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Vänliga hälsningar, Julia
Replicas in Roman Art: Redeeming the Copy?

It used to be assumed that Roman artists routinely copied earlier masterpieces of classical and Hellenistic art. In the absence of those lost originals, many of which were bronze sculptures or perishable panel-paintings, the presumed Roman copies became a fundamental source for the history of Greek art. For instance, Roman copies remain the principal sources for some of the most celebrated Greek sculptures attested in ancient literature, including Myron's Discus-Thrower, Polykleitos's Spear-Bearer, and Praxiteles' Aphrodite of Knidos. Since the nineteenth century such works have been subjected to 'Kopienkritik' (copy-criticism) in an attempt to understand better the forms of the missing originals.

However, in the last thirty years or so there has been a radical reassessment of the phenomenon of Roman copies, to the extent that a more sceptical, revisionist view has become almost a new orthodoxy on the subject. It has become clear that the Romans who used 'copies' were not always -- indeed not normally -- motivated by the desire to reproduce famous works; the artists did not copy mechanically and their work was more creative and less concerned with accuracy than had been believed; replication in art was motivated by a range of factors besides mere art-appreciation, including notions of domestic decorum, religious sensibilities, and the practicalities of artists' workshops. Moreover, the previous identifications of copies, including those of the Doryphoros itself, have been seriously challenged.

These important developments are the background for the workshop, but our aim is to move beyond the revisionist view of Roman copies by recognizing that copying did indeed occur extensively in Roman art, often with a surprising degree of consistency and fidelity to models. Such replication is a mark of imperial portraiture, for example, but it demonstrably also involved the detailed reproduction of sculptures and works in other media which ultimately originated in Greek models of previous centuries. That phenomenon is all the more significant and intriguing given the lessons of the revisionist research in recent years and it demands to be re-examined though an open-minded synthesis of old and new knowledge and approaches.

This workshop therefore aims to put replication back on the agenda for research on Graeco-Roman art, addressing such questions as: should there be a new Kopienkritik for the 21st century? What is the relationship between replicas in portraiture and 'ideal-sculpture'? Why did the accurate replication of details matter in an artistic tradition dominated by freehand carving and painting? What geographical and chronological patterns can be detected in the production of copies? And what role did religion have in motivating replicas?
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1000 Welcome and Introduction: The Problem of the Replica
Dr Peter Stewart (Director, Classical Art Research Centre)

1100 Break – Tea and Coffee

1130 Types and Versions in Roman Art: Some Contexts
Prof RRR Smith (Oxford)

1230 Lunch (not provided)

1400 Retrospective Styles in Late Hellenistic and Roman Art: Terminology and Interpretation
Prof Christopher Hallett (Berkeley)

1500 Pictorial Qualities and their Replication
Prof Michael Koortbojian (Princeton)

1600 Break - Tea and Coffee

1630 A History and Theory of Lock-Counting
Dr Ellen Perry (Holy Cross)

1730 Concluding comments on Day One.
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1000  Anonymous 'Originals': Greek Sculpture of the Classical Period in Roman Context
      Dr Gabriella Cirucci (Pisa)

1100  Break – Tea and Coffee

1130  From Bronze to Marble: Sculpture Copies and their Supports
      Dr Anna Anguissola (Erlangen)

1230  Lunch (not provided)

1400  The Syon House Aphrodite
      Dr Julia Lenaghan (Oxford)

1500  Paper to be confirmed

1600  Break – Tea and Coffee

1630  Intertextuality and Roman Visual Culture: A New Approach to Roman Ideal Sculpture
      Dr Julia Habetzeder (Uppsala)

1730  Response by Amanda Claridge (Royal Holloway)
      Round-table discussion and concluding comments
First of all, I wish to thank You for inviting me to participate in this workshop.

I will take this opportunity to present my ongoing research project, entitled “Intertextuality and Roman Visual Culture. A New Approach to Roman Ideal Sculpture”. This is a three-year project, spanning from 2014-2016. This is, therefore, a work in progress.

