

Winckelmann, Greek masterpieces, and architectural sculpture. Prolegomena to a history of classical archaeology in museums

Book or Report Section

Accepted Version

Smith, A. C. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0224-428X> (2017) Winckelmann, Greek masterpieces, and architectural sculpture. Prolegomena to a history of classical archaeology in museums. In: Lichtenberger, A. and Raja, R. (eds.) The Diversity of Classical Archaeology. Studies in Classical Archaeology, 1. Brepols. ISBN 9782503574936 Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/70169/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

Published version at: http://www.brepols.net/Pages/ShowProduct.aspx?prod_id=IS-9782503574936-1

Publisher: Brepols

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

Winckelmann, Greek Masterpieces, and Architectural Sculpture

Prolegomena to a History of Classical Archaeology in Museums

Amy C. Smith

‘Much that we might imagine as ideal was natural for them [the ancient Greeks].’¹

♣ Just as Johann Joachim Winckelmann mourned the loss of antiquity, so have subsequent generations mourned his passing at the age of fifty, in 1768, as he was planning his first journey to Greece. His deification through — not least — the placement of his profile head, as if carved out of a gemstone, on the title page of the first volume of his *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* (‘History of Ancient Art’) in 1776 (the second edition, published posthumously) made him the poster boy for the study of classical art history and its related branches, *Altertumswissenschaft* or classical studies, history of art, and classical archaeology.² While Winckelmann strongly influenced artists, aesthetes, and historians, who have debated and developed his ideas in his and succeeding generations, his renown has put him at the centre of many movements — aesthetic (classicism, Hellenism, and neoclassicism), intellectual (historicism,³ romanticism,⁴ and modernism⁵), or political (national socialism⁶) — that used and abused his name and ideas.

Why is Winckelmann so useful or adaptable? He changed his ideas throughout his lifetime (as famously noted by Goethe⁷) and, although he published much, left much unwritten on the unexpected occasion of his death. His successors have picked through the fruits of his labour, moreover, to suit their particular causes. More fundamentally, Winckelmann’s academic mind encouraged him to seek knowledge across disciplines. First, as an antiquarian, he ‘collected’ antiquity, amassing a wealth of information from primary sources, textual and otherwise.⁸ Second, as a connoisseur, he extracted and distilled from these sources lists of ‘masters’, established chronologies, and promoted style analysis through

I am grateful to the editors for the invitation to contribute this piece and for their patience and to Katherine Harloe for encouragement, useful discussions, and reading an earlier draft of this article. I acknowledge all responsibility for remaining errors.

¹ Winckelmann 2006, 186.

² Orrells 2011, 166.

³ Meinecke 1936.

⁴ Schultz 1952.

⁵ Ferris 2000, 51–63.

⁶ Sünderhauf 2004, 303–07.

⁷ Hatfield 1953, 288–89.

⁸ On antiquarianism and collectors, see Abt 2006, 119–22; Marvin 2008, 57; MacGregor 2007.

close investigation of ancient objects.⁹ Third, as a historian, he tried to establish a grand narrative.¹⁰ In his overarching *Geschichte*, published first in 1764, Winckelmann brought these three pursuits together, thus founding at their intersection the discipline of classical archaeology. This ‘translation of antiquarianism into passion and imagination’¹¹ relies on autopsy and analysis of collected individual objects in the creation of an overarching historical narrative. Such a construction of narrative(s) on the basis of a series of autopsies constitutes the experience of a museum-goer, so Winckelmann’s approach has naturally influenced the display of classical archaeology since the very birth of the public museum in his own time.¹² In the next generation — the late eighteenth to the early nineteenth centuries — classical archaeology took a foothold on the foundations of the so-called universal museums of the Enlightenment — at the confluence of romanticism and (neo)classicism — where it has remained ever since. Winckelmann’s most enduring influence, therefore, is on the display of classical archaeology in museums, where his diverse academic pursuits coalesced with his aesthetic perspective.

Winckelmann influenced his contemporaries and successors not merely as an academic but also in practical ways. As Vatican Scriptor and then Prefect of Antiquities, when museum collections were disentangling themselves from the libraries and archives from which they were birthed, he had intimate familiarity with collectors as well as collections and a pioneering role in the collection, interpretation, and display of ancient Greek and Roman artefacts by individuals working both for private and public benefit.

This article traces Winckelmann’s influence on the collection and display of classical architectural sculpture, an essential first chapter in the history of the role of classical archaeology in public museums. In positing his influence on the display of classical archaeology, I review the pioneering acquisition and display of Greek architectural sculpture, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, ‘housed in new or rapidly developing museum institutions that made it a mission to present antiquities to the new audiences of urban modernity’.¹³ A comparison of the museums in which the Aigina, Phigalean, and Elgin marbles took pride of place, namely Munich’s Glyptothek and the British Museum, therefore allows insights into the role of classical archaeology in both universal and specialist museums.

The Birth of Public Museums in the Vatican

In general terms, the modern museum is a product of Renaissance humanism, eighteenth-century Enlightenment, and nineteenth-century democracy. And of these three stages — occurring principally in Italy, France, and Britain respectively — perhaps the most dramatic was the museological revolution associated with the Age of Reason.¹⁴

As librarian to Heinrich, Graf von Bünau, an amateur scholar of Roman imperial history, Winckelmann (born in poverty, the son of a cobbler) gained access to library resources, including a ‘cabinet of curiosities’ — primarily coins and gems but increasingly

⁹ In emphasizing first-hand observation of works, Winckelmann was influenced by, in particular, Comte de Caylus and Pierre-Jean Mariette (Décultot 2000; Harloe 2013, 109–12 and 2010, 174; McClellan 1994, 73; Potts 1994).

¹⁰ Harloe 2013.

¹¹ Miller 2013, 73.

¹² Siapkas and Sjögren 2013, 23–33.

¹³ Prettejohn 2012, 39.

¹⁴ Mordaunt Crook 1972, 32.

paintings and sculptures — and to artists and collectors in the cultural centre of Dresden.¹⁵ Winckelmann's 1755 publication of *Gedanken über die Nachahmung der griechischen Werke in der Malerey und Bildhauerkunst* ('Thoughts on the Imitation of Greek Works in Painting and Sculpture') opened up for him distant vistas, as he received a salary from Augustus III, King of Poland and Elector of Saxony, to pursue his studies in Rome, where he concentrated his scholarship on ancient art. In Dresden, Winckelmann met Cardinals Archinto, Passionei, and perhaps even Alessandro Albani, whose collections of classical art would have whetted his appetite for *Roma Aeterna* and his subsequent move to Rome, specifically to the Vatican where he was later employed by the cardinals.¹⁶

While at the Vatican, Winckelmann served as librarian — first to Alberico Cardinal Archinto, the papal secretary of state, and then to Cardinal Alessandro Albani, whom Pope Clement XIII appointed to the post of Cardinal Librarian (1761). From 1763, Albani seems to have recommended Winckelmann to further positions within the Vatican libraries:

Prefect of Antiquities of Rome, Apostolic Antiquarian and Commissioner for the Antiquities of the Apostolic Chamber (with the qualification of 'scriptor teutonicus' and Custodian of the profane antiquities of the Library).¹⁷

While Scriptor of German texts in 1764, Winckelmann received a small payment of 12.5 *scudi* for three months of work. Perhaps it was an honorarium for his prefect role, as he already had other roles in the Vatican. This payment is, alas, the only evidence that links Winckelmann to Clement XIII's Museo Profano, as Ruprecht has noted it among other payments to workers on that project.¹⁸ It is highly likely, however, that Winckelmann and his patron, Cardinal Albani, played important roles in establishing the Museo Profano. Albani had a hand in the development of the papal public museum of art throughout the eighteenth century. In 1703, his uncle Gianfrancesco Albani, Pope Clement XI, established the Museo Ecclesiastico, the collections of which were soon dispersed. In 1728, Alessandro Albani famously undersold his substantial collection of antiquities to Clement XII who therewith established the extramural Capitoline Museum in 1734.¹⁹ The Galleria Clementina, established in the 1730s by Clement XII, exhibited Albani's collection of coins and some 'Etruscan' vases alongside books and manuscripts.²⁰ The collections in the Vatican Palace were beginning to cohere as the 'Vatican Museum', to which a 1749 inscription refers.²¹

On 4 August 1761, Clement XIII decreed the completion of a catalogue of the Vatican collections²² and the creation of an environment suitable for their display.²³ Work on the Museo Profano seems to have begun soon thereafter. An inscription with Clement XIII's coat of arms records his name and the date of the founding of the museum. 1767.²⁴ in a single room that occupies a closed-off space under arches overlooking the Cortile della Pigna. It was originally floored with luxurious marbles and crowned with Stefano Pozzi's 1767 ceiling fresco of *Minerva Ordering the Genius of Rome to Save the Vestiges of Antiquity from the*

¹⁵ Justi 1923, 359–410.

¹⁶ Ruprecht 2011, 48–49; Vian 1976.

¹⁷ Cornini 2013, 29.

¹⁸ Ruprecht 2011, 193.

¹⁹ Vatican Museums 1983, 14 traces the Capitoline back to 1471 when Sixtus IV gave the Lateran bronzes to the Roman populace.

²⁰ Ruprecht 2011, 97; Vatican Museums 1983, 15.

²¹ Cornini 2013, 27.

²² Ruprecht 2011, 147–55.

²³ Cornini 2013, 27.

²⁴ Cornini 2013, 29.

Decay of Time,²⁵ which celebrates papal protection of Rome's cultural treasures.²⁶ Coins, cameos, and other small items, many formerly in the Museum of Cardinal Gaspare Carpegna, filled its sumptuous cabinets, while busts filled some niches.²⁷

The Museo Profano served as a semi-formal entry to the collections of classical antiquities collected by earlier popes: to the public Galleria Clementina on the same level and same wing of the palace, just to the south, and to the private Antiquario, where the famous ancient sculptures were housed, via a monumental staircase to the north. The Museo Profano thus ushered visitors away from the sacred area of the Library and into the profane part of the museum.²⁸

The Museo Profano seems to have been part of a strategy to separate classical antiquity into its own realm within the Vatican. By 1767, as evidenced by receipts, the Greek manuscripts were divided into classical vs. sacred/scriptural; manuscripts were separate from statues; and the public museum was set apart from the private library.²⁹ What inspired this? In separating manuscripts from artworks and sacred from profane, Clement XIII had reorganized the collections in the same way that, in 1754, his predecessor, Benedict XIV had divided sacred and profane in the Capitoline: its Museo Sacro contained gems, medals, casts, and the like, while the Accademia del Nudo was intended for artistic study/sketch of ancient sculptures. Ruprecht suggests Clement XIII was encouraged by his 1765 visit to the Villa Albani, built between 1751 and 1763 by Cardinal Albani as a museum for his own antiquities, which Winckelmann curated.³⁰ Winckelmann also assisted in the conception and design of its new frescoes by Anton Raffael Mengs.³¹ Since Albani the collector and Winckelmann the scholar had worked together so closely over such a long period of time on the Villa Albani and seemingly later on the Museo Profano, it is impossible to judge which way the influence went. Yet, it is likely that they had developed a shared agenda, which began to be realized, alas, after the deaths of Winckelmann and the pope under whom he worked.³²

Later popes, Clement XIV and Pius VI, working initially with Cardinal Albani, reorganized and legitimized the 'profane' collection, united it with the sculptures in the Antiquario (that had until now been private), and collected yet more Greek and Roman masterpieces for it.³³ The resulting neoclassical Museo Pio-Clementino, named after these two popes who established it between 1771–94,³⁴ integrated antique with modern as throughout Europe,³⁵ using sculptures both as decoration and as pretext for lavish display.³⁶

²⁵ Cornini 2013, 35, fig. 9; and 26, fig. 1.

²⁶ The name 'Museo Profano' is still used to refer to this space, which was returned to its former splendour in 2013 (Bertello 2013, 10).

²⁷ Bertello 2013, 9.

²⁸ Ruprecht 2011, 119–30.

²⁹ Ruprecht 2011.

³⁰ Ruprecht 2011, 60; Vout 2006, 51.

³¹ Röttgen 1977. Much of this collection was later dispersed, particularly to Munich. For what remains see Bol 1988–.

³² For Winckelmann's relationship with Albani, see Vout 2006, especially 49–51.

³³ Vatican Museums 1983, 15.

³⁴ Ruprecht 2011, 95–108.

³⁵ Cornini 2013, 29.

³⁶ Potts 2000, 29–30.

The Ideal, from Aesthetics to Romanticism

Der einzige Weg für uns, gross, ja, wenn es möglich ist, unnachahmlich zu werden, ist die Nachahmung der Alten. ('The only way for us to become great or, if this be possible, inimitable, is to imitate the ancients.')

