

# The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

## Professor Furtwängler, Ageladas and Stephanos

Charles Waldstein

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 04 / May 1905, pp 234 - 235  
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00000627, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00000627](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00000627)

### How to cite this article:

Charles Waldstein (1905). Professor Furtwängler, Ageladas and Stephanos. The Classical Review, 19, pp 234-235 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00000627

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

were a special title of the Septimontium, and not a generic term applied to more than one festival. On p. 51 we have perhaps the one passage in which Mr. Platner is completely abandoned by that sobriety of judgment which characterizes his work as a whole. For there is something almost oriental in the imagery of the paragraph in which he favours the theory that 'the Romans applied the name Janiculum to the ridge in the west, because Janus the Sun-god was seen each night to sink behind it, entering his own abode at the close of the day, just as the shepherds themselves entered their own city, the Palatium.' Of the many views advanced concerning Janus, that which regards him as a sun-god is the least likely, and it is indeed now generally discredited. Nor is there justification for the assertion on p. 45: 'the word Argei is evidently a Latinization of Ἀργεῖοι.' Where there is such divergence of opinion as there is on this point, it should at least be indicated. On p. 128 the shields of Mars are said to have been kept in the Curia Saliorum on the Palatine. They were, however, kept in the sacrum Martis in the Regia, as is correctly pointed out on p. 204. From the account given on p. 282 Mr. Platner apparently believes in the separate existence of a god Terminus at an early period of Roman religion. There is much more to be said in favour of Wissowa's theory that there was no independent cult of Terminus before imperial times, and that originally the boundary stones were under the protection of Jupiter Terminus. This being the case, the presence of the stone in the middle cell of the Capitoline temple had its own appropriateness. On the same page it is stated that the statue of Jupiter was 'clothed with the attire of a Roman triumphator.' It was the other way: the garb of the triumphator was modelled on that of the god. On p. 375 the casual reference to human sacrifices might lead one to suppose that these were of frequent occurrence among the Romans.

The illustrations are well chosen, some of the restorations being especially good, e.g. that of the Area Palatina, p. 143, and that of the Domus Flavia, p. 147. There are also a number of useful maps and plans, but many others might have been added with distinct advantage to the book, e.g. a map of the Campagna, showing the courses of the aqueducts; a map of the Campus Martius, and one of the Caelian. If the drains of the Forum merited the detailed description given on pp. 252-255, they certainly deserved a plan. Maps of ancient and of

modern Rome are given at the beginning and end of the volume, but they are on too small a scale to be satisfactory. Sites mentioned in the text cannot always be identified on them. The typographical work is excellent; I have noticed only one error: 'alerae' for 'Valeriae' on p. 488.

G. J. LAING.

*University of Chicago.*

#### PROFESSOR FURTWÄNGLER, AGE- LADAS AND STEPHANOS.<sup>1</sup>

I ASK to be allowed to advert briefly to Professor Furtwängler's reply (*J.H.S.* xxiv. p. 336) to my strictures on his style of controversy. He would have his readers believe that my arguments were limited to *one* point (*ibid.* p. 336), and would have me assert that 'my (Furtwängler's) whole stylistic comparison, including the hypothesis suggested about Ageladas, was founded on a mistake in a drawing.' This is distinctly not the case. Every reader of my article will see that more space is devoted to other arguments of style than to the question of the false drawing—itsself of considerable importance. He now admits that the drawings are wrong; but here too he throws the blame on other shoulders—namely upon the artist who made them, Herr Max Lübke. Even if the artist working from photographs is the immediate cause of the mistakes in the drawings—made for purposes of stylistic comparison—this does not remove the responsibility of the archaeological writer who accepts them and bases conclusions upon them. Next he endeavours to show how the mistakes in the drawings do not affect the main points of his comparison, and makes this remarkable statement: 'The sole object of the drawing, as I distinctly stated in that place [the italics are mine], is to show clearly how the *motif* of the Ligurio bronze is related to the so-called Stephanos type.' It is hardly credible; but I am bound to state, that *there is not a word* to that effect in his publication of the fiftieth *Berliner Winckelmannsprogramm* to which he refers. What he does say, on the other hand (p. 137), in commenting on the points which the statues are supposed to have in common, is, that the drawings there given are capable of demonstrating his point more readily than words (*die bestehenden Skizzen vermögen dies rascher als*

<sup>1</sup> See *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xxiv. pp. 129-134.