The project is financed by Riksbankens Jubileumsfond, The Swedish Foundation for Humanities and Social Sciences. Within the frames of the project I am employed at Uppsala University.
I will begin this presentation with a case-study, an example of how the sculpture of a seated female now in Geneva can be interpreted in intertextual terms. The sculpture is depicted here to the right.

After this initial example, I will outline the theory and method of the intertextual approach, before moving on to a second case-study, this time dealing with the satyr sculpture seen here to the left, a sculpture today in the Palazzo Corsini in Rome.

The two sculptures here singled out for case-studies are traditionally ascribed to the sculpture-group “The Invitation to the Dance”, and therefore a few words regarding this reconstructed sculpture-group are, I believe, called for.

Lastly I will say something of the intertextuality-project as a whole, and of how it is to be published.
As I envision the intertextual approach, each such study produces a reading of the form represented in one rather well-preserved Roman ideal sculpture. Our first case-study will therefore attempt a reading of the form represented by this sculpture: the seated female in Geneva.

The intertextual approach is completely formalistic: it interprets this sculpture by means of its physical form. It sets out to map all sculptures that repeat the “human forms” rendered in this sculpture.

This network of formally related sculptures is then compared, in particular with regard to whether there are variations among the “non-human” forms rendered. Such variations are seen as interesting, because they give a more multifaceted view of how this form could be understood within the Roman cultural context.

The sculpture’s body-type and head-type are studied separately. Let us therefore initially have a look at the body-type represented in the sculpture in Geneva.

Seen in isolation, this sculpture is rather difficult to interpret: there are no preserved attributes that determine the female’s identity.
I know of 15 sculptures that repeat the “human form” of this sculpture’s body-type. Let us look at three examples.

In some instances these sculptures seem to simply repeat the traits represented by the seated female in Geneva. One such case is the torso now in Dresden. However, I am very careful not to reconstruct fragmentary sculptures. I do not assume that a fragment such as that in Dresden must have repeated the forms seen in the more well-preserved sculpture in Geneva. We simply cannot know what the full sculpture once looked like. Nevertheless, as far as preserved, the torso in Dresden repeats the body-type of the sculpture in Geneva.

In the Antikenmuseum in Basel there is a sculpture which repeats the “human form” studied, although the figure is somewhat more thick-set, and she is seated on a rectangular stool, rather than on a schematically rendered rock. This is, as far as we can tell from the preserved sculptures, the only instance where a figure with this body-type is not seated on a rock.

In three instances, the female has her left hand placed, not directly against the rock but against a vessel lying on the rock. In two cases drill-holes tell us that the sculpture could function as a fountain figure, with water spurting out from the vessel’s orifice. This is the case for the sculpture in Naples, depicted here. It should, of course, be noted that this sculpture has been restored: its head, right arm and left foot are post-antique additions.

As we all know, this particular “human form” is today rarely considered as a solitary figure. It is generally understood as having originally been part of a sculpture-group. And there are, in fact, three instances where this body-type is used as part of a sculpture-group.
Here those three constellations are illustrated.

First, there are two series of coins, one minted in Kyzikos and the other, that seen here, in Pautalia in Thrace. The example seen here was published as late as 2009. Both series of coins depict a seated female next to a standing male. Since the late 19th century, both figures displayed on the coin from Kyzikos have been related to figures sculpted in the round.

In the middle, we have a sculpture-group in the repository of the Vatican, which has this female depicted with Pan. The goat-legged God stands next to the female, placing his left hand over her shoulder, while tugging at the cloth covering her lower body with his right hand.

Lastly, at the far right, we have a sculpture-group which was put up for sale at Sotheby’s New York in 2005. Allegedly with 18th century restorations, and previously in a French private collection, this piece needs to be treated with caution. As far as I know, it has never been published. The account given by Sotheby’s is unfortunately very brief. As it would seem, the theme is the same as for the sculpture-group in the Vatican, only here Pan is seated on the rock next to the female.