As Prefect of Antiquities, Winckelmann was the prototype of scholarly curator, balancing his efforts between studying/publishing his thoughts on the artefacts in his care, caring for the monuments, and enabling visitors access to antiquities. Some of Winckelmann's most influential writings consider the Vatican's famous sculptures, the Belvedere Torso and the Apollo Belvedere (1759). Although his final publication, *Monumenti antichi inediti* ('Unpublished Monuments of Antiquity', 1767–68), was a sort of catalogue prefaced by a general sketch of the history of art, however, Winckelmann seems to have resisted cataloguing antiquities and indeed dismisses catalogues in the Preface to his *Geschichte*.³⁷ Under his watch, Giovanni Battista Passeri catalogued the Vatican's Greek vases in *Picturae Etruscorum in Vasculis* (1767). Winckelmann famously resisted Sir William Hamilton's invitation to catalogue his own extensive catalogue of vases,³⁹ eventually published by Baron d'Hancarville.⁴⁰

While he was Prefect, Winckelmann was increasingly favoured as the tour guide *extraordinaire* for important visitors to Rome, such as Hamilton and his wife, Emma, whom he guided in February–April 1768.⁴¹ Winckelmann advised many, whether or not on tour, in the art of connoisseurship, namely the identification and authentication of artworks and their attribution to particular artists, schools, and/or styles.⁴² Winckelmann had learned some of this skill — an essential basis for judicious collection — from the writings of Pausanias, likewise a tour guide, in second-century CE Greece.⁴³ Ultimately, Winckelmann's connoisseurial role spread his influence well beyond the academy, among artists, collectors, and others. In 1759, Winckelmann advised Mengs, for example, in his acquisition of three hundred vases, mostly from Nola.⁴⁴ Winckelmann's work with this collection in particular seems to have encouraged him in his conviction that so-called Etruscan vases were in fact Greek, as concluded also eventually by Hamilton.⁴⁵ Winckelmann's friendship with Mengs also resulted in the fact that Mengs incorporated Winckelmann's ideas into his own paintings.⁴⁶

Winckelmann's influence coincided with a new era of classicism that changed European tastes for classical archaeology and further encouraged subsequent generations of neoclassical artists to imitate the antique. Winckelmann used aesthetics in a philosophical manner and identified aesthetic truth with artistic beauty.⁴⁷ It is unsurprising then that the *Gedanken*'s strongest immediate influence was on contemporary aesthetes. Gotthold Ephraim

³⁷ Winckelmann 1755, 2.

³⁸ Winckelmann 1764, 8.

³⁹ Winckelmann 1925, III, 336; see Jenkins 1996, 46.

⁴⁰ Hancarville 1767.

⁴¹ Jenkins 1996, 46.

⁴² Ebitz 1988.

⁴³ Harloe 2010; Pretzler 2010 and 2007, 122–25.

⁴⁴ Jenkins 1996, 52; Greifenhagen 1939.

⁴⁵ Jenkins 1996, 51; Constantine 1993; Tischbein 1791.

⁴⁶ Marvin 2008, 123–25; Prettejohn 2005, 34–35.

⁴⁷ Sheehan 2000, 5 and others see here an influence from Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten, under whom he could have studied at the University of Halle. Harloe 2013, 54 n. 85 notes that Winckelmann seems not to have attended Baumgarten's classes on aesthetics.

Lessing relied on it heavily in his formulation of his *Laokoon* (1766). Immanuel Kant provided philosophical equivalents for Winckelmann's art-historical ideas, insofar as he saw beauty as neither inherent to the object nor a property or feature of the object but rather a 'judgment of taste'. Whereas Winckelmann's writings abound in rules and criteria, Kant rejected aesthetic rules derived through empiricism, so 'we can see Kant's theory as clearing the way, at least, for modern art'.⁴⁸ Regarding art's imitative qualities, while Winckelmann made an important distinction between *Nachahmung* ('imitation') and *Nachmachen* ('reproduction') in his *Gedanken*, Kant declared *Nachahmung* ('imitation') as the artistic ideal as contrasted with its base opposite, *Nachäffung* ('mindless aping').⁴⁹

Indeed, Winckelmann encouraged artists to imitate and then surpass the ancient, not just in forms but in spirit, as in the opening of his *Gedanken* (above). Winckelmann praised Raphael's elegant Renaissance works as closer to ancient precedents than the work of most of his contemporaries, yet upheld Mengs as coming closest to that ideal.⁵⁰ In defining classicism as the *absence* of taste, however, Winckelmann turned taste upside down. He compared Greek artworks of the 'best' periods to the purity of water and characterized the classical ideal as the avoidance of both mannerism (the 'characteristic') and extreme emotional expression. Neoclassical artists in his and the next generation — e.g. Jacques-Louis David, who looked to Mengs for inspiration — thus shunned complex baroque and frivolous rococo and sought to revive the 'edle Einfalt und stille Grösse' (noble simplicity and silent grandeur) of the antique that Winckelmann had found perplexing in the Laocoon statue.⁵¹ Through his personal relationships and writings, Winckelmann also influenced neoclassical architects and other craftsmen. In *Anmerkungen über die Baukunst der Alten* ('Observations on the Architecture of the Ancients', 1762), he lauded the accomplishments of Greek architects whose work he observed at Paestum. The Scottish architect Robert Adam disseminated Winckelmann's ideas to other architects throughout Europe. Perhaps the most influential disseminator of Winckelmann's ideas among craft practitioners was Josiah Wedgwood, with his neoclassical ceramic reproductions in 'Etruria' (Staffordshire, UK) from 1782. Wedgwood and other craftsmen thus transmitted Winckelmann's ideas to the public in developing their taste for the antique. Thomas Hope returned from his tour of Greece and Ionia (1788–96), for example, armed with marbles with which he had hoped to convert the English to neo-Grecian taste. Although snubbed in his own time, his furniture and fabrics, somewhat modelled on Hamilton's vase collection, became popular in Regency England.⁵²

This enthusiasm for all things Greek took hold throughout Europe, especially in the revolutionary climate of the 1790s, as Europe's cultural alternative to pervasive Christianity.⁵³ Yet, Winckelmann's 'vision of Greece led not to tyranny but to liberation and renaissance'.⁵⁴ Winckelmann's influence was broad and deep throughout continental Europe and especially in France, where Antoine Quatremère de Quincy encouraged rising Hellenism in support of Winckelmann's thesis that Greek art was a unique product of Greek ways and would be impossible to revive.⁵⁵ At this time, Hellenism ran alongside romanticism, and Winckelmann was adopted by the romantic poets, e.g. Goethe, Hölderlin, Schiller, and Schegel.⁵⁶ In 1807,

⁴⁸ Prettejohn 2005, 49.

⁴⁹ Kant 1790. See Prettejohn 2005, 15–64 and Vorländer 1974, 172–74.

⁵⁰ Winckelmann 1767, V.VI.12.

⁵¹ Winckelmann 1755, 21; see Prettejohn 2012, 13–14, Tzortzaki 2012, 668; Hatfield 1953, 285.

⁵² Stoneman 2010, 170–71; Watkin 1968.

⁵³ Boyle 2000, 66; Marchand 2003, 3–35.

⁵⁴ Hatfield 1953, 282.

⁵⁵ Ruprecht 2014, 114; McClellan 1994, 146–47; Pommier 1989; Potts 1978.

⁵⁶ Ruprecht 2002, xvii–xxiv; Canat 1951–55.

the idealist philosopher Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling called Winckelmann ‘the first to think of looking at works of art according to the laws of eternal works of nature’.⁵⁷ (Karl Wilhelm) Friedrich Schlegel, who aimed to be the Winckelmann of Greek poetry, endorsed Winckelmann’s idea that art and life were one in the ancient world.⁵⁸ On reading the *Geschichte* (at least four times), Johann Gottfried Herder concluded that Greek aesthetic creativity was a model for culture.⁵⁹

Connoisseurship, History, and Fantasy

Without a sense of feeling for, and fantasy of, the past, perhaps no historical narrative is possible.⁶⁰

While Winckelmann lamented what was past and gone, namely the ‘noble simplicity and silent grandeur’ of classical Greece, he sought to reconstruct this ideal and thus revive it through careful study of classical texts and fragments, albeit of Roman copies.⁶¹ Winckelmann’s writings, especially the *Geschichte*, were pivotal in the emergence of the academic persona now known as the art historian. Like Winckelmann himself, the art historian seamlessly merges the roles of aesthete, collector, and even antiquarian with a historical perspective. In intertwining aesthetics into his *Geschichte*, moreover, Winckelmann took a fundamental step away from biographical art history, which had been a connoisseurial obsession since Vasari’s *Vitae*. This enabled a shift from the perspective of the maker to that of the perceiver of art.⁶² That is, whether or not anything could be known about the maker of the artwork, art was now valued for its own sake and because of the thoughts it encouraged in the viewer. While Winckelmann the classicist ‘proclaimed the immutable value of ancient Greece as an aesthetic ideal’, Winckelmann the historian ‘sought to root the distinctive character of the Greek achievement in its circumstances’.⁶³

Winckelmann articulated in the *Geschichte* not only the cultural and aesthetic value of studying the ancient Greeks but also outlined a new method — style analysis — for studying ancient artworks and provided a model of cultural-historical development in terms of a succession of period styles. The text comprises analysis, description, and discussion of the four ancient sculptural traditions: Egyptian, Etruscan, Greek, and Roman. Winckelmann embedded his philological knowledge of the great masters — particularly of ancient Greece — into his developmental ideas and thus gave rise to the enduring twofold classification of art according to school and chronology.⁶⁴ The artistic sense of ‘school’ as a group of individuals working in connection with a master persists, for example, in the study of Greek vases pioneered by John Beazley.⁶⁵ In the first volume of the *Geschichte*, Winckelmann presented a schema of four developmental periods of Greek art and thus defined an artistic tradition as a

⁵⁷ Schelling delivered this lecture, ‘Über das Verhältnis der bildenden Künste zu der Natur’ (Concerning the Relationship of the Plastic Arts to Nature), in his role as Director of the Bavarian Academy of Sciences in Munich on the name day of the King, 12 October. See Shaw 2010, 113–73.

⁵⁸ In ‘Über die Grenzen des Schönen’: see Behler and others 1958, 36–37, Beiser 2003, 19.

⁵⁹ Zammito 2002, 334–35.

⁶⁰ Orrells 2014.

⁶¹ Tzortzaki 2012, 668.

⁶² Abrams 1989, 137.

⁶³ Sheehan 2000, 13.

⁶⁴ McClellan 1994, 80; Potts 1982 and 1978.

⁶⁵ See most recently Rodríguez Pérez and others 2016.

process of historic development.⁶⁶ This developmental process rose through ‘oldest’ (archaic), ‘sublime’ or ‘high’ (early classical, e.g. Pheidias), ‘beautiful’ (late classical, e.g. Praxiteles), and finally fell to Graeco-Roman imitation and decline.⁶⁷ In this step towards historicism, albeit perhaps only halfway, he influenced the next generation of continental historians of art, who applied his anti-biographical model to regional or national and post-antique art.⁶⁸ All art histories try to tell linear or at least sequential stories, historicizing or re-historicizing images, and thus follow Winckelmann’s lead.⁶⁹

In the preceding pages, I have demonstrated how Winckelmann’s writings are significant in historical as well as philosophical terms. While his historical accomplishment was constituted by his weaving Pliny’s list of names and works together with a political and social history that linked the development of Greek arts to the political freedom of its creators, his philosophical achievement was in demonstrating that the (otherwise indefinable) beauty of Greek art could be found in the present through the experience of the modern viewer in sustained observation of particular works of art. Yet, it is Winckelmann’s descriptions of his engagements with the visual, namely ancient works of art in Rome, that demonstrated the real beauty of Greek art. This beauty is defined not by the material characteristics of the work under scrutiny but through a more considered contemplation of its ‘idea’.⁷⁰

Putting Classical Archaeology on Public Display

While most contemporaries may not see the point in reading Winckelmann’s aesthetics or his encomia on classical statues anymore, we are not done with him, nor with his aesthetic vision, precisely because his ideas still haunt the very museums modern people attend in ever greater numbers.⁷¹

The oldest art museums, namely the Capitoline and Vatican Museums, owe their origins to Renaissance collecting impulses. Ancient Greek and Roman art has always been at the core of the art museum, therefore, both because of the museums’ Roman origins and because Renaissance and later collectors inherited the priority that antiquarians and men of letters had traditionally given to antiquity. By the end of the eighteenth century, not only had classical archaeology become an essential feature of the (art) museum, but the museum itself had become the essential context for ancient art in terms of housing, preserving, and presenting it to the public. This museum context still overshadows any didactic context.⁷² At the same time, royal and noble collections had begun to open their collections to the public. In 1801, Napoleon opened his Musée Napoléon, successor and predecessor to the Louvre, as a universal art museum that would present in one place antiquities — including the Vatican’s greatest treasures that it had been forced to contribute — and other art treasures of Europe, both to educate the public and to glorify the new French Empire. The project was short-lived: on the occasion of Napoleon’s defeat (1815), most of the works were returned to their homes. Crown Prince Ludwig (later King Ludwig I) of Bavaria acquired some antiquities, e.g. from Cardinal Albani’s collection, that Italian families couldn’t afford to bring home. Meanwhile,

⁶⁶ Winckelmann 2006, 111–298.

