

July 2000

Chapter 2: Survey of examples of period-setting in studies of Greek art (or Greek sculpture) in modern scholarship

J.L. Benson

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/art_jbgs

Benson, J.L., "Chapter 2: Survey of examples of period-setting in studies of Greek art (or Greek sculpture) in modern scholarship" (2000). *Greek Sculpture and the Four Elements*. 6.

Retrieved from https://scholarworks.umass.edu/art_jbgs/6

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Art at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Greek Sculpture and the Four Elements by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

II.

SURVEY OF EXAMPLES OF PERIOD-SETTING IN STUDIES OF GREEK ART (OR GREEK SCULPTURE) IN MODERN SCHOLARSHIP

INTRODUCTION

It has not been my intention to bring together an exhaustive collection of period sequences proposed by scholars in our age, but rather enough examples to illustrate my remarks in Chapter IV about the problems of articulating the specimens of Greek art that have survived. For the sake of completeness in understanding these problems, I preface the later systems with the famous style stages of J.J. Winckelmann, since all subsequent conceptions of Greek style are to some extent derivative from them—to the annoyance of some critics.¹ The limits of acceptability of Winckelmann's stages in relation to later criteria have, of course, been sharply drawn.² New questions then naturally arose out of the revised criteria, e.g., on the basis of Heinrich Brunn's history of artists.³ Further affecting all this was the flood of objects and artifacts and new information yielded by the unceasing excavations that began seriously in the third quarter of the nineteenth century and continues unabated: these give the possibility of striving for a more accurate picture statistically of the development of ancient art. On the other hand, this very possibility carried (carries) with it the danger of a totally objectified archaeology that shuns the effort of striving to understand the conditions of consciousness that the objects themselves reflect.

CONDITIONS FOR INCLUSION

Among the more or less comprehensive studies of Greek art (or specifically of Greek sculpture) available, some are more designed to deal with problems of categories, distribution and other special concerns than to reflect periodical development. These could not be considered here.⁴ The following survey begins with the last quarter of the

nineteenth century, when apparently such books began to be used for instruction, and continues chronologically, which allows for the possibility of seeing influence from theoretical scholarship on periodicity (Riegl, turn of the century; Wölfflin, early decades; Buschor and Focillon, thirties and forties). A few books that are concerned exclusively with Hellenistic art are included here because of the special challenge to period-setting inherent in that age.⁵ In regard to the two major innovations in nomenclature suggested by me, one (Protohellenistic: 340/330–300) concerns that period: Hellenistic. Only W.H. Schuchhardt seems to have largely anticipated my thinking on this,⁶ and even he did not suggest a name for this phase. In the circumstances it seems appropriate to cite the passage that presents his reasoning on the subject (see below for reference: his p. 428):

In terms of archaeology, particularly its art historical aspect, Hellenism should begin at the end of the fourth century, not with the death of Alexander the Great, where Droysen set it with full justification from the purely historical standpoint. For the last quarter of that century is a time of transition, in which the sublime Classical conceptions of Praxiteles and Leochares unfold their last flowers, but in which simultaneously a new, early Hellenistic art begins to take form. This is a time of transition, embodied in the work of the aged Lysippos. By the turn of the century, however, a generation of artists was arising with new ways of thinking and fashioning that are often in crass opposition to those of the expiring Classical period. By the same time, in the historical-political realm, the individual Diadochian states had become consolidated and a new political configuration of the Mediterranean and Near Eastern world was in place.

In regard to my second innovation: Protoclassical (525–480), Buschor and Schefold, followed by others, saw problems with calling the first two decades of the fifth century Archaic, and began the Classical period about 500. Thus in a certain sense this was a step in the direction of my reorganization of the work of the two generations before 480 as Protoclassical. In regard to the first of those generations, Martin Robertson referred to the redfigure style as a “revolution”, thus implying that it departed from Archaic standards. This concept has also gained adherents.⁷

After these introductory remarks I can perhaps best introduce the subject of this chapter by recalling the stages of Greek sculpture proposed by J.J. Winckelmann.

J. J. Winckelmann, *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* (Dresden 1764) 213–312:

- *The Earlier Style* (now called Archaic and Early Classical): characterized by the severe, powerful, angular line.
- *The Sublime Style* (now called High Classical and Ornate): the preceding style becomes more fluid, smooth, subdued without necessarily sacrificing monumentality (Pheidias and his followers).