To sum up regarding the female’s body-type, there is evidence for a quite wide range of variation. And, as we will see, an analysis of the female’s head-type adds further facets to the picture.
The study of head-types requires a greater attention to detail. I know of 18 sculptures that repeat the head-type seen in the sculpture in Geneva. Here we see the female who is the focus of our attention to the left. I have added the example in Baltimore because the pair, taken together, can illustrate two points regarding the head-type studied:

Firstly, especially the sculpture in Baltimore nicely illustrates the female’s hairdo. She has parted her hair in two strands and simply made a knot high up at the back of her head. This is then, as far as I can tell, not a realistic hairdo. I suspect it would require a mass of hairpins to keep the hair in place.

Secondly, it is this unrealistic hairdo that most clearly defines this head-type. The individual locks of hair framing the female’s face are not copied precisely, as is clear from the profiles of the two heads depicted here.

Among the 18 sculptures that repeat the head-type studied, there are a four that include notable variations.

One of these is the head in Baltimore. This particular sculpture seems to have been used as a fountain-figure, with the water spurting out of the female’s mouth. We can see the drill-hole on the frontal photograph included here.
Here all four heads which vary the theme seen in the sculpture in Geneva are illustrated.

To the far left we have the head in Baltimore again, which I will not elaborate on further.

Next is a head in Venice, which repeats the head-type on a colossal scale: the head is 46 cm high. The other renderings of the type are usually slightly smaller than life-size.

The third photograph shows a head in Boston, which, apart from repeating the human traits seen in the seated female in Geneva, also preserves the hand of another figure at the back of the female’s head. What this sculpture-group originally looked like, we can only guess.
This very swift presentation of the various uses of the “human form” seen in the sculpture in Geneva can be summarized in this illustration.

I would like to emphasize that the form seems to have been varied quite often. For the head-type the general hairdo, with its unrealistic knot, is copied, while the rendering of individual locks of hair is varied.

Due to the wide range of variations it is tempting to suggest that this particular “human form” was, during the Roman period, used as a generic figure, albeit one tied to the Bacchic sphere.

We will return to the intertextual reading of the seated female in Geneva, but first, let us proceed to the presentation of the theoretical framework that underpins this analysis.
The theoretical concept of intertextuality belongs to the semiotic sphere. As you all know, semiotics has had its part to play within the study of Roman visual culture. In the newly published “Oxford Handbook of Roman Sculpture” I was pleased to read that several scholars emphasize Tonio Hölscher’s “The Language of Images in Roman Art” as a particularly influential work.

My own semiotic approach uses texts by the cultural theorist Mieke Bal and the art historian Norman Bryson as a general point of departure. Both have argued for the use of semiotic theory within art historical research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General semiotics: Mieke Bal &amp; Norman Bryson</strong>&lt;br&gt;• There can be no such thing as <em>one</em> fixed, unified meaning&lt;br&gt;• Intertextuality: Roland Barthes&lt;br&gt;• The death of the author&lt;br&gt;• Formalism&lt;br&gt;Mark D. Fullerton&lt;br&gt;• 'Imitation and intertextuality in Roman art' (JRA 10, 1997)</td>
<td><strong>Reading of one well-preserved sculpture</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Analysis of intertextual network</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Repetition of “human forms” vs. variation of “non-human forms”</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It should be noted that Bal’s and Bryson’s approach to art history is markedly post-structuralist, a feature which sets it apart from the semiotic approach formulated by Hölscher. Bal and Bryson emphasize the notion that there can be no such thing as ONE fixed, unified meaning.

Rather than being aggravated because years of research will not present absolute knowledge regarding Roman sculptures, this notion can actually be quite liberating. It does, for one, take the pressure of the polemic discussion regarding whether Kopienkritik is a useful approach or not. Kopienkritik is indeed quite useful, so long as one remembers that its results throw light on certain aspects of Roman ideal sculpture. But neither Kopienkritik, nor any other approach, can ever claim to discover the ONE fixed unified meaning of a sculpture, because meaning as such is not an absolute entity.