⁶⁷ Potts 1994, 15.

⁶⁸ Lanzi 1792 (on Italy) or Agincourt 1810–23, for example.

⁶⁹ Squire 2011, 28–29.

⁷⁰ Prettejohn 2005, 21.

⁷¹ Ruprecht 2011, 22.

⁷² Cohen 2015, 473.

the British Museum, which had opened to visitors 15 January 1759, was Europe's first public universal museum.⁷³ The impetus for its foundation was the sale of the cabinet of 'curiosities' of Sir Hans Sloane, whose will says:

[...my collections], tending many ways to the [...] benefit of mankind, may remain together [...] chiefly in and about the city of London [...] may be from time to time visited and seen by all persons desirous of seeing and viewing the same [...] for the improvement of knowledge, and information of all purposes.⁷⁴

Arthur Onslow, Speaker of the House of Commons, suggested joining it with the Cottonian and Harleian Libraries in creating a national museum, thus combining books, antiquities, natural history, and other miscellanies.⁷⁵

From the beginnings of universal museums, Winckelmann's ideas contributed significantly to the public display of classical archaeology, in terms of both rationale and manner of display. James Sheehan has cogently articulated that three 'assumptions' Winckelmann tied to his work on antiquity underpin his impact on the display of classical archaeology in museums, namely: aesthetics, which valued art for its own sake; history, which valued the past and recognized the need to protect and conserve it for the future; and ethics, whereby 'aesthetic experience is [deemed] beneficial to individuals and society and the separation of art from the everyday world helps individuals to understand the connections between art and truth'.⁷⁶ While Winckelmann was not unique in seeing the public benefit of engagement with art, the integration of this idea into his scholarship aided its adoption by the next generation. Through the *Gedanken*, in a proselytizing manner, and in the *Geschichte*, in a more programmatic manner, he argued for putting classical archaeology on public display, namely to view and study ancient art with an opportunity for comparison of both similar and dissimilar artefacts. Aloys Hirt echoes Winckelmann's view in talking of ancient monuments in the Prussian royal collection in 1778: 'Only by making them public and uniting them in display can they become the object of true study; and every result obtained from this is a new gain for the common good of mankind.'⁷⁷

Winckelmann's development of style not only catered to the taste for a plurality of artistic forms but also gave museum curators an academic basis for chronological presentation. His linear conception of art history, reliant on periods rather than precise dates,⁷⁸ provided an adaptable organizing principle for collectors and curators. His influence is still felt in any museums that display art, insofar as the consequent emphasis on the history of forms opened curators up to displays that don't necessarily rely on (supposed) famous creators of their works. From 1779, Winckelmann's friend Christian von Mechel rearranged the Austrian imperial collection of the Belvedere Museum, Vienna, as a 'visible history of art'.⁷⁹ For Ennio Quirino Visconti's arrangement of the new sculpture galleries in the Louvre in 1795, a chronological organization was impossible, both because the Louvre marbles had

⁷³ Wilson 2002, 8; Paul 2012, 47–72. The history of museums is rife with firsts. Oxford's Ashmolean Museum, built by Thomas Wood in 1679–83, with a collection assembled by John Tradescant the Younger and supplemented by that of Elias Ashmole, was the first institution designed for exhibition, yet it was not truly opened to the public until 1845 (MacGregor 1983). Kassel's Museum Fredericianum, built in 1779 for the Landgrave Frederick II by Simon Louis du Ruy, was the first building designed and constructed as a public museum (Paul 2012, 145–66; Savoy 2006).

⁷⁴ Mordaunt Crook 1972, 47.

⁷⁵ Caygill and Date 1999, 12–13.

⁷⁶ Sheehan 2000, 3.

⁷⁷ Mordaunt Crook 1972, 34.

⁷⁸ In contrast e.g. to those found in Hancarville 1767.

⁷⁹ Paul 2012, 167–90.

not been collected on the basis of this desideratum and because of uncertainties about the dating of ancient sculptures.⁸⁰ Winckelmann's developmental cycle had an influence on the next generation of museums, however, as exemplified by the Munich Glyptothek whose architect, Leo von Klenze, advocated a historical arrangement, as discussed below.⁸¹

The Discovery of Greek Architectural Sculpture

The works of Phidias and Myron will willingly rise out of their moist graves and emigrate thither, where, as Pindar's hymn once received the returning victors from Olympia, our jubilation will welcome these conquerors of the centuries.⁸²

Winckelmann had no choice but to write his *Geschichte* on the basis of little if no engagement with original Greek art. The sculptures in Rome were largely from the Roman period, taken to be copies of Greek originals, not inferior but rather differentiated. Visconti's catalogue of antiquities in the Vatican (1782), for example, provides a tripartite classification of sculptures: Greek (fine), Roman (mediocre), and Roman copy of Greek original (design superior to execution).⁸³ It was still hanging in the balance whether the vases in Mengs's and other collections of so-called 'Etruscan' vases found in Vulci, Naples, and elsewhere were Greek, Etruscan, or other.⁸⁴ In any case, they were not the masterworks about which Winckelmann had read in the ancient writings of Pausanias, Pliny, and others. Winckelmann did not live to see original sculptures from Greece, but he had admired the ancient Greek architectural forms he found at Paestum (1762) and had encouraged excavations at Olympia, as did Klenze later.⁸⁵ Mengs eventually concluded 'it seems unbelievable to me that we possess works of the most celebrated artists of antiquity'.⁸⁶

The impetus for a change in collecting tastes and therefore public display of ancient art was none other than the acquisition of original Greek artworks from Greece itself: the Aigina pediments (1812), the Bassae frieze a.k.a. Phigalean marbles (1814), and the Elgin marbles (1816). These acquisitions 'reflected the growing, indirect power exercised by the Europeans over the decaying Ottoman Empire'⁸⁷ and the temporary difficulties northerners had in accessing Rome during the Napoleonic Wars. The fact that these were works of genuine Greek art elicited a re-evaluation of Europe's taste for the antique. Through these marbles, artists, aesthetes, and antiquarians gained an appreciation of unrestored Greek originals in a variety of styles. While the first of these three sets of architectural sculptures, those from Aigina, underwent *Antikenergänzung* or restoration, the latter two were eventually displayed in the British Museum without restoration. The resulting display of parts of an architectural monument without the architecture both changed our understanding of ancient art and expanded our idea of what constituted sculpture.

⁸⁰ McClellan 1994, 153.

⁸¹ Klenze and Schorn 1863, iv.

⁸² Leo von Klenze, 'On the Removal of Works of Plastic Art from Contemporary Greece, and the Latest Undertakings of the Kind', a lecture to the Bavarian Academy of Sciences, 31 March 1821, trans. Stoneman 2010, 197.

⁸³ Marvin 2008, 128–33.

⁸⁴ Nørskov 2009, 72–74; see also Halbertsma forthcoming.

⁸⁵ See n. 82. Ernst Curtius revived Winckelmann's plans in 1852, but systematic excavations by the German Archaeological Institute only began in 1875.

⁸⁶ Mengs 1771, 2.245; see also Potts 1980a.

⁸⁷ Dyson 2006, 135.

The Aigina marbles came to light in April 1811 when a quartet of Englishmen — Charles Robert Cockerell and John Foster — and Germans — Carl Haller von Hallerstein and Jacob Linckh — visited the so-called Temple of Zeus Panhellenios — later revealed to be the Temple of Aphaia⁸⁸ — on the island of Aigina.⁸⁹ This ‘Society of Travelers’, ‘little company of adventurers’, or just ‘friends’ — as they called themselves⁹⁰ — started out happily measuring and sketching. Cockerell and Haller were architects, while the others were painters (fig. 3.1). On their second day, when work progressed to excavation, they unearthed a set of high relief pedimental sculptures ‘in very powerful action evidently in combat [...] not inferior to the remains of the Parthenon and certainly in the second rank after the (Belvedere) Torso, Laocoon and other famous statues’.⁹² These figures were later understood to be the heroes Herakles, Telamon, and others fighting the Trojans. Aesthetic responses to the figures were mixed, but indeed, as is now clear, they represent two distinct styles: the latest archaic (c. 500) and the earliest classical (c. 480). The Irish painter Edward Dodwell captured their essence in describing them as ‘noble, without being harsh or rigid; [...] composed with Doric severity, mingled with the airy grace of youthful forms’.⁹³ After they secured the excavation rights with a payment of £40 to the Aiginetan officials, the Friends exported the sculptures to Malta via Athens and Zante (Zakynthos), then under British control, and resolved to auction the marbles on 1 November 1812.

Insert fig. 3.1 here:

Figure 3.1. View of the Temple of Aphaia at Aigina. Proof before title to Cockerell 1860, engraved by Robert Brandard from a drawing by J. M. W. Turner, 1935. © The Trustees of the British Museum.

In September 1811, the same ‘Society of Travellers’ — Cockerell, Foster, Haller, and Linckh — visited the classical temple at Bassae (‘Wooded Glen’), on the barren ridge of Mt Kotyilion in the Arcadian mountains, near Phigalea. In 1765, the French architect Joachim Bocher had identified Bassae’s classical temple as that of Apollo Epikourios (‘Helper’), designed by Iktinos, according to Pausanias VIII.41.7, perhaps in 429 BCE. Cockerell scraped around the base of the temple and found, apparently in a fox hole, a relief depicting Lapiths and Centaurs. The Friends postponed their excavations to the following spring, while Foster obtained the permission of Veli, Pasha of the Morea and son of Ali Pasha.⁹⁴ The ‘little company of adventurers’ then reassembled in July–August 1812, albeit without Cockerell, who was recuperating from illness in Sicily, but with the addition of a Dane, Peter Oluf Brøndsted, and the Estonian painter Baron Otto Magnus von Stackelberg.⁹⁵ They removed many marbles, including reliefs of mythological battles — the Amazonomachy as well as the Centauromachy from the temple’s interior Ionic frieze — to Zante, where they were temporarily installed in probable sequence and offered for sale on 1 May 1814.⁹⁶

⁸⁸ Paus., II.30.3.

⁸⁹ Wünsche 2011, 7–56; Stoneman 2010, 182–86; Ruprecht 2002, 125–39.

⁹⁰ Cooper 1996, 13.

⁹² Cockerell 1903, 103.

⁹³ Dodwell 1819, 570.

⁹⁴ Veli first asked for half of what was obtained but, unimpressed with the results and with more urgent matters at hand, agreed to £400 to opt out of his share (Leigh 1817, 32–34; Cooper 1996, 21–23 notes discrepancies in the reports of the amount paid).

⁹⁵ For biographies, see Cooper 1996, 15–31; for Linck, Wagner, and Stackelberg, see Hautumm 1983, 77–142.

⁹⁶ See Cooper, 12–22; Stoneman 2010, 188–91.

