykleitos. Against the testimony of Pliny the Elder (NH 34.55 and 57), he thinks that Pythagoras of Rhegion exerted a greater influence upon Polykleitos than did Hageladas of Argos (9-10). The first of a variety of opinions on the ambiguous 'standing-walking' pose of the Doryphoros is that the pose of the Archaic kouros provides 'one very good antecedent' (11).

In Chapter 2 ('The Canon of Polykleitos and Other Canons', 19-24) J.J. Pollitt investigates possible precedents for the Canon, notably (perhaps a little surprisingly) in the work of Greek architects, and speculates on some of the philosophical and practical ideas that may have been contained in the treatise. There is an interesting discussion of the possible application to the visual arts of Pythagorean doctrines about the truth underlying numbers (the Temple of Athena at Paestum, built around 500 BC, lends itself remarkably) (22). Ira Mark, in Chapter 3 ('The Lure of Philosophy: Craft and Higher Learning in Ancient Greece', 25-37), paints Polykleitos as both craftsman and intellectual, and illustrates something of the tension that might have been involved in this dual identity in a world of changing social attitudes. Once more, the Pythagorean connection is canvassed (28), and Plato's attack on craftsmen as would-be intellectuals (Rep. 494a-497a) is seen in the context of ire directed against Polykleitos and his followers (35).

Gregory Leftwich and Richard Tobin argue, in Chapters 4 ('Polykleitos and Hippokratic Medicine', 38-51) and 5 ('The Pose of the Doryphoros', 52-64) that Hippokratic medicine was one of the major sources of inspiration for the way in which Polykleitos perceived the human body and composed its various parts into a unified and balanced design. Leftwich argues on anatomical grounds that 'the pose is a construct and not intended to be strictly natural for either walking or repose' (47). Tobin, on the other hand, employs a detailed gait analysis to show that the Doryphoros represents a dynamic figure, not a static or stationary one ('a slowly
moving figure as it has just stepped off from a stationary stance', 55).

ii) The copies of the Doryphoros and the vexed problem of how they relate to one another and to the original bronze (Chapters 6-9).

The type of analysis known to German scholars as Kopienkritik has come under fire recently for its tendency to produce conclusions that differ markedly from scholar to scholar about the details thought to reflect most accurately those of the Greek original and the details thought to represent modifications undertaken by Roman copyists to adapt the statue to their own needs. Several contributors to this volume defend Kopienkritik as an approach and apply it with care. In Chapter 6 ('A Roman Masterpiece: The Minneapolis Doryphoros', 65-115) Hugo Meyer, for instance, studies the replica of Polykleitos' highly influential Doryphoros ('Spearbearer') acquired by the Minneapolis Institute of Arts, compares the Minneapolis statue with other replicas, postulates an early to middle Augustan date of carving (73), and concludes that in certain respects it is a Roman adaptation, rather than copy, of the original. It was the acquisition of this fine statue that initially stimulated the Wisconsin symposium. However, the next contributor, Christopher Hallett (Chapter 7 'The Replica of Polykleitos' Doryphoros in the Minneapolis Institute of Arts: An Archeological Description', 116-20 and Chapter 8 'Kopienkritik and the Works of Polykleitos', 121-60), concludes that the Minneapolis replica is the statue which most accurately reproduces the proportions of the Polykleitan original. He criticizes the practice of dating Roman copies on their style (121) and refuses to be any more explicit than 'first century BC or early first century AD' (118). Moon skates over the implications (xii): 'Such differences of opinion, needless to say, are welcome, in the hope that they will lead to further debate'. A more cynical commentator might feel that the results of these papers, contrary to the intentions and competence of the authors, in fact illustrate continuing problems with Kopienkritik.

K.J. Hartswick, in Chapter 9 ('Head Types of the Doryphoros', 161-76), enters the minefield of this general area by studying the
surviving heads of the Doryphoros type and drawing a multitude of careful and meaningful distinctions. The paper’s focus is a conscious but respectful reaction against Rhys Carpenter’s influential call for study to be directed at the bodies of Greek statues (161).

iii) The evidence for the oeuvre of Polykleitos as a whole (Chapters 10-13).

Brunilde Ridgway presents an overview of what is known of Polykleitos’ output in Chapter 10 (‘Paene ad exemplum: Polykleitos’ Other Works’, 177-99). Her analysis is masterly, though the results may disappoint, for she confirms that not enough is known to enlarge the oeuvre of Polykleitos beyond the Doryphoros and the Diadoumenos. Indeed, difficulties seem insurmountable—The conclusion is inevitably absurd: if a piece is too close to the Doryphoros, we reject it as an adaptation of later times imitating Polykleitan forms; if a piece is too different, we exclude it because it does not conform to the schemata and proportions we believe were worked out by Polykleitos’ (195).