- *The Beautiful Style* (now called Late Classical and Transition to Hellenistic): characterized by the graceful, serpentine line (Praxiteles, Lysippos and Apelles). N.B. Winckelmann was severely deceived in assigning the Laocoon to this stage.
- *Style of the Imitators* (now called Hellenistic): characterized by the will to ornamentalize, improvise and revive earlier styles, often mixing these tendencies.

We can now address the question of how our era: the so-called modern age, which can be defined chronologically in various ways according to fields of interest, is related to the subject of periodicity. For that purpose it is indeed right to begin with Winckelmann.

Let us recall that stages of development in Dilthey's sense have no significance except in the context of a particular understanding of life. Therefore, it is necessary to ask, in what context was Winckelmann finding the stages of his scheme? The intellectual milieu in which he moved was that of the Renaissance Neoplatonic tradition of humanism as that survived in the 18th century. Winckelmann transformed that tradition dramatically—and thereby introduced the era of modern art history—by penetrating the old tradition with a sense of the *development* that Greek culture went through, or must have gone through, in real—not ideal—terms. He studied Egyptian and Near Eastern cultures as a prelude and accompaniment of a completely different kind from the Greek development, which stood out from that background in stark contrast. While he could not have known anything about the Minoan-Mycenaean world as we have recovered it, his strong preoccupation with the Homeric poems gave him a sense of the unique native Greekness out of which the visual arts would emerge. Above all, in working out the several stages of cultural development he set the world on a totally new path of understanding and, in effect, anticipated unconsciously the very paradigm that Dilthey, digging deep in his own consciousness, managed to bring to light and formulate. That task of recognizing chronological stages and thereby bringing into new relationships the physical remains from the ancient world, had to be done intuitively. But the other task: defining the substance of the Greek world—in short its understanding of life—had to be a conscious activity, a deliberate re-ordering of 18th century curiosity about other cultures (for instance, the Chinese). And Winckelmann confirms this explicitly, as shown in the following passage quoted from the biography by W. Lippmann:⁸

“The History of Ancient Art that I intend to write,” he had already announced in the preface, “is no mere description of the sequence of its development and the changes it underwent; rather I take history in the broader meaning it possessed in Greek (information, tidings), and therefore propose to design a systematic doctrine.” The climate, which actuated and continued to nourish the Greek cult of beauty and fitness; a form of government that among other things gave birth to philosophy and rhetoric, disciplines which do not thrive under tyrants; the esteem in which the Greeks held their artists, who were credited with being wise as well as skilful, and were so honored that many of their names defied the passing of time; and the uses to which art was put by them (to reward outstanding athletes and other citizens as well as to venerate the gods) are cited among the causes of the superiority of Greek sculpture, painting, and architecture over those of other nations.

The heritage, therefore, that later writers on Greek art took over from Winckelmann was not simply the doctrine of the aesthetic achievements of Greek artists but a solidly grounded view of the culture behind these achievements; even if individual parts of the historical view might be questioned, it gave a firm point of departure.

Thus, Winckelmann achieved two separate but interrelated goals, the effect of which, when their import came to be fully realized much later, was to revolutionize the understanding of art. First, he saw that it is necessary to understand the historical background of artistic development in as deep a perspective as possible. Second, that it is necessary to find an internal order in the development of works of art which gives them meaning as links in a chain, as it were. This two-pronged approach is still incontrovertibly valid: it corresponds in a broad sense to the art historian's preoccupation with absolute and relative chronology which explains and justifies the expression "history of art." Constantly balancing these two factors, the art historian evolves an aesthetic interpretation. But the mighty deed of "The Father of Art History" does not quite stop with that, for—as I said above—the particular sequence he worked out by this method contained within it, unbeknownst to him, the seeds of an understanding of the periodical factor in aesthetics which started to bear fruit only in a much later period.

I have devoted considerable attention to Winckelmann's work, partly because it has not been sufficiently appreciated by archaeologists, as Karl Schefold⁹ pointed out, and partly because—for my thesis—it was necessary to demonstrate that Winckelmann performed the initial hard intellectual work for the "understanding of life" (world-view) of modern art history. This is another remarkable instance of the historical phenomenon of the right man or woman turning up in the right place at the right time to bring a new direction to human affairs. Of course, the right time does not always mean that there is an immediate appreciation or follow-up of the impulse offered.