The Friends, now called ‘Proprietors’, prioritized the sale of the Aigina marbles.⁹⁷ Cockerell persuaded his prince regent, George, however, to bid up to £8000 for them. Louis François Sébastien Fauvel, artist, collector, one time French consul, and perpetual host of international visitors to Athens,⁹⁸ encouraged Visconti, now Keeper of Antiquities in the Napoleon Museum, who was only willing to bid up to £6000. Haller enthused Prince Ludwig of Bavaria, an avowed Philhellene and collector, having recently secured Dodwell’s judicious collection of ancient vases.⁹⁹ Eager for Bavaria to imitate London and Paris with the display of antiquities,¹⁰⁰ Ludwig re-routed his agent, Johann Martin von Wagner — painter, sculptor, and antiquarian — from Rome, where he had been buying the prince statues.¹⁰¹ When Wagner arrived in Zante, he was disappointed not to be able to see the sculptures, as they were on Malta with Taylor Combe, the British Museum’s Keeper of Antiquities, who was poised to make England’s formal bid. Wagner easily outbid the French, while Combe — waiting in vain on Malta — missed the sale.¹⁰²

For the sale of the Bassae reliefs and related marbles — collectively known as the Phigalean marbles — the ‘Proprietors’ comprised the original four plus Thomas Leigh, a wealthy Englishman turned archaeologist, who perhaps partially funded the removal of the sculptures from Bassae.¹⁰³ In a letter dated 7 September 1812, Foster explains their perceptions of the value of the frieze:

If our former collection [from Aigina] was valuable from its *date*, this becomes so from its *superior execution*; since, from the circumstances of the temple being of the same age with the Parthenon of Athena, was also erected by the same architect, there can be no doubt of the frieze which we have found being the work of Phidias.¹⁰⁴

During his visit to Zante, Wagner had viewed the Bassae frieze, which he found to be of inferior quality, and thus declined it on the basis that Ludwig had stipulated he should buy it only if certain it was created by the ‘school of Pheidias’. On the day of the auction, the English excessively overbid the French — £15,000 to £8000 — to assure their success.¹⁰⁵ The paid amount was increased to £19,000 by an unfavourable exchange.¹⁰⁶

Thorvaldsen and *Antikenergänzung*

One of the most relevant tests of true artistic mastery remains the ability to heal artworks of antiquity.¹⁰⁷

The journey of the Aigina marbles to Munich was interrupted by a stop in Rome (1815–18) for *Antikenergänzung* or restoration by the idealizing neoclassical Danish sculptor Bertel

⁹⁷ Cooper 1996, 13.

⁹⁸ Pannuti 1971–72, 254–55.

⁹⁹ Stoneman 2010, 192.

¹⁰⁰ Wünsche 2011, 78–80.

¹⁰¹ Hautumm 1983, 87; Vierneisel and Leinz 1980, 30–36; see also Ruprecht 2002, 179–83 for his itinerary.

¹⁰² *Select Committee* 1816, 63.

¹⁰³ Stackelberg and Brøndsted are not mentioned in the sale documents, so it is assumed that they were not financial contributors to the project (Cooper 1996, 13).

¹⁰⁴ British Museum, Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities Library, 42 B, p. 62.

¹⁰⁵ See Michon 1912, based on reports of eyewitnesses such as Leigh 1817, 1–3, 23–34.

¹⁰⁶ *Select Committee* 1816, 15.

¹⁰⁷ Schlegel 1825, 334.

Thorvaldsen and three assistants, under the direction of none other than Wagner, himself a sculptor.¹⁰⁸ The restoration of damaged sculptures was still deemed not only appropriate but also beneficial. Whether through the influence of romanticism or pride in his status as an artist — not a mere technician — the Italian sculptor Antonio Canova had declined Lord Elgin’s invitation to restore the Parthenon marbles (discussed below), declaring ‘It would be sacrilege in him, or any man, to presume to touch them with a chisel’.¹⁰⁹ Quatremère, who also preferred to keep the Parthenon frieze unrestored, suggested restoration of the Aigina marbles on the proviso that it ‘does not damage the original workmanship [...] does not mislead [...] falsifies neither the subject nor the composition by mendacious addition’.¹¹⁰ Neither subject nor composition nor even style of the Aigina marbles was correctly understood, however, and there was no precedent for restoring a unified group out of so many fragments. And while he did not benefit from viewing the Parthenon marbles, Thorvaldsen had been influenced by ‘restored’ engravings and casts of them, e.g. on his frieze of *Alexander’s Entry into Babylon* (1812), commissioned for Napoleon’s occupation of the Quirinale Palace in Rome. Yet even Thorvaldsen had his reservations. Neither he, Canova, nor other antiquarian sculptors had much knowledge of the originals, let alone the stylistic development of early Greek sculpture:¹¹¹ he and others recognized that the Aigina fragments belonged to an older style that, as Canova cautioned, ‘would not be instructive to artists in learning to recognize beauty’.¹¹²

Thorvaldsen cautiously wrote to the Prince about his reservations and later claimed ‘It is a thankless task to restore the art of Antiquity. If you don’t do it well enough it would have been better if you had never tried, and if you do it well it will seem as if you had done nothing at all’.¹¹³ Rather than a polished product, eventually Thorvaldsen opted to treat the new marble surfaces so as to replicate the surface decay of the weathered originals. Thorvaldsen’s restorations were well received in his own time.¹¹⁴ If Canova naturalized the ancient Greeks by treating their gods and goddesses as beings of flesh and blood, in contrast to Winckelmann’s distancing of the Greeks from modern Europeans, Thorvaldsen sought to imbue his figures with a purity that could unify what was, for the early Romantic generation to which he belonged, the cultural unity of ancient Greece and the Christian northern countries.¹¹⁵

The Glyptothek

While the British Museum was Europe’s first public universal museum, as noted above, Munich’s Glyptothek, which would house the Aigina marbles from its opening in 1830, was planned as the world’s first public classical archaeology museum.¹¹⁶ Its design and decoration

¹⁰⁸ Wünsche 2011, 57–144 and 1991; Pinelli 1991.

¹⁰⁹ Hamilton 1815, 39–40; see also Johns 1998, 37; St Clair 1998, 149.

¹¹⁰ Quincy 2012, 46.

¹¹¹ Michaelis 1908, 143–44.

¹¹² Missirini 1824, 328.

¹¹³ Wünsche 2011, 154; Thorvaldsen 1817.

¹¹⁴ Larsson 1969.

¹¹⁵ Bindman 2014, 135.

¹¹⁶ Paul 2012, 305–29; Vierneisel and Leinz 1980, 360–71. Berlin’s Altes Museum, planned by Karl Friedrich Schinkel, with whom Klenze had studied architecture under David Gilly, was built approximately at the same time and launched on the birthday of the Prussian king Frederick William III — 3 August 1830 — while the Glyptothek was launched 13 October 1830 — the name day of Queen Therese of Bavaria.

evoked ‘the reform era’s aspirations for an aesthetic community and the Romantics’ belief in the healing power of art’,¹¹⁷ a belief shared by Ludwig, an emerging patron of the arts.¹¹⁸ Inspired by his own Grand Tour (1804–05),¹¹⁹ Ludwig had already acquired a diverse collection of art both for his own prestige and for public enlightenment, so it was a foregone conclusion that it would end up in a public museum. As early as 1809, even before his acquisition of the Aigina marbles, Ludwig had a museum of antiquities in the urban design for Munich that Karl von Fischer, Professor of Architecture, had prepared for him.¹²⁰ While campaigning to raise funds for Walhalla, his ‘temple to German genius’, in 1814, Ludwig initiated an architectural competition for a building to house his antiquities. Dissatisfied with the results, even after an extension of the deadline, and after Haller (one of the Aigina excavators) and Fischer displeased him, he gave the job to Klenze, who later became his court architect.¹²¹ Klenze had not yet visited Greece but consulted widely those who had. The cornerstone was laid in April 1816. The prince, king as of 1825, kept a strong hand in the project and exchanged at least five hundred letters with Klenze on the matter.¹²²

Like many of his contemporaries, Klenze inherited from Winckelmann the belief that the classical style remained an artistic ideal. Yet, his classicism was a nineteenth-century neoclassicism, an eclectic system whereby one could choose from a variety of styles, whichever best suited the project. He thus supplied Ludwig with museum plans in three different styles: Greek, Roman, and Renaissance.¹²³ The revised plan was a square building with a central court, adapted from a design by Jean-Nicolas-Louis Durand (and Fischer).¹²⁴ Its main facade was forefronted by a gabled Ionic portico, the pediment of which centred on a statue of Pallas Athena, surrounded by artists drawing inspiration from her.¹²⁵

As for the interior, Wagner insisted that the Aigina marbles should be exhibited together, in contrast, for example, to the haphazard display of the Elgin marbles in their first London home (see below). He also argued against a display of richness and splendour, lest it distract viewers from focusing on the sculpture.¹²⁶ Klenze, who argued rather ‘die Kunst ins Leben zu führen und mit dem Leben zu vermengen’ (to bring art into life and make it mingle with life),¹²⁷ responded with an exciting polychromatic space (fig. 3.2). Ludwig ignored Wagner’s other complaints, e.g. against holding torchlit galas in the museum itself or displaying the objects in chronological order. Klenze insisted on a historical approach, à la Winckelmann, whereby the visitor followed the development of art through its rise and fall so as to have an opportunity to compare an artwork both with its predecessors and successors.¹²⁸ The museum’s display therefore started with the Egyptians and ended with a neoclassical sculpture room that boasted post-classical sculptures among stucco images of neoclassical

¹¹⁷ Sheehan 2000, 62.

¹¹⁸ Schelling emphasized this in his 1807 speech, n. 57 above.

¹¹⁹ Sheehan 2000, 62–70.

¹²⁰ Vierneisel and Leinz 1980, 90–92.

¹²¹ Sheehan 2000, 63–64; Baumstark 1999, 14–19. The success of this project encouraged further museum commissions for Klenze, e.g. the annex to the imperial palace, known thereafter as the New Hermitage, commissioned in 1837 by Czar Nicholas I, to house his influx of antiquities from the state-funded excavations in Kerch, inaugurated in 1852 (Meyer 2017, 498).

¹²² Sheehan 2000, 63.

¹²³ Sheehan 2000, 65.

¹²⁴ Durand 1802–05.

¹²⁵ Sheehan 2010, 66–67.

¹²⁶ Potts 2000, 30; Schwahn 1983, 72.

¹²⁷ Pölnitz 1929, 272–73.

¹²⁸ Ernst 1996.

sculptors — Thorvaldsen included — who ‘contributed immensely by leading art back to the one true path of antiquity’.¹²⁹

Insert fig. 3.2 here:

Figure 3.2. Leo von Klenze’s Aigina Gallery, Glyptothek, Munich, engraving after Klenze 1830.

The Glyptothek’s immediate influence was most strongly felt in the Berlin Museums but also in all other neoclassical museums, including the evolving British Museum. In 1849, Charles Newton reported to the British Museum’s Trustees that the Glyptothek provided the best model of ‘the true method of arrangement — that according to periods of art’.¹³⁰ The Glyptothek’s influence was not limited to its neoclassical decorative style that integrated antique and modern into a lavish display but also included the historicizing or developmental presentation. Both influences persist until the present day, e.g. in the 2009–10 redesign of the Greek and Roman galleries at the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.¹³¹

Elgin and his Marbles

A most dizzy pain, that mingles Grecian grandeur with the rude Wasting of old Time.¹³²

Meanwhile, the extraction of some architectural sculptures from Athens’ Parthenon by Thomas Bruce, seventh earl of Elgin, and their display in London from 1806, had begun to gain him and thus the marbles some notoriety, not least because they were ‘prised stone by stone from a still largely standing monument’.¹³³ Their separation from their architectural context — between 1801 and 1805, when he was British ambassador to Constantinople — and redisplay in a foreign land ultimately brought about a radical change in Europe’s appreciation of antique sculpture.

Elgin’s intention to display his Parthenon sculptures in London was well known and broadly supported, yet Elgin’s luck quickly turned. After the wreck of one transport vessel, his three-year detention in France, impending divorce, and other financial problems, Elgin determined to display the marbles in London as quickly as possible, at no. 6 Park Lane, where the artists were suitably impressed. Canova ‘admire[d] in them the truth of nature combined with the choice of beautiful forms’¹³⁴ and finally accepted that the statues in Rome must be copies that had been made to be sent to Rome.¹³⁵ Critics such as William Hazlitt were no less entranced:

The human figure petrified: they have every appearance of absolute fac-similes or casts taken from nature [...] The artist [...] has arrived at that stage [...] in which, having served out his apprenticeship to nature, he can set himself up in opposition to her.¹³⁶

¹²⁹ Klenze 1830, 7; see also Diebold 1995, 61–62; Potts 1980b.

¹³⁰ Newton 1851, 227.

¹³¹ Burn and others, 2012.

¹³² John Keats, ‘On Seeing the Elgin Marbles for the First Time’ (1816).

¹³³ Stoneman 2010, 168. See also Hamilakis 2007, 246–86; St Clair 1998; Michaelis 1877.

¹³⁴ Visconti 1816, xxi.

¹³⁵ Johns 1998, 156; Pavan 1974–75, 250.

¹³⁶ ‘On the Elgin Marbles’ in Hazlitt 1856, 241.