The abstract that describes this workshop poses the question: “should there be a new Kopienkritik for the 21st century?” My answer to this question is definitely “no”. If one accepts that a sculpture can never hold but ONE fixed meaning, then one must acknowledge that every sculpture deserves to be approached from several different perspectives.

This, then, is why the intertextual approach is not at odds with Kopienkritik. In fact, the two approaches compliment each other very well.

The notion that there can be no ONE fixed meaning is reflected in the intertextual approach’s methodology, for instance in the sense that each study takes one, preferably well-preserved, sculpture as its point of departure. Borrowing terminology from the field of Literary studies, the intertextual approach can be said to produce readings of particular sculptures. The case-study already presented can be described as my intertextual reading of the sculpture in Geneva. In the same sense that there can be countless readings of, say, the Iliad, there can also, at least theoretically, be countless readings of this particular sculpture.
Let us move on, from semiotics in general, to intertextuality in particular.

The term “intertextuality” was coined by Julia Kristeva in the 1960’s. But Roland Barthes remains the most renowned theorist tied to the concept. In particular his short text “The death of the author” is well known. Two of the notions put forth in this article are of crucial importance to my study. We shall turn to those shortly.

First I will say something regarding intertextuality in general. Intertextual theory holds that texts, both literary and non-literary, lack any kind of independent meaning. Where a literary text is concerned, intertextual theorists argue that the act of reading plunges us into a network of textual relations. To discover meaning in a text, these relations are explored. In essence, reading is seen as a process of moving between texts, and meaning is seen to exist between one text and all other texts to which it refers and relates.

With this general characteristic of intertextuality in mind, the approach to Roman sculpture presented here is essentially the analysis of intertextual networks of related sculptures. The general idea is that a viewer interprets a sculpture by reference to what he or she has seen before. A Roman viewer encountering the seated female now in Geneva for the first time may have called to mind having seen the sculpture-group in the Vatican at some earlier point. Remembering that the sculpture-group depicts this female together with Pan, our viewer might instinctively conclude that also the female in Geneva should be interpreted as connected to the Bacchic sphere, even though the sculpture in Geneva does not render any Bacchic attributes.

That said, let us move on to the two concepts outlined in Barthes’ article.
The first is synonymous with the article’s title: “The Death of the Author”.

For Barthes, literary meaning can never be fully stabilized by the reader, because the literary work’s intertextual nature always leads readers on to new textual relations. Authors, therefore, cannot be held responsible for the multiple meanings readers can discover within literary texts. Hence, Barthes’ famous proclamation of “the death of the author”.

Transferred to sculpture, this means that the original sculptor of a particular form cannot envisage or control the multiple meanings that viewers can discover in their sculptures. This disregard for originality and authorial intention within the interpretation of meaning in art distinguishes the intertextual approach clearly from the practice of Kopienkritik. It does, however, not mean that the two approaches are incompatible.
The consequences of the notion of “the death of the author” can be illustrated in two figures, one seen here to the right.

In the center of this figure we have the sculpture-group in the Vatican. This sculpture could be brought forth as an example of the eclecticism of Roman sculpture, an aspect that has received much attention in recent years. When confronted with such a sculpture, scholars usually point out the earlier sculptural compositions which the eclectic piece refers to by means of its form. For this piece, scholars have pointed out that the sculpture combines the female from the so-called “Invitation to the Dance” (seen here at the top) with a figure of Pan, who repeats this deities head-type as otherwise seen in depictions of the so-called “Pan and Daphnis-Group” (seen here at the bottom of the figure).

Chronology has a crucial part to play in this line of reasoning, where the presumably later eclectic constellation is interpreted by reference to sculptural compositions believed to have been made earlier. This relationship is, however, rarely allowed to work both ways. That is to say that the later eclectic composition is not seen to have any significance for the interpretation of the earlier compositions.

Intertextual theory, by contrast, emphasizes that these relationships can, indeed, work both ways. Hence, the only thing that changes as we move on to the second figure are the arrows, which now point both ways.
In essence then, once an eclectic composition has been made, its existence has the potential to change how the earlier forms are interpreted by a viewer. The original sculptor responsible for the so-called “Invitation to the Dance” could not have foreseen that this form was to be used in the eclectic manner seen in the sculpture in the Vatican. Hence, the original sculptor’s intentions can never present us with a full account of the meaning that his or her sculpture could convey.