Winckelmann's insight into the historical movement of Greek art is indeed a remarkable and admirable achievement in view of the limitations of his era: geographical and technical in particular. Yet his pioneering perceptions, formed in the absence of direct experience of the major sculpture to be found at Greek sites, and even in Magna Graecia, were doomed to remain merely aesthetic formulae—albeit the best available—for several generations, during which the study of Greek art proceeded in the spirit of the great philological tradition of German scholarship; among the best of this was the work of H. Brunn. In fact, not until Greece itself had attained independence and begun to sort out its treasures on the basis of western museology (itself not very advanced at that time), and the wave of excavations of the last third of the 19th century was underway, could there have been any reason to attempt an up-to-date survey of Greek sculpture on an art historical basis at all. But when this did take place, it may surely be said that the large picture which Winckelmann had sketched out began to prove its worth, whether there was much consciousness of it or gratitude for it or not. In fact, given the spirit of the scientific age just beginning at that time, there was almost necessarily more concern with descriptive analysis of the great stream of discoveries that were pouring into the museums and onto pages of scientific periodicals than with seeking in these materials great underlying thought structures. Constant improvement in grasping the absolute and

relative chronology of Greek art on a pragmatic basis obviously would have seemed more important than theoretical considerations of periodicity.

On the basis of the preceding summary I shall undertake a broad interpretation of the periodicity factor in the history of scholarship on Greek sculpture. It is, however, not feasible in the framework of this study to attempt this in great detail. I believe that a minimally adequate basis for it is a review of the chapter headings of the books I have been able to consult, since the structure of an author's thought is generally encoded in these headings. It appears that the degree of elaboration—or the virtual absence of it—in the table of contents is likely to give a clue to the weight which an author attaches to the problem of periodicity.

The first generation of the type of book involved with this problem seems to begin in the early 1880's and to last about two decades (1906 is my cut-off date) and it follows rather closely on the Winckelmann prototype.

L. M. Mitchell, *A History of Ancient Sculpture* (London 1883)

- Archaic Greek Sculpture, ca. 600–450
- Age of Pheidias and Polykleitos, 450–400
- Age of Scopas, Praxiteles & Lysippos, 400–323
- Hellenistic Sculpture, 323–133

J. Overbeck, *Geschichte der griechischen Plastik* (Leipzig 1893)

- Aelteste Zeit (bis zum 8. Jahrhundert)
- Alte Zeit (das 6. Jahrhundert)
- Die Zeit der ersten grossen Kunstblüte
- Die zweite Blütezeit der Kunst
- Die Zeit der Nachblüte der Kunst

Maxime Collignon, *Geschichte der griechischen Plastik* (Strassburg 1897)

- Die Anfänge
- Die früharchaische Kunst
- Der fortgeschrittene Archaismus
- Die grossen Meister des V. Jahrhunderts
- Einfluss der grossen Meister des V. Jahrhunderts
- Das Vierte Jahrhundert
- Die hellenistische Kunst
- Die griechische Kunst unter römischer Herrschaft

E. A. Gardner, *Greek Sculpture* (London 1898)

- Early Influences
- Rise of Greek Sculpture 600–480
- Fifth Century 480–400

- Fourth Century 400–320
- Hellenistic Age 320–100

H.B. Walters, *The Art of the Greeks* (London 1906)

- The Beginnings of Greek Art
- The Rise of Greek Sculpture 600–480
- Pheidias and His Contemporaries
- Greek Sculpture after Pheidias (includes the Hellenistic Age as a phase after Fourth Century sculpture)

It may, in fact, actually be surprising how closely Mitchell's book does reflect Winckelmann's approach. "Archaic Greek Sculpture" is comparable to "The Earlier Styles" with still no clear concept of Early Classical; "The Age of Pheidias and Polykleitos" is the "Sublime Style" and the "Age of Skopas, Praxiteles and Lysippos" is the "Beautiful Style"; "Hellenistic Sculpture" is "Age of the Imitators". What appears modern is, of course, the substitution of terms we still use for 18th century terminology and the addition of rough limits of absolute chronology. And, indeed, apart from the overextension of the Archaic period, Mitchell's scheme may still seem adequate for critics who choose to work with the most non-committal blocks of time possible. Despite the greater attention paid by Collignon and Walters—at the turn of the century—to defining the earlier stages, there are no clear gains in the articulation of the Classical period (a term not used by them) beyond the appreciation that 480 was an epochal date for the subject.