These marbles appealed to the romantic sentiment that prioritized nature over artifice and thus condemned the connoisseurs from the previous generation who had championed self-conscious, theatrical, and repetitive artworks. Fragments were inherently romantic insofar as they recalled the beginnings and ends of the sculptures' biographies, yet had 'escaped' the vicissitudes of history: 'How and by what good fortune have such treasures of art escaped the shipwreck of the times, the ravages of war and the barbarism of the Turks?'¹³⁷ In the first decade of the nineteenth century, however, Quatremère and other aesthetes denied the potential importance of the Elgin marbles,¹³⁸ as did antiquarians and even the Dilettanti.¹³⁹ To add insult to injury, in 1812 Lord Byron published *Childe Harold* and *Curse of Minerva* — both of which directly condemned Elgin's acquisition of the marbles in Athens — and thus turned public sentiment against them. A despondent Elgin retreated to his Scottish estate, while the majority of the marbles retired to an open courtyard at Burlington House. The tide was yet to turn.

The abdication of Napoleon in 1814 gave Elgin another chance, namely to fetch Visconti, Winckelmann's successor at the Vatican, from the Louvre to see his marbles. Visconti was effusive about the style of the Parthenon sculptures: 'In the best preserved parts do we not rediscover the traces of a chisel which knew how to soften the marble and transform it into supple and living flesh?'¹⁴⁰ Thereupon committees were set up, first by the Trustees of the British Museum and later by the House of Commons. The loss of the Aigina marbles to Bavaria had reminded the English connoisseurs of the prestige associated with sculptures found in Greece itself. Elgin petitioned Parliament finally on 15 June 1815, but the decision was deferred.¹⁴¹ Within days Europe changed through the Battle of Waterloo. Napoleon's looted works were to be dispersed, not among the conquering powers but back to their homelands, so England became yet greedier for antiquities.

When the House of Commons' Select Committee began hearings on 29 February 1816, Elgin asked £72,240 to recompense him for costs and interest accrued.¹⁴² John Bacon Sawrey Morritt, a politician who had studied the classics, judged the marbles to be 'of the first importance to the progress of art', thus adhering to Winckelmann's linear history of art.¹⁴³ Almost sixty years after Winckelmann's passing, witnesses — gathered from among the most famous artists and connoisseurs — were asked to compare Elgin's marbles to Winckelmann's favourites in Rome, e.g. the Apollo Belvedere and the Laocoon.¹⁴⁴ Elgin himself had made this comparison when he placed a cast of Belvedere Torso alongside his marbles and thus perpetuated Winckelmannia.¹⁴⁵ It is based on Winckelmannian principles, in fact, that the British Museum's Select Committee determined England to be the place in which to unify the masterpieces with political liberty, thus legitimizing imperialism:

If [...] free governments afford a soil most suitable to the production of native talent, to the maturing of the powers of the human mind, and to the growth of every species of excellence, by opening to merit the prospect of reward and distinction, no country can be better adapted than our own to afford an honourable asylum to these monuments of the school of Phidias, and of the administration of Pericles; where secure from further injury and degradation they may

¹³⁷ Quincy 2012, 29.

¹³⁸ Schneider 1810.

¹³⁹ Stoneman 2010, 177–79, 198; Messman 1973.

¹⁴⁰ Hamilton 1815, 80.

¹⁴¹ *Select Committee* 1816, 16.

¹⁴² *Select Committee* 1816, 13.

¹⁴³ *Select Committee* 1816, 132.

¹⁴⁴ *Select Committee* 1816, 68 and elsewhere.

¹⁴⁵ Marvin 2008, 135.

receive that admiration and homage to which they are entitled, and serve in return as models and examples to those, who by knowing how to revere and appreciate them, may learn first to imitate, and ultimately rival them.¹⁴⁶

The enthusiasm of the artists had now spread to the connoisseurs, especially George Hamilton-Gordon, fourth earl of Aberdeen and later prime minister.¹⁴⁷ The government finally agreed to Aberdeen's suggested price of £35,000.¹⁴⁸ After the purchase, enabled through an Act of Parliament that came into force on 11 July 1816, Quatremère wrote of the British Museum:

It must henceforth be considered the foremost of all collections: the one to which science and history will go in search both of classical models and of the most authentic materials for the salutary criticism of taste.¹⁴⁹

There was no space for either the Phigalean or Elgin marbles in the old British Museum building, Montagu House, so the museum's architect, Robert Smirke, constructed two temporary brick-faced timber rooms for them at the west of the Townley Gallery (fig. 3.3).¹⁵⁰ The resulting display, which turned the friezes towards the viewer, as they are today, inspired John Keats's poem quoted above.¹⁵¹ This altered perspective whereby 'one can scan the full extent of it, reviewing each object in turn and comparing them for variety',¹⁵² although little noted by the public, continues to delight modern scholars and museologists. To contextualize the British Museum's permanent display of the Parthenon frieze, I will briefly turn back to the museum's development from its origins.

Insert fig. 3.3 here:

Figure 3.3. View of Smirke's temporary rooms for the Elgin and Phigalean marbles, British Museum, after Frederick Mackenzie, c. 1825. © The Trustees of the British Museum.

A Less Universal Museum

Between its founding in 1759 and its acquisitions of the Elgin and Phigalean marbles, the British Museum had already begun to prioritize the classical with two major collections: Lord Hamilton's collection of Greek vases in 1772 and the Townley marbles in 1804 and 1814. The latter, in fact, occasioned the establishment of the British Museum's Department of Antiquities (1807) and the building of a new wing of Montagu House, yet in a plainer style (1808).¹⁵³ Within a generation and confirmed by the subsequent acquisitions of the Elgin and Phigalean marbles (1814–16), classical archaeology had replaced natural history as the core of the British Museum's collections. The acquisitions of Egyptian antiquities captured from the French surrender of Alexandria (1802) and Richard Payne Knight's bronzes and drawings (1824) added to the bulk. Yet, the Elgin marbles had revolutionized the perception of true

¹⁴⁶ *Select Committee* 1816, 27.

¹⁴⁷ *Select Committee* 1816, 13 and 117–27.

¹⁴⁸ As suggested by Visconti in 1814: Quincy 2012, 39.

¹⁴⁹ Quincy 2012, 40.

¹⁵⁰ Caygill and Date 1999, 19; Mordaunt Crook 1972, 108–09.

¹⁵¹ See n. 135 above. Mordaunt Crook 1972, 109.

¹⁵² Quincy 2012, 44–45, 129.

¹⁵³ Caygill and Date 1999, 16–18; Mordaunt Crook 1972, 67–68.

Greek sculpture, paving the way for acquisition of yet more Greek originals, such as Edmond-Antoine Durand's second collection of vases, sold posthumously to the British Museum (1836).¹⁵⁴ While eyes were opening to the 'pure Greek spirit' for which Winckelmann had yearned, Victorian didactic tastes were reviving a taste for antiquaria rather than aesthetics and thus a greater stylistic variety.¹⁵⁵ The British Museum expanded its sculpture collection through Charles Newton's efforts in Ottoman Turkey,¹⁵⁶ yet marginalized its Townley Collection, mostly relegated to the basement.¹⁵⁷

Plans were afoot to build a new British Museum 'to be a veritable Temple of the Arts, recalling in its very structure the glories of ancient Greece',¹⁵⁸ in a Greek revival building that owed much to Smirke's own grand tour travels. Smirke first showed the Trustees plans and elevations on 10 June 1826, but by the time of his resignation in 1846, when he was succeeded by his younger brother Sydney, this incomplete British adaptation of Palladianism — with a gabled facade framed by projecting wings — was a century behind the times.¹⁵⁹ Yet, it catered to Victorian demand for prominent pedimental decoration, allowing room for Richard Westmacott's allegorical Progress of Civilisation — white figures on a blue background, eventually installed in 1851.¹⁶⁰ The new Elgin Room, with natural lighting from above to illuminate the Parthenon marbles, opened in July 1832 (fig. 3.4).¹⁶¹ The Phigalean marbles were installed in an adjacent room, later the Nereid Room.¹⁶²

Insert fig. 3.4 here:

Figure 3.4. James Stephanoff's 1833 watercolour of the new Parthenon gallery. © The Trustees of the British Museum.

By the end of the nineteenth century, the British Museum had ceased to be a universal museum, as parts of its collections had earned their own museums, starting with the National Gallery (1825) and then the Natural History Museum (1883). This latter split opened up more than 5700 square metres of space to the antiquities departments.¹⁶³ A surplus from William White's 1879 bequest paid for a bespoke room for the Mausoleion of Halikarnassos, opened in 1884, later cropped to allow for the insertion of a 1960s public lecture theatre, which itself was refurbished as the present Hellenistic Gallery (1995), in keeping with the style of Smirke's original design.¹⁶⁴ White's bequest also enabled a refitting of the former insect and print rooms, north-east of the Elgin rooms, to house the Phigalean marbles.¹⁶⁵

¹⁵⁴ His first collection had been purchased by the Louvre in 1825 (Jenkins 1992b; Merlin 1946, 144).

¹⁵⁵ Jenkins 1992a; see also Nørskov 2009, 74.

¹⁵⁶ Dyson 2006, 137–41.

¹⁵⁷ Ernst 1992, 159–67.

¹⁵⁸ Mordaunt Crook 1972, 71.

¹⁵⁹ Caygill and Date 1999, 20. It follows the style of Dublin's 1767 Parliament House (later Bank of Ireland), begun 1728 by Edward Lovett Pearce and completed by James Gandon, Robert Parke, and Francis Johnston (Mordaunt Crook 1972, 111, 143).

¹⁶⁰ Traces of the blue-painted background, evidenced in preliminary drawings and noted in contemporary accounts, quickly covered by pollution and forgotten, were found in a 1992 cleaning: Caygill and Date 1999, 43–44.

¹⁶¹ Caygill and Date 1999, 34.

¹⁶² Jenkins 1992a, 64–65; Mordaunt Crook 1972, 132–33.

¹⁶³ Wilson 2002, 184–85.

¹⁶⁴ Caygill and Date 1999, 55.

¹⁶⁵ Wilson 2002, 185; Caygill and Date 1999, 55.

Throughout the Victorian and Edwardian periods, successive keepers of Greek and Roman antiquities at the British Museum used sculptures in combination with casts and even adhered casts to ‘complete’ the Parthenon figures for didactic purposes. In the 1920s, A. H. Smith, keeper from 1909 to 1925, began to remove some of the accretions.¹⁶⁶ Bernard Ashmole (Yates Professor of Classical Archaeology at University College London), John Beazley (Lincoln Professor of Classical Archaeology at Oxford University), and Donald Robertson (Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge University) wrote that:

The Parthenon Marbles, being the greatest body of original Greek sculpture in existence, and unique monuments of first maturity, are primarily works of art. Their former decorative function as architectural ornaments, and their present educational use as illustrations of mythical and historical events in ancient Greece, are by comparison accidental and trivial interests, which can indeed be better served by casts.¹⁶⁷

At the same time, a grander space for the Elgin marbles was sought and finally created through the patronage of the antiquities dealer Sir (Lord) Joseph Duveen to the design of his chosen New York architect, John Russell Pope, in 1939. Yet — from his appointment in 1930 — Pope used the sculpture ‘as an ornament to his own architectural design and not, as was required, subordinating the gallery to the needs of the sculpture’.¹⁶⁸ Careful negotiations among curators, architect, and donor continued through the 1930s, while efforts were made to clean the sculptures, alas not only of the plaster accretions but in ‘restoring’ the marble surfaces through the use of copper chisels and carborundum in 1938, resulting in the sacking of relevant staff.¹⁶⁹ In 1939, Ashmole was appointed as keeper of Greek and Roman antiquities to manage the redisplay of the Parthenon marbles in the new Duveen Gallery (fig. 3.5).

Insert fig. 3.5 here:

Figure 3.5. John Russell Pope’s design for the Duveen Gallery, 1932. Photographic print, 4 February 1934. © The Trustees of the British Museum.

Entrestaurierung, Rearrangement, and Representation after World War II

Greek art was the symbol of everything we were fighting for, and everything the Nazis and Fascism were seeking to crush.¹⁷⁰

These words of Charles Seltman — fellow of Queen’s College, Cambridge, antiquities collector, and one of the creative directors of a retrospective exhibition of Greek art at the

¹⁶⁶ Wilson 2002, 240–41.

¹⁶⁷ Jenkins 1994, 203–05.

¹⁶⁸ Jenkins 1992a, 226.

¹⁶⁹ Wilson 2002, 242–43; Jenkins 2001. Reflexes of this controversy plagued the British Museum throughout the twentieth century, namely in 1950, 1984, 1987 (Hitchens 1987) and 1998 (St Clair 1998, 293–302, 342–45). The British Museum hoped that a 1999 conference put the matter to rest (Jenkins 2001).

¹⁷⁰ Baker 2016, 407.

Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, in 1944¹⁷¹ — highlight the politicization of Greek and Roman art and archaeology, especially in the era of the dictators, building up to and during World War II. Both Mussolini and Hitler had used classical archaeology for nationalistic purposes.¹⁷² The Fitzwilliam exhibition was one of several vehicles for the British Council and the Greek government in exile. Especially as it illustrated the full range of Greek art up until the present day, it was not even conceived as a substitute for the grand Greek and Roman sculptures that had taken pride of place in Europe's national museums. Yet, it provided a welcome glimpse at what had been and might be lost. Widespread destruction and deprivation in Europe in World War II occasioned evacuations of collections and later the re-presentation of these architectural sculptures.

Before the marbles were installed in the new Duveen Gallery, it was shattered by bombs.¹⁷³ After their brief sojourn in the London Tube,¹⁷⁴ the marbles were put back in Smirke's Elgin Room (currently Room 17) in a display completed by September 1949. The repaired Duveen Gallery — consisting of a large hall for the frieze with two raised areas on either end for the pediments and two further rooms on a long side to contain related and pedagogical material — reopened in 1962. Another fourteen Greek and Roman galleries, designed by Robin Wade, were opened in 1969.¹⁷⁵ They included an upstairs room (now Room 16) lined with the Bassae frieze at appropriate viewing height, in a dimly lit space that might help viewers appreciate the frieze as it looked in antiquity.¹⁷⁶ The effect is of course artificial, because the viewing distance is greatly diminished to allow viewers an opportunity to scrutinize the sculptures in detail, as indeed Winckelmann would have wished it.

In the same war, the Glyptothek sustained bomb damage (1944). As the artefacts had been removed at the outbreak of war, no provisional roof was installed to protect what was left of the building, so the painted stucco fell into disrepair over time (fig. 3.6). In a 1960s reconstruction campaign, the rigid historical progression gave way to a more nuanced thematic arrangement, as indeed Wagner had wished it, which had become popular in other twentieth-century museums. Wagner's other idea of a monochrome museum was also revived.¹⁷⁷ On the occasion of the reopening, just in time for the Munich Olympics in 1972, an inobtrusive setting with bare modernist interiors, boasting exposed pale brickwork, as designed by Josef Wiedemann,¹⁷⁸ highlighted the artefacts themselves (fig. 3.8). The stripped-down effect matched the starker appearance of the Aigina figures after their *Entrestaurierung* or thorough removal of Thorvaldsen's restorations between 1962 and 1965.¹⁷⁹

Insert figs 3.6–3.7 here:

Figure 3.6. Roman Gallery of the Glyptothek, Munich, after bombing in 1944, after Wiedemann 1980, 387, fig. 1.

Figure 3.7. Diomedes Gallery, formerly the Aigina Gallery at the Glyptothek, Munich, in 1972, after Wiedemann 1980, 393, fig. 5.

¹⁷¹ Baker 2016.

¹⁷² Aicher 2000; Quinn 2000.

¹⁷³ Caygill and Date 1999, 65; Wilson 2002, 243–44.

¹⁷⁴ Caygill 1990 and 1989.

¹⁷⁵ Mordaunt Crook 1972, 230–33.

¹⁷⁶ Mordaunt Crook 1972, 271.

¹⁷⁷ Schwahn 1983, 72–73.

¹⁷⁸ Diebold 1995, 61; Vierneisel and Leinz 1980, 386–97.

¹⁷⁹ Ohly 1976.

Multiple reasons for removing Thorvaldsen's emendations had emerged: Adolf Furtwängler's excavations at Aigina in 1901 had uncovered the bases, which proved that Thorvaldsen's composition was incorrect and that several figures were incorrectly placed. Furtwängler's mild remedy in his role as Director of the Glyptothek had been to display a reduced plaster model of his own reconstruction alongside Thorvaldsen's neoclassical fictions.¹⁸⁰ By the 1960s, tastes had changed: conservation tendencies preferred the 'less is more' approach; Thorvaldsen's reputation had declined;¹⁸¹ and the art market yearned for starker surfaces. More fundamentally, as Dieter Ohly, then Glyptothek director, put it: 'The way to the liberation of the Aegina pediments from their neoclassical bonds was cleared by the loss of the splendid decoration of the Glyptothek's interior, the result of a bomb that struck the museum in 1944'.¹⁸² If one reverses the equation, Ohly took the opportunity of displaying pure, de-restored sculptures (along with casts of fragments found subsequently) as an excuse to provide a stark cave-like enclosure for them, like some sort of *tabula rasa*.

This *tabula rasa* was also an opportunity to erase the tinge of Nazism that the restored 'neoclassical' sculptures had acquired by dint of their home in Munich's Königsplatz. Through the addition of several buildings — the Führerbau (Hitler's office and private apartments) and Verwaltungsbau der NSDAP (Nazi Party administration building) — the neighbourhood of the Glyptothek had become a centre for Nazi activity before and during the war.¹⁸³ Hitler explicitly followed in King Ludwig's architectural footsteps. Nazis favoured and imitated classical and neoclassical art, singling out the Aeginetan sculptures and thus praising Thorvaldsen. This encouraged Thorvaldsen's positive reception in Germany under the Third Reich. The Nazis appreciated his restoration of the Aigina marbles as confirmation that the Greeks were a warrior people.¹⁸⁴ The de-restoration of the Aigina marbles has been interpreted therefore as one of many attempts at denazification of Munich's Königsplatz,¹⁸⁵ part of a broader goal towards the *Bewältigung der Vergangenheit* ('overcoming of the past') for which President Theodor Heuss called in the 1950s.¹⁸⁶

The de-restoration of the Aigina marbles was carefully directed and well published by Dieter Ohly.¹⁸⁷ Yet, Thorvaldsen had made irreparable changes to the ancient surfaces of the sculptures, so that no presentation of them will ever match the original. They are now not known or studied, for example, for the remains of painting and gilding that they once exhibited, according to John Nicholas Fazakerley.¹⁸⁸ The de-restoration was therefore met with modern criticism.¹⁸⁹ Adolf Borbein argues most vehemently that *Entrestaurierung* denies history, yet agrees it was 'scientifically necessary'.¹⁹⁰ Now both Thorvaldsen's restorations and their removal are part of the cultural history or biography of these pedimental figures.

¹⁸⁰ Ohly 1966, 516.

¹⁸¹ Diebold 1995, 61; Wünsche 1991, 313.

¹⁸² Ohly 1966, 515.

¹⁸³ Scobie 1990, 37–68.

¹⁸⁴ Bindman 2014, 135.

¹⁸⁵ Diebold 1995, 63–64.

¹⁸⁶ Hartman 1986, 115.

¹⁸⁷ Ohly 1976.

¹⁸⁸ *Select Committee* 1816, 133.

¹⁸⁹ Bianchi Bandinelli 1976, 76 and Gesche 1982; for a summary of divergent approaches, see Maass 1984.

¹⁹⁰ Borbein 1981, 63–65 and 75 n. 72

Postscript

Museums in the Winckelmannian mode are designed to seduce us, providing forms of escape into other, presumably better, worlds.¹⁹¹

Winckelmann's linear style development is 'still considered as a blueprint that determines our conceptualizations of ancient art',¹⁹² both in and beyond the museum, not least because of the continuous and repeated exposure that the public and budding art historians have to his ideas. Winckelmann's developmental schema for his *Geschichte* was a synthesis of the organizing principles in the ancient texts that inform us about art, most notably Pliny's *Natural History*, which traces a chronology of artists. By the second century CE, when the travel writer Pausanias contextualized Pliny's artists into a gazetteer, the celebrity of the artist was thriving. Winckelmann's wide reading of primary sources, both textual and literary — which constituted his immersion into the world of the ancients — was a starting point, therefore, from which his schema would evolve. His combination of formal analysis with encouragement of individual experience was exceptionally popular among both neoclassical contemporaries and romantic successors. Yet, it couldn't take account of Greek architectural sculpture, of which Winckelmann had no direct experience either from the visual or literary sources. Even when Pausanias mentioned sculptural programmes on buildings, he didn't divulge information about their creators or style; they were significant to him, if at all, as illustrations of myths. Winckelmann probably would have shared the optimism of early travellers and their scholarly successors who extrapolated from *testimonia* that Pheidias designed the Parthenon to believe he created its frieze (which even Pausanias failed to note).¹⁹³ Autopsy may have discouraged him from following Foster's absurd logic that if Iktinos was architect of the Temple at Bassae, then Pheidias must have also created its frieze.¹⁹⁴

The House of Commons' Select Committee on the purchase of the Elgin marbles was eventually persuaded that the architectural sculptures from the Parthenon were more valuable than the Phigalean marbles (which the British Museum already owned), which in turn were more valuable than the Aigina marbles. In accepting the opinion of the architect William Wilkins, among others, that the Parthenon sculptures might have been designed rather than executed by Pheidias, the marbles retained their status of 'masterpiece' without the actual work of the 'master'.¹⁹⁵ This conclusion had two distinct effects on the display of classical archaeology in museums that continued to prefer sculpture over the other arts. The first was to keep alive the legend of the master sculptors (and by extension all artists) of ancient Greece, despite the implicit acceptance that one might never find an original 'masterpiece' attributable to a famous 'master'. The second was to simultaneously elevate the value of all architectural sculpture (and by extension all fragmentary artefacts) despite its separation from its context. I will address each of these consequences in turn below.

The celebrity of the artist (whether ancient, modern, or contemporary) continues unabated for the foreseeable future, at least in museum displays. By 1816, curatorial priority was given to original works that might have been created by a 'master', e.g. the Parthenon architectural sculptures. Such authentic 'masterpieces' now eclipsed the copies of

¹⁹¹ Ruprecht 2011, 134.

¹⁹² Siapkas and Sjögren 2013, 23.

¹⁹³ Paus., 1.24.5.

¹⁹⁴ See n. 103 above.

¹⁹⁵ *Select Committee* 1816, 111–13.

‘masterpieces’ known either because of their artists (e.g. the Venuses that seemed to copy Praxiteles’ Aphrodite of Knidos) or their historical context (e.g. the Laocoon found in Rome’s Baths of Titus) that had been so highly praised in Winckelmann’s time. Winckelmann’s beloved Belvedere Torso, still not known to copy a particular ‘masterpiece’, has subsequently lost its cachet, except for its influence on Renaissance artists. That is, its post-antique biography has become more significant or at least better known and understood than its role in antiquity. Contrary to Klenze’s exhortation, quoted above (n. 82), despite centuries of excavation, even Greece’s museums remain devoid of freestanding ‘masterpieces’ that were celebrated as such in antiquity.¹⁹⁶ Many were removed to Rome, Constantinople, Venice, or elsewhere. Others were melted down or smashed. In the process, even on archaeological sites, most have been removed from their architectural and primary historical contexts and separated from bases that might have identified their masters.¹⁹⁷ Through the new availability of authentic Greek art in the early 19th century, therefore, the likes of Quatremère came to realize that:

the received history of the art of Greece had been founded on a small number of incoherent and doubtful facts that had been taken for a complete body. This left us, as he put it, with something like a volume containing an inaccurate translation, of which we lack at least three-quarters, and in which no two pages are successive.¹⁹⁸

As in Winckelmann’s time, however, we are lucky that so many ancient works of art were copied or adapted by the Romans, even if they do not do justice to the originals. They give us something to grasp, as we join Winckelmann in amazement at what was once there and is now lost. We are lucky also that so many casts have been made by and for Winckelmann’s and subsequent generations of artists because, again, they help students of art, archaeology, classics, and history come face to face with the forms and general stylistic principles of the remarkable sculpted arts of ancient Greece in all its variety.

The fragmentary state of the Aigina, Phigalean, and Elgin marbles, which caused anxiety from the outset, has been managed in both art-historical and curatorial circles, both to help viewers engage with the material in creating new stories and to reframe ancient art in its physical presentation.¹⁹⁹ In his Berlin lectures of the 1820s, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel leaned heavily on the artistic legacy of Greece and Rome and (therefore) also on Winckelmann in developing his own three-stage history of art.²⁰⁰ Hegel weaves both the Aigina and Elgin marbles into his historical schema as defining the archaic and classical periods, respectively.²⁰¹ To elevate the Elgin marbles to another defining role, namely as the classical ideal, he ‘forgave’ their fragmentary state:

Every point, even the minutest detail has its purpose [...] and yet it remains in continual flux, counts and lives only in the whole. The result is that the whole can be recognized in

¹⁹⁶ Possible exceptions are Euphranor’s Apollo Patroos found by the Athenian Agora (1907) some 20 m from where Pausanias noted it (1.3.4) (Palagia 1980, 13–32) and Praxiteles’ Hermes and Dionysos, found by its excavators at Olympia (1877) where Pausanias said it was (v.17.5), but many doubt it is the original. Antonio Corso collected the evidence and opinion on this (2013, 165–71) and other ‘originals’ that may be attributed to Praxiteles.