This brings us to another aspect of the intertextual approach, as I practice it in this study: it is completely synchronic. It interprets the preserved ideal sculptures as an expression of Roman visual culture in general.
Continuing with the second notion listed here in connection with Roland Barthes’ name, we come to the concept of “formalism”.

The intertextual approach to Roman ideal sculpture, as I have formulated it, is completely formalistic. In his article, “The Death of the Author”, Barthes not only separates the text from authorial intention, he also separates it from reference to the real world beyond itself. What might appear to be realism is only the repetition, within the text, of the discursive forms which, in Barthes’ view construct reality.

With this notion in mind, I will allow the intertextual approach to Roman ideal sculpture to be completely formalistic. It derives its reading of the studied sculptures exclusively from their physical form. This has the great advantage of making the approach applicable to all sculptures that render a repeated form, regardless of whether the sculptures’ original contexts are known or not.

Even though Kopienkritik was not initially formulated as a mainly formalistic approach, it has often come to be used as such. The fact that Kopienkritik is applicable to sculptures with no known provenance is, I believe, one of the reasons why the approach has become so frequently used. It is, however, not the only formalistic approach possible. In formulating an intertextual approach, I wish to add an alternative formalistic approach, an approach that highlights completely different aspects of Roman ideal sculpture.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General semiotics: Mieke Bal &amp; Norman Bryson</td>
<td>• Reading of one well-preserved sculpture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There can be no such thing as one fixed, unified meaning</td>
<td>• Analysis of intertextual network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intertextuality: Roland Barthes</td>
<td>• Repetition of “human forms” vs variation of “non-human forms”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The death of the author</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mark D. Fullerton
• ‘Imitation and intertextuality in Roman art’ (JRA 10, 1997)
It has often been noted that Roman sculptors seem to have copied human bodies quite precisely, while taking the liberty to vary other aspects in the compositions rendered, such as the support. This is why the intertextual approach traces repetition of what I here call the “human form” of the sculpture studied. This limits the material studied.

For the interpretation of the studied sculpture variations among the “non-human” forms are seen as particularly interesting. This is because such variations have the potential to present us with a more multifaceted view of how the studied form was perceived.
Last but not least, I want to emphasize that Mark Fullerton suggested that the study of Roman ideal sculpture might benefit from theories of intertextuality already in 1997. His review-article in the Journal of Roman Archaeology caused the term “Intertextuality” to echo faintly within the continuing discussion regarding repetition in ancient art. But as far as I know no coherent study using an intertextual approach has been published.

Professor Fullerton’s article of 1997 served as the initial inspiration for this project and I am very happy that he has encouraged me to explore his idea further.

Now, let us turn to our second case-study, keeping these theoretical considerations in mind.
This time the sculpture of a satyr, kept in the Palazzo Corsini in Rome, will be the focus of our attention. The sculpture is rather well preserved, although the hands with the cymbals are restored, as are parts of the legs. The head has been reattached.

Also this time, we will begin with the sculpture’s body-type. As far as I know, there are 15 sculptures that repeat the body-type seen in the satyr in Rome. Interestingly enough, there are not many that include variations among the composition’s “non-human” forms.

When preserved, the support is always shaped as a tree-trunk, although these tree-trunks are never rendered in exactly the same way. At times there are also different Bacchic attributes placed on the support, be it a set of pan-pipes, a *pedum*, or a *nebris*. 
There is a sculpture in Athens, seen here in the middle, which includes both a set of pan-pipes and a *nebris*. What should be noted in particular for this sculpture, though, is that drill-holes through the support show that it could have functioned as a fountain-figure, with the water spurting out of the mouth of the goat-skin draped over the support.

As for the support, also the rendering of the foot-clapper varies among the preserved examples.