I have found almost no general studies of Greek sculpture that appeared in the first two decades of the 20th century (apart from the overlap of Walter's book) and it is therefore not clear whether they should be added on to the "founders" generation or start the next stage. These were, of course, years of turmoil in contemporary artistic practice and theory and also art historical theory. In the latter category are the writings of E. Loewy, Alois Riegl, W. Pinder, F. Wyckoff, Max Dvorak among others, but above all of Heinrich Wölfflin. The practical result of all this, as I see it, was a new interest in the "typical" or even typological nature of stages in the history of artistic creation rather than with eras as the personal creation of particular artists. This must have been at least partially owing to the tremendous expansion of interest at this time to ages and cultures of which the artistic creations remain anonymous. This by definition excluded the biographical approach which had been so evident in Classical art scholarship—which in any case was now running into great skepticism about attributions. Thus, to define periods, Wölfflin looked for general tendencies which all artists shared.

In the light of this it is not surprising that the first intimation of that definitely microperiodic organization of the Classical period (the word "classical" was used) which we now take for granted, was proposed in the work of A. von Salis, himself an admirer of Wölfflin. Yet von Salis did not carry this principle through to other periods (the Hellenistic is for example divided into two parts). In fact, for the next 30 years, the same

tendency to see development in terms of three parts shares the stage with a tendency to subdivide into two parts.

A. von Salis, *Die Kunst der Griechen* (Leipzig 1919)

- Die Kunst der Frühzeit
- Die Archaische Kunst
- Die klassische Kunst
 - Frühe
 - Reife
 - Auflockerung
- Die hellenistische Kunst
- Die Kunst der Spätzeit (Klassizismus)

F.B. Tarbell, *A History of Greek Art* (New York 1919) (Greek sculpture)

- The Archaic Period First Half 625(?)–550
- The Archaic Period Second Half 550–480
- The Transitional Period 480–450
- The Great Age First Half 450–400
- The Great Age Second Half 400–323
- The Hellenistic Period 323–146

C. Picard, *La Sculpture Antique* (Paris 1923, 1926)

- La Grèce Archaïque
- Ecoles et Artistes de la Première Moitié du V.e. Siècle
- Myron, Polyclète
- Pheidias et Son Temps
- Le Ve. Siècle Après Phidias
- Les Origines du IVe. Siècle
- Les Maîtres du IVe. Siècle
- La Sculpture Hellénistique

A.W. Lawrence, *Later Greek Sculpture* (London 1927) (Hellenistic)

- The First Hundred Years 334–240
- Ascendancy of Pergamon 240–140
- The Late Hellenistic 140–27

G.M.A. Richter, *Sculpture and Sculptors of the Greeks* (New Haven 1929)

- Archaic Period
- Transitional Period
- Second Half of Fifth Century

- Fourth Century
- Third to First Century

A.W. Lawrence, *Greek and Roman Sculpture* (London 1929)

- Beginnings of Greek Sculpture (Daedalic)
- Archaic Period 620–480
- Early Classical 480–430
- Middle Classical 430–370
- Late Classical 370–323
- Early Hellenistic 323–133
- Hellenistic Anticlimax and the Roman Republic 133–23

B.W. Byvanck, *De Kunst der Oudheid* (Leiden 1949) Tweede Deel

- Het ontstaan van de Graekse Kunst
- De vroege Archaische Periode 600–525
- De late Archaische Periode 525–475
- De Praeklasieke Periode
- De Tijd van Phidias
- De Tijd van de Overgang van de Vijfde naar de Vierde
- Eeuw v. Ch.
- De tweede Klassieke Periode
- De hellenistische Tijd

A.W. Lawrence, for example, followed von Salis almost exactly in 1929; in fact, in a special treatment of Hellenistic art in 1927 he had already opted for a tripartite arrangement of that period. F.B. Tarbell divided the Archaic period into two parts but kept a tripartite division of Classical art under non-committal names (of the subdivisions). C. Picard reverted to artists' names to define the stages. G. Richter in 1919 employed a tripartite division of Classical art—again under non-committal names. After the long interruption of the war Byvanck in 1949 was still dividing the Archaic period into two parts but he introduced a four-part division of the Classical phase, the first time that this occurred, apparently. Yet even without adequate terminology this innovation had much going for it and has become rather commonplace.