¹⁹⁷ It is impossible to securely assign a bronze statue to its original base, so we remain uncertain in the case of efforts to assign bronze ‘originals’ e.g. the Riace Bronzes to particular master signatures, e.g. on statue bases at Delphi (see Paoletti 2009).

¹⁹⁸ Bindman 2014, 136, paraphrasing Quincy’s *Le Jupiter Olympien*, iv–viii.

¹⁹⁹ Ernst 1996.

²⁰⁰ Squire 2011, 198.

²⁰¹ Prettejohn 2012, 44–47.

fragments, and such a separated part affords the contemplation and enjoyment of an unbroken whole.²⁰²

What is the unbroken whole? In the case of architectural sculpture, the building that it decorated; if a sacred building, the sanctuary in which it was used, the landscape with which it interacted, and community that used it in religious practice. Other contexts should be inferred for these and all physical remains of antiquity. Their decontextualization that brings about display in a museum should encourage the interested viewer to consider the original contexts.²⁰³ Decontextualization of these artefacts actually enabled the birth of classical archaeology. These *disiecta membra* — scattered fragments — of antiquity once belonged yet still belong to many contexts that might be reconstructed on the basis of their study via classical archaeological approaches. Each redisplay of the artefacts, of which only a few have been noted above, gives impetus to a whole new range of reinterpretations of the monuments and their contexts. The display of fragments of architectural sculptures separated from their primary architectural contexts thus broadened our conception of sculpture, set in motion the writing of a new history of ancient art, and encouraged visitors to wrestle with the contextual and other analytical problems inherent to the new academic field of classical archaeology.

Miranda Marvin wonders ‘Could the new history [of ancient art] have been written without detaching the marbles from their temples and displaying them in museums?’²⁰⁴ Perhaps not. While we can’t rewrite history or undo its consequences, we have begun to write another history that prioritizes the social and historical contexts over the mastery of their creators. 3D and other visualization techniques are increasingly used both within and beyond the museum and even on archaeological sites to help visitors, as well as students and scholars, recreate a sense of the glory of ancient sites and their artworks, whether standing, dismantled, or completely lost. This is a history in which sculptures, old or new, large or small, exquisite or humble, architectural or freestanding, play their part alongside related artworks and everyday objects to give a truer glimpse of antiquity than that seen by Winckelmann.

²⁰² Hegel 1975, 2.726.

²⁰³ Hamilakis 2007, 243–86.

²⁰⁴ Marvin 2008, 57.

Works Cited

- Abrams, Meyer H. 1989. 'Art as Such: The Sociology of Modern Aesthetics', in Michael Fischer (ed.), *Doing Things with Texts* (New York: Norton), pp. 135–58
- Abt, Jeffrey. 2006. 'The Origins of the Public Museum', in Sharon MacDonald (ed.), *A Companion to Museum Studies* (Malden: Blackwell), pp. 115–34
- Aicher, Peter. 2000. 'Mussolini's Forum and the Myth of Augustan Rome', *Classical Bulletin*, 76: 117–39
- D'Agincourt, Jean-Baptiste-Louis-Georges-Séroux. 1810–23. *Histoire de l'art par les 'monumens depuis sa décadence au I^{er} siècle jusqu'à son renouvellement au XV^e'* (Paris: Treuttel et Würtz)
- Baker, Abigail. 2016. "'Everything Good We Stood for": Exhibiting Greek Art in World War II', *Classical Receptions Journal*, 8: 404–28
- Baumstark, Reinhold (ed.). 1999. *Das neue Hellas: Griechen und Bayern zur Zeit Ludwigs I* (Munich: Hirmer)
- Behler, Ernst, and others (eds). 1958. *Kritische Friedrich Schlegel Ausgabe* (Munich: Schöninghaus)
- Beiser, Frederic C. 2003. *The Romantic Imperative: The Concept of Early German Romanticism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)
- Bertello, Giuseppe. 2013. 'Presentation', in Guido Cornini and Claudia Lega (eds), *Precious Antiquities: The Profane Museum in the Time of Pius VI* (Vatican City: Edizioni Musei Vaticani), pp. 9–10
- Bindman, David. 2014. *Warm Flesh, Cold Marble: Canova, Thorvaldsen, and their Critics* (New Haven: Yale University Press)
- Bianchi Bandinelli, Ranuccio. 1976. *Introduzione all'archeologia classica come storia dell'arte antica* (Rome: Laterza)
- Bol, Peter C. (ed.). 1988–. *Forschungen zur Villa Albani* (Berlin: Mann)
- Borbein, Adolf H. 1981. 'Archäologie und historisches Bewusstsein', in Bernard Andreae (ed.), *Archäologie und Gesellschaft* (Stuttgart: Wissenschaftliche Verlagsgesellschaft), pp. 45–76
- Boyle, Nicholas. 2000. *Goethe: The Poet and the Age, II: Revolution and Renunciation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Burn, Lucilla, and others. 2012. *Journal of the History of Collections*, 24, Special Issue: Greece and Rome at the Fitzwilliam Museum (2012)
- Canat, René. 1951–55. *L'hellénisme des romantiques* (Paris: Didier)
- Caygill, Marjorie L. 1989. '1939: Evacuating the BM's treasures', *The British Museum Society Bulletin*, 62: 17–21
- 1990. 'The British Museum at War', *British Museum Magazine*, 6: 35–39
- Caygill, Marjorie L., and Christopher Date. 1999. *Building the British Museum* (London: British Museum Press)
- Cockerell, Charles R. 1860. *The Temples of Jupiter Panhellenius at Aegina and of Apollo Epicurius at Bassae near Phigaleia in Arcadia* (London: J. Weale)
- Cockerell, Samuel Pepys. 1903. *Travels in Southern Europe and the Levant, 1810–1817: The Journal of C. R. Cockerell* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co.)

- Cohen, Beth. 2015. 'The Post-Antique Reception of Greek and Roman Art and Architecture', in Clemente Marconi (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Art and Architecture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 473–98
- Constantine, David. 1993. 'Winckelmann and Sir William Hamilton', *Oxford German Studies*, 22: 55–83
- Cooper, Frederick A. 1996. *The Temple of Apollo Bassitas, I: The Architecture* (Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens)
- Cornini, Guido. 2013. 'Precious Antiquities: The Profane Museum from Clement XIII to Pius VI', in Guido Cornini and Claudia Lega (eds), *Precious Antiquities: The Profane Museum in the Time of Pius VI* (Vatican City: Edizioni Musei Vaticani), pp. 25–38
- Corso, Antonio. 2013. *The Art of Praxiteles, IV: The Late Phase of his Activity* (Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider)
- Décultot, Elisabeth. 2000. *Johann Joachim Winckelmann: Enquête sur la genèse de l'histoire de l'art* (Paris: Presse Universitaires de France)
- Diebold, William J. 1995. 'The Politics of Derestoration: The Aegina Pediments and the German Confrontation with the Past', *Art Journal*, 54: 60–66
- Dodwell, Edward. 1819. *A Classical and Topographical Tour through Greece: During the Years 1801, 1805, and 1806*, 1 (London: Rodwell and Martin)
- Durand, Jean-Nicolas-Louis, 1802–05. *Précis des leçons d'Architecture données à l'École Polytechnique* (Paris: Fantin)
- Dyson, Stephen L. 2006. *A History of Classical Archaeology in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (New Haven: Yale University Press)
- Ebitz, David. 1988. 'Connoisseurship as Practice', *Artibus et Historiae*, 9: 207–12
- Ernst, Wolfgang. 1992. 'La transition des galeries privées au musée public et l'imagination muséale: L'exemple du British Museum', in Annie-France Laurens and Krzysztof Pomian (eds), *L'Anticomanie, La collection d'antiquités aux 18e et 19e siècles* (Paris: Editions de l'École des hautes études en sciences humaines), pp. 155–67
- 1996. 'Framing the Fragment: Archaeology, Art, Museum', in Paul Duro (ed.), *The Rhetoric of the Frame: Essays on the Boundaries of the Artwork* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 111–35
- Ferris, David S. 2000. *Silent Urns: Romanticism, Hellenism, Modernity* (Stanford: Stanford University Press)
- Gesche, Inga. 1982. 'Bemerkungen zum Problem der Antikenergänzungen und seiner Bedeutung bei Johann Joachim Winckelmann', in Herbert Beck and Peter C. Bol (eds), *Forschungen zur Villa Albani: Antike Kunst und die Epoche der Aufklärung* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann), pp. 453–55
- Greifenhagen, Adolf, 1939. 'Griechische Vasen auf Bildnissen der Zeit Winckelmanns und des Klassizismus', *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, 3.7: 200–15
- Halbertsma, Ruurd B. (ed.). Forthcoming. *The Canino Connections: The History and Restoration of Vases from the Excavations of Lucien Bonaparte, Prince of Canino (1775–1840)* (Leiden: Sidestone Press)
- Hamilakis, Yannis. 2007. *The Nation and its Ruins: Antiquity, Archaeology, and National Imagination in Greece* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Hamilton, William R. 1815. *Memorandum on the Subject of the Earl of Elgin's Pursuits in Greece*, 2nd edn (London: John Murray)

- Hancarville, Pierre-François H. 1767. *Collection of Etruscan, Greek and Roman Antiquities from the Cabinet of the Hon. Wm. Hamilton, his Britannick Majesty's Envoy Extraordinary at the Court of Naples* (Naples: François Morelli)
- Harloe, Katherine. 2010. 'Pausanias as Historian in Winckelmann's History', *Classical Receptions Journal*, 2: 174–96
- . 2013. *Winckelmann and the Invention of Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Hartman, Geoffrey. 1986. *Bitburg in Moral and Political Perspective* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press)
- Hatfield, Henry C. 1953. 'Winckelmann: The Romantic Element', *Germanic Review*, 28: 282–89
- Hautumm, Wolfgang. 1983. *Hellas: Die Wiederentdeckung des klassischen Griechenland* (Cologne: Taschenbuch)
- Hazlitt, William. 1856. *Criticisms on Art*, 2nd edn (London: C. Templeman)
- Hegel, Georg W. F. 1975. *Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Arts*, trans. T. Malcolm Knox (Oxford: Clarendon)
- Hitchens, Christopher. 1987. *The Elgin Marbles: Should They Be Returned to Greece?* (London: Chatto & Windus)
- Jenkins, Ian. 1992a. *Archaeologists and Aesthetes in the Sculpture Galleries of the British Museum, 1800–1939* (London: British Museum Press)
- . 1992b. 'La vente des vases Durand (Paris 1836) et leur reception en Grande-Bretagne', in Annie-France Laurens and Krzysztof Pomian (eds), *L'Anticomanie, La collection d'antiquités aux 18e et 19e siècles* (Paris: Editions de l'Ecole des hautes etudes en sciences humaines), pp. 269–77
- . 1994. 'Bernard Ashmole and the British Museum', in Donna C. Kurtz (ed.), *Bernard Ashmole. An Autobiography* (Oxford: Lithic Studies Society), pp. 203–09
- . 1996. "'Contemporary Minds": Sir William Hamilton's Affair with Antiquity', in Ian Jenkins and Kim Sloan (eds), *Vases and Volcanoes: Sir William Hamilton and his Collection* (London: British Museum Press), pp. 40–65
- . 2001. *Cleaning and Controversy: The Parthenon Sculptures 1811–1939*, British Museum Occasional Paper, 146 (London: British Museum Press)
- Johns, Christopher M. S. 1998. *Antonio Canova and the Politics of Patronage in Revolutionary and Napoleonic Europe* (Berkeley: University of California Press)
- Justi, Carl. 1923. *Winckelmann und seine Zeitgenossen*, 3rd edn, I (Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel)
- Kant, Immanuel. 1790. *Critik der Urtheilskraft* (Berlin: Lagarde und Friedrich)
- Klenze, Leo von. 1830. *Sammlung architektonischer Entwürfe für die Ausführung bestimmt oder wirklich gebaut* (Munich: J. G. Cotta)
- Klenze, Leo von, and Ludwig Schorn. 1863. *Beschreibung der Glyptothek seiner Majestät des Königs Ludwig I. von Bayern: Architektonischer Theil* (Munich: J. G. Cotta)
- Lanzi, Luigi. 1792. *Storia Pittorica della Italia* (Bassano: Remondino)
- Larsson, Lars Olof. 1969. 'Thorvaldsens Restaurierung der Aegina-Skulpturen in Lichte zeitgenössischer Kunstkritik und Antiken-auffassung', *Konsthistorisk tidskrift*, 38: 23–46
- Leigh, Thomas. 1817. *Narrative of a Journey in Egypt and the Country beyond the Cataracts*, II (London: John Murray)
- Maass, Michael. 1984. 'Nachträgliche Überlegungen zur Restaurierung der Ägineten', *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Athenische Abteilung*, 99: 165–76