This is followed in Chapter 11 (‘Polykleitos and the Allure of Feminine Beauty’, 200-17) by a paper in which Angelos Delivorrias concentrates on Polykleitos’ statues of female figures and takes aim at ‘the mistaken misogyny which pervades studies of Polykleitos’ (201). In adventurous fashion, the author associates the renowned ‘Hera’ Borghese statue type with the Polykleitan corpus (202) and sets out in search of the famous Amazon which was awarded first prize in the artistic contest at Ephesos (Pliny, NH 34.53; 204-11).

The value of numismatic evidence for reconstructing a Polykleitan corpus is analyzed in Chapter 12 (‘Reflections of Polykleitos’ Works on Ancient Coins’, 218-28) by Carmen Arnold-Biucchi, who seeks echoes of the Hera of Argos (219-24) and of the Doryphoros itself (224-27). On the whole, the comparisons between coins and sculpture show the independence and originality of the die-engravers. Then, in Chapter 13 (‘Polykleitan and Related Sculptures in American Collections: Recent Acquisitions’, 229-45), Carlos Picón complements Hugo Meyer’s publication of the
Minneapolis Doryphoros by reviewing other sculptures in American collections that can be associated with the *oeuvre* and style of Polykleitos. This paper in particular benefits from a series of fine illustrations.

iv) The reception, adaptation, and influence of the Polykleitan style in Antiquity and in post-Classical Europe (Chapters 14-18).

In Chapter 14 ('Notes on the Reception of the Polykleitan Style: Diomedes to Alexander', 246-61) Andrew Stewart examines the period from the sculptor's own lifetime through to the age of Alexander. The concentration is upon heroes rather than upon athletes or gods (246) and it is argued that the Doryphoros 'set a new standard for the representation of heroes in the ancient world' (249). This view is supported with special reference to (for example) representations of Diomedes, the Lansdowne Herakles, Meleager, and Lysippos' famous 'Alexander with a lance'. John Pollini takes the beginning of the Roman Empire as his period in Chapter 15 ('The Augustus from Prima Porta and the Transformation of the Polykleitan Heroic Ideal: The Rhetoric of Art', 262-82), and aims to show that, for a Roman, the Prima Porta Augustus ('the period's premier sculpture in the round', 262) would have surpassed ideologically its Polykleitan prototype and any other heroic Greek model, especially Alexander the Great (276).

Warren Moon moves through space to Dura-Europos, on the borders of the Roman Empire, and through time to late Antiquity in Chapter 16 ('Nudity and Narrative: Observations on the Synagogue Paintings from Dura-Europos', 283-316). He demonstrates Polykleitan echoes even at this distance, and in the peculiar circumstances of cross-cultural contact between Jewish and classical traditions.

Finally, in Chapters 17 ('Polykles and Polykleitos in the Renaissance: The "Letto di Policletto"', 317-26) and 18 ('Winckelmann's History of Art and Polyclitus', 327-56), Phyllis Bober and Alice Donohue study examples of how the literary sources about Polykleitos continued to have an influence on later
European art criticism even after the archaeological evidence for his work was lost or forgotten.

There is much to be learned from this book about methodological controversies, attitudes to craftsmen, anatomy, philosophy, gait analysis, copyists' aims and techniques, numismatics, the preferences of modern American collectors, and so on. Above all, the reader will learn much about Polykleitos and should agree with the late Warren Moon that 'the study of the styles of individual masters in ancient Greek sculpture, while unquestionably a problematical topic that is subject to constant revision, is not a moribund field' (xii).

T.R. Stevenson
University of Auckland / University of California at Berkeley

---


Brian Stock calls his book (1) 'a study of Augustine's attempt to lay the theoretical foundation for a reading culture'. In offering to expound this theoretical foundation Stock already sets himself a complex task; but the implicit scope of Augustine the Reader goes beyond the man and into the full breadth of Christian literate culture. Augustine's writings, Stock argues (2), 'provide western reflection on reading, inwardness and transcendence with their earliest synthetic treatment'.

An Introduction (1-20) refers to oral genres of Christian exegesis and meditation (sermo, enarratio, tractatus, expositio, commentum, explanatio), and acknowledges Augustine's 'ability to combine spoken and reflective theology' (5), before focusing on his