In the two decades from 1950 on, interest in periodic rhythms literally surged, so to speak, particularly but by no means exclusively among German scholars. A partial explanation for this phenomenon may be that during the interim between the two wars and even, perhaps, during the second one a new interest in the higher meaning of periodicity in its broadest form can be detected. One might include in this tendency, in a general way, already Oswald Spengler's *Untergang des Abendlandes* (1918) but more specifically, in the German sphere, Paul Frankl's *Das System der Kunstwissenschaft* (1938) and particularly Ernst Buschor's *Vom Sinn der griechischen Standbilder* (1942) and—in the French sphere—H. Focillon's *La Vie des Formes* (1934). The latter study ensures that this trend was not merely a Germanic inspiration. There was at that time

obviously a strong *feeling* about the religious and philosophical implications of art sequences (this being particularly evident in G. Kantorowicz' *Vom Wesen der griechischen Kunst*, even though this was not published until later), although to express this defied the general prohibition on bringing such aspects existentially into the supposedly objective sphere of scholarship.

I can hardly escape the conclusion that all this was in some way a preparation for the efflorescence of periodic thinking on Greek art that characterizes the years from about 1950–1970. These two decades seem to form a separate phase as a kind of culmination, well set off from a long beginning and, as we shall see, from what seems to be an ending.

G. Lippold, *Die griechische Plastik* Hdbh d. Arch. III, 1 (Munich 1950, p. 5)

Die Entstehung der griechischen Geschichte in eine archaische, klassische und hellenistische Epoche hat auch für die Plastik ihre Berechtigung. Richtig verstanden, lassen sich auf diese drei Perioden auch die Begriffe von Aufstieg, Blüte und Niedergang anwenden.

- Archaische Zeit
 - 1. Ältere bis um 580
 - 2. Jüngere 580–480
- Klassische Periode
 - 1. Strenger Stil 490–450
 - 2. Blütezeit des 5. Jhdts. 450–420
 - 3. Nachblüte des Klassischen im 5. Jhd. 430–400
 - 4. Vorblüte des 4. Jhd. 370–330
 - 5. Alexanderzeit 340–310
- Hellenistische Periode
 - 1. Diadochenzeit 320–280
 - 2. Hochblüte des 3. Jhdts. 280–230
 - 3. Späteres 3. Jhdts. 240–200
 - 4. Pathetischer Stil des 2. Jhdts. 200–150
 - 5. Anfänge des Klassizismus 150–80
 - 6. Uebergang zur römischen Kunst 90–30

Richard Haman, *Geschichte der Kunst von der Vorgeschichte bis zur Spätantike* (Munich 1952)

- Geometrische Kunst (10.-8. Jhd.)
- Orientalisierende und dädalische Kunst (7. Jhd.)
- Archaische Kunst (6. Jhd.)
- Klassische Kunst (5. Jhd)
- früh, hoch, spät
- Ermattung des Plastischen und Verinnerlichung (4. Jhd.)
- Hellenismus (3.-1. Jhd.)

L. Alscher, *Griechische Plastik I* (Berlin 1954)

- Die Zeichen (10.-8 Jhd.)
- Weltenschöpfung (700-erstes Viertel 7. Jhdts.)
- Monumentale Gestalten (2. und letztes Drittel 7. und frühes 6. Jhd.)
- (Bd. II, 2, 1982)
 - Frühklassik
 - Hochklassik
 - Spätklassik
- (Bd. IV, 1957)
 - Frühhellenismus (1. Drittel 3. Jhdts. & zweites Drittel desselben)
 - Hochhellenismus: früh, reif, Uebergangsstufe
 - Späthellenismus: 1. und 2. Entwicklungsphasen; Endphase der Entwicklung

Karl Schefold, *Klassische Kunst in Basel* (Skulpturhalle) n.d. (1950's)

- Geometrisch: Früh, streng, reif, reich, spät
- Archaisch
 - Früh: früh-, mittel-, spätprotokorinthisch
 - Reif: dreistufig
 - Spät: Vierstufig
- Klassisch: Früh, hoch,—reicher Stil- spät
- Hellenismus
 - Früh: dreistufig (330–300; 300–280; 280–230)
 - Hoch
 - Spät

G.M.A. Richter, *A Handbook of Greek Art* (London 1959)

- Sculpture:
 - Early Archaic Period 600–580
 - Middle Archaic Period 580–535
 - Late Archaic Period 540–480
 - Early Classical Period 480–450
 - Second half of Fifth Century
 - Fourth Century
 - Hellenistic ca. 330–100