*Worte zu veranschaulichen*). In this connexion he dwells upon points of proportion, width of chest, size of head, etc., etc., for several pages, and not only on the *motif* or scheme, by which I suppose he means the attitude and action.

Even if it were the attitude and action alone upon which he bases his comparison and his momentous conclusions, I defy any trained archaeologist not to see how strikingly different these are. I could indicate a number of statues and statuettes in which there is greater similarity of *motif* (without such great differences in other respects) on the one hand, to the Ligurio bronze, on the other to the Stephanus ephebus, than these two works show between each other. *Motifs* of this kind, in the centuries that elapsed between the making of the Ligurio bronze and the Stephanus ephebus, became so diversified, while in their respective periods themselves so many statues by different schools and artists had the same or similar attitudes, that no scientific conclusions of value can be based upon even greater similarity of *motif* than they possess. Moreover I consider the principle involved of such wide and fundamental importance for the general method of archaeological study, that I should like to give all possible emphasis to the following statement: It may be interesting and instructive in the early stages of the development of plastic art (the archaic and the transitional period), to pursue carefully the advance in freedom of *motif* and attitude. But when sculpture has passed beyond these elementary stages, a similarity of 'motif,' where there is not similarity of style — especially when the 'motif' is a simple, almost a universal one — is not of much use in establishing a relationship of school. This rule would strikingly apply to the case of the two works compared by Prof. Furtwängler even if there was greater similarity of *motif* between them.

Prof. Furtwängler ends his short article with an appeal to archaeological authority. 'Any one,' he says, 'who has made a serious attempt to grapple with the problem will agree with me.' I do not see how such an appeal helps argument and proof which both he and I ought to be able to produce without support of 'authority.' As he does so, I may say that I have received numerous letters from colleagues at home and abroad accepting my evidence against his; while the only publication which has appeared since this discussion has been before the public which is concerned in this

question is W. Klein's *Geschichte der Griechischen Kunst*, vol. i. (1904). On p. 385 this author distinctly rejects Furtwängler's view of Ageladas and Stephanos and accepts mine. His words are: *Aber noch weit weniger kann die Stephanosfigur mit Hagelaidas, dem sie derzeit zuversichtlich zugeschrieben wird, etwas zu thun haben. Gerade der Vergleich mit dem argivischen Ballspieler ergibt dies als sicheres Resultat.* The footnote to this passage runs: *Ihre richtige Beleuchtung erhält die Konstruktion Furtwänglers durch Waldstein im J.H.S. xxiv. (1904), p. 129 ff.*

CHARLES WALDSTEIN.

### THE BRITISH SCHOOL AT ROME.

THE third open meeting of the British School at Rome was held in the Library of the School on Monday April 3. The chair was taken by Prof. H. F. Pelham, President of the Managing Committee of the School, and among those present at the meeting was the British Ambassador, Sir Edwin Egerton.

The Acting Director (Mr. T. Ashby, junr.) read a paper on Monte Circeo, the solitary promontory which is seen from the Alban Hills rising from an otherwise uniformly flat coastline. Tradition has identified it with the magic isle of Circe, and M. Bérard in his recent work, *Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssee*, fully accepts this identification, which he supports by the statement that *Αἰαίη*, the name of the island of Circe, is the exact transcription of the Semitic equivalent for the island of the hawk (*κίρκος*).<sup>1</sup>

The fact that the promontory is not an island, and apparently was only one long before any period to which the Homeric legend may be assigned, is no bar to the identification; for Procopius well remarks (*Bell. Goth.* i. 11) that it has the appearance of an island from a distance, whether seen from the land or from the sea.

The promontory next appears in the early history of Rome, when we hear of the foundation of the colony of Cercei (this is the older and better orthography according to Hülsen in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realenk.* iii. 2565), according to some authorities, in the time of Tarquinius Superbus, according to others, at the beginning of the fourth century B.C. It was at that time the frontier of the Roman dominion against the Volscians. The site of this colony is not certain: for, though upon the promontory itself there are considerable remains of Cyclopean walls,

<sup>1</sup> As to this and similar derivations see Prof. W. M. Ramsay's remarks in *C.R.* 1904, p. 168.