- McClellan, Andrew L. 1994. *Inventing the Louvre: Art, Politics and the Origins of Modern Museums in Eighteenth-Century Paris* (Berkeley: University of California Press)
- MacGregor, Arthur. 1983. *Ark to Ashmolean* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- 2007. *Curiosity and Enlightenment: Collectors and Collections from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century* (Yale: Yale University Press)
- Marchand, Suzanne. 2003. *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970* (Princeton: Princeton University Press)
- Marvin, Miranda. 2008. *The Language of the Muses: The Dialogue between Greek and Roman Sculpture* (Los Angeles: Getty Publications)
- Meinecke, Friedrich. 1936. *Die Entstehung des Historismus* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg)
- Mengs, Anton R. 1771. *Gedanken über die Schönheit und den Geschmack in der Malerey* (Zurich: Orell, Gessner, Füssli and Co.)
- Merlin, Alfred. 1946. ‘De l’intérêt des catalogues de ventes publiques pour d’étude des vases antiques’, in *Mélanges dédiés à la mémoire de Félix Graf*, I (Paris: Pecqueur-Grat), pp. 127–44
- Messman, Frank J. 1973. ‘Richard Payne Knight and the Elgin Marbles Controversy’, *British Journal of Aesthetics*, 13: 69–75
- Meyer, Caspar. 2017. ‘Russian Encounters with Classical Antiquities: Archaeology, Museums, and National Identity in the Czarist Empire’, in Zara Martirosova Torlone, Dana LaCourse Munteanu, and Dorota Dutsch (eds), *Companion to Classical Reception in Eastern and Central Europe* (Chichester: John Wiley and Sons), pp. 491–504
- Michaelis, Adolf. 1877. ‘Die Aufnahme der Elgin Marbles in London’, *Im Neuen Reich*, 3–4: 81–94
- 1908. *A Century of Archaeological Discoveries* (London: J. Murray)
- Michon, Étienne. 1912. ‘Les sculptures d’Égine et de Phigale; les projets d’acquisitions du Musée Napoléon en 1811–1812’, *Revue d’Épigraphie Grécque*, 25: 148–208
- Miller, Peter N. 2013. ‘A Tentative Morphology of European Antiquarianism, 1500–2000’, in Alain Schnapp (ed.), *World Antiquarianism* (Los Angeles: Getty Publications), pp. 67–87
- Missirini, Melchior. 1824. *Della Vita di Antonio Canova* (Prato: Gichetti)
- Mordaunt Crook, Joseph. 1972. *The British Museum: A Case Study in Architectural Politics* (London: Penguin)
- Newton, Charles T. 1851. ‘Remarks on the Collections of Ancient Art in the Museums of Italy, the Glyptothek in Munich, and the British Museum’, *The Museum of Classical Antiquities*, 3: 205–27
- Nørskov, Vinnie. 2009. ‘The Affairs of Lucien Bonaparte and the Impact on the Study of Greek Vases’, in Vinnie Nørskov and others (eds), *The World of Greek Vases* (Rome: Edizioni Quasar), pp. 63–76
- Ohly, Dieter. 1966. ‘Die Neuaufstellung der Ägineten’, *Archäologischer Anzeiger*, 4: 515–28
- 1976. *Die Aegineten: Die Marmorskulpturen des Tempels der Aphaia auf Aegina* (Munich: C. H. Beck)
- Orrells, Daniel. 2011. ‘Burying and Excavating Winckelmann’s History of Art’, *Classical Receptions Journal*, 3: 168–88
- 2014. Review of Harloe 2013, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2014.12.06
- Palagia, Olga. 1980. *Euphranor* (Leiden: Brill)
- Pannuti, Ulrico. 1971–72. *Il Tempio di Apollo Epikourios a Bassai (Phiagalia): Storia, struttura e problemi* (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei)

- Paoletti, Maurizio. 2009. 'I Bronzi di Riace. Una bibliografia', in Maurizio Paoletti (ed.), *Relitti, porti e rotte nel Mediterraneo* (Cosenza: University of Calabria), pp. 91–114
- Paul, Carole (ed.). 2012. *The First Modern Museums of Art: The Birth of an Institution in 18th- and Early 19th Century Europe* (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum)
- Pavan, Massimiliano. 1974–75. 'Antonio Canova e la discussione sugli "Elgin Marbles"', *Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale di Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte*, n.s., 21–22: 219–344
- Pinelli, Orietta Rossa. 1991. 'Il frontone di Aegina e la cultura del restauro dell'antico a Roma intorno al 1816', in Patrick Kragelund and Mogens Nykjaer (eds), *Thorvaldsen: l'ambiente, l'influsso, il mito* (Rome: L'Erma' di Bretschneider), pp. 132–30
- Pölnitz, P. Winfrid von. 1929. *Ludwig I von Bayern und Johann Martin von Wagner* (Munich: Verlag der Kommission)
- Pommier, Edouard. 1989. 'Winckelmann et la vision de l'Antiquité classique dans la France des Lumières et de la Révolution', *Revue de l'art*, 83: 9–20
- Potts, Alexander D. 1978. 'Political Attitudes and the Rise of Historicism in Art Theory', *Art History*, 1: 191–213
- 1980a. 'Greek Sculpture and Roman Copies I: Anton Raphael Mengs and the Eighteenth Century', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 43: 153–73
- 1980b. 'Die Skulpturenaufstellung in der Glyptothek', in Klaus Vierneisel and Gottlieb Leinz (eds), *Glyptothek München, 1830–1980* (Munich: Glyptothek), pp. 258–83
- 1982. 'Winckelmann's Construction of History', *Art History*, 5: 377–407
- 1994. *Flesh and the Ideal: Winckelmann and the Origins of Art History* (New Haven: Yale University Press)
- 2000. 'The Classical Ideal on Display', *Ricerche di storia dell'arte*, 72: 29–56
- Pretzler, Maria. 2007. *Pausanias: Travel Writing in Ancient Greece* (London: Duckworth)
- 2010. 'From One Connoisseur to Another: Pausanias as Winckelmann's Guide to Analysing Greek Art', *Classical Receptions Journal*, 2: 197–218
- Prettejohn, Elizabeth. 2005. *Beauty and Art, 1750–2000* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- 2012. *The Modernity of Ancient Sculpture: Greek Sculpture and Modern Art from Winckelmann to Picasso* (London: I. B. Tauris)
- Quincy, Antoine Quatremère de. 2012. *Letters to Miranda and Canova on the Abductions of Antiquities from Rome and Athens*, trans. Chris Miller and David Ginks, with an introduction by Dominique Poulot (Los Angeles: The Getty Research Institute)
- Quinn, John T. 2000. 'The Ancient Rome of Adolf Hitler', *Classical Bulletin*, 76: 141–57
1816. *Report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Earl of Elgin's Collection of Sculptured Marbles* (London: John Murray)
- Rodriguez Pérez, Diana, and others. 2016. *Beazley and Christ Church: 250 Years of Scholarship on Greek Vases* (Oxford: Christ Church Library)
- Röttgen, Steffi. 1977. 'Mengs, Alessandro Albani und Winckelmann: Idee und Gestalt des Parnass in der Villa Albani', *Storia dell'Arte*, 30/31: 86–156
- Ruprecht, Louis A. Jr. 2002. *Was Greek Thought Religious? On the Use and Abuse of Hellenism, from Rome to Romanticism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan)
- 2011. *Winckelmann and the Vatican's First Profane Museum* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan)
- 2014. *Classics at the Dawn of the Museum Era: The Life and Times of Antoine Chrysostome Quatremère De Quincy (1755–1849)* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan)

- St Clair, William. 1998. *Lord Elgin and the Marbles*, 3rd edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Savoy, Benedicte (ed.). 2006. *Tempel der Kunst: Die Entstehung des öffentlichen Museums in Deutschland 1701–1815* (Mainz: Von Zabern)
- Schlegel, Friedrich. 1825. *Sämmtliche Werke, X: Beiträge zur Kenntnis der romantischen Dichtkunst. Neue Kunst und Litteratur. Alte Weltgeschichte* (Vienna: Jacob Mayer)
- Schneider, René, 1810. *Quatremère de Quincy et son intervention dans les arts* (Paris: Hachette)
- Schultz, Franz. 1952. *Klassik und Romanik der Deutschen* (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler)
- Schwahn, Britta. 1983. *Die Glyptothek in München. Baugeschichte und Ikonologie* (Munich: UNI-Druck)
- Scobie, Alex. 1990. *Hitler's State Architecture: The Impact of Classical Antiquity* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press)
- Shaw, Devin Z. 2010. *Freedom and Nature in Schelling's Philosophy of Art* (London: Continuum Books)
- Sheehan, James J. 2000. *Museums in the German Art World: From the End of the Old Regime to the Rise of Modernism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Siapkas, Johannes, and Lena Sjögren. *Displaying the Ideals of Antiquity: The Petrified Gaze* (London: Routledge)
- Squire, Michael. 2011. *The Art of the Body: Antiquity and its Legacy* (London: I. B. Tauris)
- Stoneman, Richard. 2010. *Land of Lost Gods: The Search for Classical Greece* (London: I. B. Tauris)
- Sünderhauf, Esther S. 2004. *Griechensehnsucht und Kulturkritik: Die deutsche Rezeption von Winckelmanns Antikenideal 1840–1945* (Berlin: Akademie)
- Thorvaldsen, Bertel. 1817 (13 August). Thorvaldsen Museum Archives, no. 1642: <<http://arkivet.thorvaldsensmuseum.dk/documents/ea0751>> [accessed 10 February 2017]
- Tischbein, Johann H. W. 1791. *Collection of Engravings of Ancient Vases, Mostly of Pure Greek Workmanship, Discovered in Sepulchres in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies but Chiefly in the Neighbourhood of Naples ... Now in the Possession of Sir Wm. Hamilton*, I (Naples: Tischbein)
- Tzortzaki, Delia. 2012. 'Myth and the Ideal in 20th c.: Exhibitions of Classical Art', in Tyler Jo Smith and Dimitris Plantzos (eds), *A Companion to Greek Art* (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell), pp. 667–82
- Vatican Museums. 1983. *The Vatican Collections: The Papacy and Art* (New York: H. N. Abrams)
- Vian, Nello. 1976. 'Winckelmann alla Biblioteca Vaticana', *Strenna dei Romanisti*, 36: 432–42
- Vierneisel, Klaus, and Gottlieb Leinz (eds), *Glyptothek München, 1830–1980* (Munich: Glyptothek)
- Visconti, Ennio Q. 1816. *A Letter from the Chevalier Antonio Canova and Two Memoirs Read to the Royal Institute of France on the Sculptures of the Earl of Elgin* (London: John Murray)
- Vorländer, Karl (ed.). 1974. *Immanuel Kant, Kritik der Uteilskraft* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner)
- Vout, Carrie. 2006. 'Winckelmann and Antonous', *Cambridge Classical Journal*, 52: 139–62
- Watkin, David. 1968. *Thomas Hope and the Neo-Classical Idea* (London: Murray)
- Wilson, David M. 2002. *The British Museum: A History* (London: British Museum Press)
- Winckelmann, Johann J. 1755, *Gedanken über die Nachahmung der griechischen Werke in der Mahlerey und Bildhauerkunst* (Friedrichstadt: Christian Heinrich Hagenmüller)
- 1767. *Anmerkungen über die Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* (Dresden: Walther)
- 1925. *Ausgewählte Briefe* (Leipzig: Insel-Verlag)

- 2006. *History of the Art of Antiquity*, trans. Harry F. Mallgrave (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute)
- Wünsche, Raimund. 1991. “Perikles” sucht “Pheidias”: Ludwig I. und Thorvaldsen’, in Ursula Peters (ed.), *Künstlerleben in Rom: Bertel Thorvaldsen (1770–1844)* (Nuremberg: Germanisches Nationalmuseum), pp. 307–26
- (ed.). 2011. *Kampf um Troja: 200 Jahre Ägineten in München* (Munich: Josef Fink)
- Zammito, John. 2002. *Kant, Herder, and the Birth of Anthropology* (Chicago: Chicago University Press)