G. Hafner, *Geschichte der griechischen Kunst* (Zurich 1961)

- Die Kunst der Frühzeit
- Die archaische Kunst
- Die Kunst des 5. Jhdts.
- Die Kunst der Zeit Platons
- Die Kunst des Alexanderreiches

John Boardman, *Greek Art* (1964)

- The Beginnings and Geometric Greece
- Greece and the Arts of the East and Egypt
- Archaic Greek Art
- Classical Sculpture and Architecture
- The Other Arts in Classical Greece
- Hellenistic Art

J. Boardman, J. Dörig, W. Fuchs, Hirmer, *Die griechische Kunst* (Munich 1966)

- Die bildenden Künste (Dörig)
 - Geometrische Kunst 1100–700
 - Urarchaische Plastik 700–650
 - Früharchaische Plastik 650–620
 - Strengarchaische Plastik 620–530
 - Reifarchaische Plastik 530–500
 - Frühklassik 500–450
 - Hochklassik 450–400
 - Spätklassik 400–323
 - Frühhellenistische Form 323–225 (Fuchs)
 - Hochhellenistische Form 225–160
 - Späthellenistische Form 100–31

G.M.A. Hanfmann, *Classical Sculpture* (London 1967)

- Geometric Sculpture
- Archaic Sculpture
- Classical Sculpture
- Late Classical Sculpture
- Hellenistic Sculpture

P. Arias, *L'Arte della Grecia* (Turin 1967)

- L'Età del Ferro e la grande crisi Dorica
- L'esperienza orientalizzante
- L'arte delle poleis elleniche
- La forma severa
- Alla ricerca dell' assoluto
- Il dominio della Personalità artistica
- Atticismo e arcaismo nell' età ellenistica
- Il ritorno dello stile classico

W. Fuchs, *Die Skulptur der Griechen* (Munich 1969)

- Geometrisch: früh- 900–800; hoch- 800–700; spät- 740–700
- Orientalisierender Stil: 720–650
- Archaische Zeit: früh- 650–580; hoch- 580/570–540/530; spät- 540/530–500/490
- Klassik: früh- 500/490–460/450; hoch- 450–430/420; reicher Still 420–400/390; spät- 400/390–323
- Hellenismus: früh- 320–250; hoch- 250/240–160/150; spät- 150–30

J. Charbonneaux, R. Martin, F. Villard, *Das Archaische Griechenland* (Universum der Kunst)

- Die frühen Versuche 620–580
- Die Zeit des Reifens 580–525
- Die Vollendung 535–460

Eidem, Das Klassische Griechenland (München 1971)

- Der strenge Stil 480–450
- Die Entstehung des klassischen Idealtypus 450–420
- Der reiche Stil 420–370
- Der Beginn des Realismus 390–340

Eidem, Das Hellenistische Griechenland

- Malerei
 - Die Entstehung des Raumes 350–280
 - Licht und Farbe 280–150
 - Landschaft, Natur und Realismus
- Plastik
 - Der Wandel im 4. Jahrhundert
 - Die Kunst des 3. Jahrhunderts
 - Die Stilrichtungen des 2. Jahrhunderts

In these years the principle of seeing Greek sculpture as a whole in terms of a succession of three major stages is not only everywhere in evidence but it frequently carries with it elaboration into microperiodic triadism. This latter practice is, admittedly, rather selectively applied, especially since a four-stage microperiodic sequence (as already in Byvanck) is used in some instances (e.g., Schefold's "Klassisch" and Fuchs' "Klassik"). It is, nevertheless, rather astonishing how strong a triadic view of development prevailed, even though no single scholar quite reproduced Dilthey's scheme (see Chapter I, *Recapitulation and Interpretation of Dilthey's "Structure of a World View"*, paragraph 3) in its entirety—and even though it cannot really be supposed that anyone at that time was even aware of the existence of that scheme. Instead the triadism seems to have been taken as self-evident and not in need of defense or philosophical explanation as undertaken in this study.¹⁰ Therefore I take it that something in the mental climate of

that era was nudging in the direction of triadism as a technique of understanding artistic activity. How much consciousness was there that the expansive mood, the exciting vistas of new humanistic possibilities which accompanied the earlier postwar years of themselves favored a very ordered process in understanding and interpreting the art of the Greeks? Indeed, as I look back on that era, I sense that a kind of Greek fever, not unconnected with the liberation of Greece from the fascist and then the communist threat, and perhaps distantly reminiscent of the previous liberation of Greece from the Turks, swept through a relieved Western world.

There may have been also another factor involved in this. I propose a thought that is far from original, *viz.*, that thinking, whether individual or collective, proceeds from the general to the specific, that is, from large generalizations to re-structurings on the basis of ever greater accumulation of knowledge and, finally, to quite detailed insights and ramifications. The generation of scholars I am discussing took, after the war, a fresh look at a large but not yet overwhelming heritage of scholarly research from the first half of the century (e.g., Schefold 1949, *passim*) and felt the need or challenge to give it a much firmer organization than had existed before. The enthusiasm of this period corresponds exactly to the requirements of Dilthey's middle stage, when feeling—in this case of a positive kind—infuses the other faculties and, having found the game worth the candle, gets on with the task.

While the effect of this carried through the 60's, as the structure of the books shows, that decade was notoriously a drastic turning point for the established criteria of society in general—a reflection of which I believe to have registered itself in the following decades which I shall consider to be the final stage in this periodic survey (final in the sense of being the end of a coherent development).

W. H. Schuchhardt, *Geschichte der griechischen Kunst* (Stuttgart 1971)

- Die Kunst des geometrischen Zeitalters (11.—8. Jhdts)
- Die archaische Kunst des 7. und 6. Jahrhunderts
- Die Kunst der ersten Klassik des 5. Jahrhunderts
- Die Kunst der zweiten Klassik des 4. Jahrhunderts
- Die Kunst des hellenistischen Zeitalters (3.—1. Jahrhunderts)

Richard Brilliant, *Arts of the Ancient Greeks* (New York 1972)

- Greek Beginnings and “Remembrance of the Heroic Age”
- Archaic Greek Art
- Greek Art 500–450
- Greek Classic Art
- Greek Art in its Second Classic Phase
- Hellenistic Art from Alexander to Actium

Martin Robertson, *A History of Greek Art* (Cambridge 1975)

- The Geometric and Orientalizing Periods
- The Early Archaic Period
- Ripe Archaic Art
- The Great Change: Late Archaic and Early Classical
- The Classical Moment
- Developments into the Fourth Century
- The Second Change: Classical to Hellenistic
- Hellenistic Art

H. Groenewegen-Frankfort & B. Ashmole, *Art of the Ancient World* (New York 1977)

- Protogeometric and Geometric Periods 1100–700
- Orientalizing Art and the Formation of the Archaic Style 700–600
- Archaic Period 600–480
- Early Classical Period 480–450
- Classical Period 450–330
- Hellenistic Art 330–146

R. Lullies, *Griechische Plastik* (Munchen 1979)

- Geometrische Kunst ca. 1100-ca. 700
- Archaische Plastik ca. 700-ca. 500
- Der strenge Stil ca. 500–450
- Die klassische Zeit ca. 450-ca. 310
- Hellenistische Epoche von ca. 310 bis Beginn der römischen Kaiserzeit.

W. R. Biers, *Archaeology of Greece* (Ithaca 1980)

- Geometric Period
- Orientalizing Period
- Archaic Period
- Fifth Century
- Fourth Century
- Hellenistic Age

C. Vermeule, *The Art of the Greek World I,1* (MFA Boston 1982)

- Iron Age: Geometric and Oriental
- Archaic 600–490
- Transitional 490-ca. 455
- Golden Age 455–400
- Fourth Century 400–320
- Hellenistic Age 320–30

J.J. Pollitt, *Art in the Hellenistic Age* (New Haven 1986)

- Age of the Diadochi 325–275
- Age of the Hellenistic Kingdoms 275–150
- Graeco-Roman Phase 150–31

W. Hautumm, *Die Griechische Skulptur* (Cologne 1987)

- Das Geometrische Zeitalter
- Die Archaik
- Die Epoche des Strengen Stils
- Die Hochklassik
- Der Hellenismus

A. Stewart, *Greek Sculpture An Exploration* (New Haven 1990)

- Forerunners 900–600
- Road to Maturity 600–540
- Ripe Archaic 550–500
- From Archaic to Classic 500–470
- Early Classic 480–450
- High Classic 450–430
- Peloponnesian War and its Legacy 430–38
- Late Classical 370–330
- Age of Alexander 340–310
- Early Hellenistic 320–220
- High Hellenistic 220–150
- Late Hellenistic 150–20

In terms of this study it is not difficult to characterize what happened. The elaborate periodization schemes just described largely though not entirely disappear and it may not be an exaggeration to comment that any concern at all with triadism vanishes with them (but Pollitt and Stewart are the exceptions that prove the rule). The corollary to the generalizing process discussed above (see Chapter II, paragraph 20) sets in: that is, when thought structure becomes too elaborate, a reaction against it may occur in the direction of simplification—sometimes even radical simplification (which is not lacking in the above lists). The will asserts itself in a critical, possibly even truculent form (but not necessarily fully consciously). One might even expect, by Diltheyan standards, that at this point the proponents of Greek sculpture (and Greek art in general) as a pedagogical force would step forth with a stripped-down and even rather aggressive message, intending to conquer—in this case—the academic community. To some extent, perhaps, this did happen, though not so much by the efforts of ancient art historians as in the wake of the phenomenal success of Janson's *History of Art* (of course this is an American phenomenon). Whether or not there were conscious imitations of Janson's methods¹¹ in the field of ancient art, we do find there not only the virtual disappearance

of microperiodicity, but a playing with terms like First and Second Classic Style or, more poignantly, the use of centuries (fifth, fourth, etc.) as a structuring principle—thus masking even the very limited habit of thought which still actually serves as a generally accepted orientation on the part of professionals, *viz.*, Archaic—Classical—Hellenistic.

Nevertheless, in the actual circumstances of the 70's and 80's, it seems highly doubtful that there ever could have been a chance of making the values of the Greek "understanding of life" as inherited from Winckelmann an article of faith in higher education. Such was doomed from two directions. First, by the general disillusionment resulting from the Vietnam war, the bitterness of the Cold War, the collapse of traditional morality, the rise of multiculturalism, the denigration of the political process even in democracies—to name just some of the disruptive problems plaguing society. The second direction was internal. The cumulative effects, deadening if not deadly, of modern technology on the "inner life" of all human beings are being felt not only in the spiritual but even in the economic sphere (thus constricting educational funding). In reality, Renaissance humanism as purveyed by Winckelmann is hardly any longer viable in a world culture now effectively defined by anthropological theory ("Darwinism"). I do not find it difficult to understand that now only "facts" seem safe, for these can not be challenged. But ancient Greek values are not much concerned with facts as such. Therefore, although the final phase defined above can be prolonged, if a new cycle is to begin, it must be on the basis of seeking the spiritual values of Greek art, however difficult and unpopular this may be. It is entirely appropriate, moreover, to point out that the feminist art movement arose exactly in this period (70's and 80's). Part of its agenda is that art historical studies need to take into account real human values.

At this point it may be appropriate to recapitulate and evaluate the contents of this chapter.

Around the middle of the 18th century a new discipline was born in Western Europe: the history of Greek sculpture. This was conceived and formulated in the mind of one man who also invented, as it were, the terms—in this case the chronological stages—on which that sculpture could be studied.

In due course the discipline attracted many minds in many countries through a number of generations. Despite tremendous diversity of attitude and method, partly dictated by national languages and styles, scholars posited the outlines of the subject and marked out steps of progress. The basis of this work was largely pragmatic with much reference to excavations and scientific analysis, but without ever totally losing sight of Winckelmann's vision of how Greek sculpture came into existence and was developed according to certain values.

It may seem paradoxical that the combined work of the discipline's members appears in retrospect to have taken place in *stages somewhat similar to those just mentioned as pertaining to Greek sculpture*, that is, in a sort of cycle in four large stages; the "founders"; the early triadic innovators; the microperiodic culminators; and the

eclectic successors, whereby the second, third and fourth roughly parallel Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic. Yet now in the “postmodern” 1990’s, the original substance or vision holding together these stages seems to have dissipated for many reasons. Fragmentation has become the tendency (i.e., specialist analysis rather than synthesis) and even new efforts at multidisciplinary approaches have greater factual accuracy as their focus.

It must be stressed that few if any of the practitioners of the discipline were or are aware of the structuring discovered here; rather they simply see themselves as part of a scholarly tradition. The last thing that could occur to them is that they were compelled by abstract laws of periodicity to take part in this time-structure and to act in the particular way they acted. I should like to emphasize that statement in relation to the idea of determinism, which is regularly brought up as an objection to periodical analysis.