Then there are, of course, the coins from Pautalia and Kyzikos, which seem to display a sculpture repeating this body-type, placed next to a female, similar to that in Geneva.

Apart from this, there are no clear variations among the renderings of this particular body-type.
Turning to the sculpture’s head-type, I have again included a second sculpture for comparison.

The sculpture in Rome displays a quite distinct rendering of the hair, which is repeated between reproductions of the type. Take, for instance, the lock above the satyr’s forehead, which is raised upwards and then falls down, somewhat to the left. One can also point to the way the locks of hair run away from the face above the satyr’s right ear in bent, yet parallel strands. On the contrary, on the satyr’s left side the locks come together in a point above the satyr’s left ear.

Another distinct feature is the whirl of hair at the back of the satyr’s head, seen here for the satyr in Princeton. Unfortunately the whirl is not visible on the photographs of the satyr in Rome which I have to my disposal.

The head-type represented in the sculpture in Rome is repeated in at least 13 sculptures, and these all replicate the hair quite faithfully.

But as we can see in these two examples, the satyr is not always rendered wearing a wreath made of pine-twigs. The head in Princeton sports a wreath made of ivy. Most commonly, however, the satyr does not wear a wreath at all.
Here we have the satyrs in Rome and Princeton depicted again.

Then, in the middle, there is a satyr-head now in a private collection in Barnstable, MA. This is one of the examples where the satyr does not appear to be wearing a wreath. But the head in Barnstable is interesting in that it shows a drill-hole at the back of the satyr’s neck, which may perhaps have been used to fasten a wreath made of a different material.

Lastly, there is one example where the satyr has been rendered on a colossal scale, which is the case for the head in Venice, depicted here to the far right. The height of this fragment is 67 cm, thus clearly larger than life-size. Other repetitions of the human form are rendered in slightly less than life-size.
All in all, the sculptures that repeat the “human form” seen in the satyr in Rome do not include a very wide range of variations. Taken as a group, the sculptures that repeat these “human forms” are very consistent in formalistic terms.
What, then, of the renowned sculpture-group called “The Invitation to the Dance”?  

The question of whether “The Invitation to the Dance” was the original manifestation of these two sculpture types is simply not of relevance within the frames of the intertextual approach. But given the significance the reconstructed group has had within previous research, a few thoughts on the relationship between the two types are called for.

There definitely is a connection between the two “human forms”. For one we have the two coin-images, both minted during the reign of Septimius Severus, around 200 AD.

Another connection between the two is that for each only one rendering on a colossal scale is known, and these both belong to the same collection: the Archaeological Museum in Venice. Unfortunately, their original context is unknown.

Judging from the intertextual analysis of the sculptures in Geneva and Rome, the two “human forms” seem to have been used in distinctly different ways during the Roman era.

As we have seen, there are many variations attested for the female. I would even suggest that this “human form” was, at least within the Roman context, something of a generic figure, which was varied at will.

The satyr, on the other hand, is not varied as freely. There is a much greater coherence in the rendering of this “human form”. This could be seen to suggest that a stricter coherence to a original form was upheld for the satyr.

The nature of the interaction between the two figures has long been a matter of discussion.
The traditional view, first formulated by Wilhelm Klein in 1909, is that the satyr is snapping his fingers as a gesture to invite the seated nymph to the dance. To the left we have a reconstruction made to match this interpretation.

Some have, however, noted that satyrs are generally no gentlemen, and that this scenario would be quite uncharacteristic of a sculpture-group combining the a satyr and a female.

If one looks at the wider network tied to the female figure, it can be concluded that when this “human form” is included in groups, such as that in the Vatican, and – with reservations – that at Sotheby’s, the seated female is approached by a Bacchic male who tugs at the cloth covering her lower body. I would say that this is the scene also rendered on the coins from Pautalia, here the coin depicted in black and white.
To conclude, I will briefly summarize the layout of my intertextuality-project as a whole. I hope to publish this research in a monograph.

There is some inconsistency between the case-studies presented here and the theoretical concept of intertextuality. Also the sculptures, in relation to which the female and the satyr have here been interpreted intertextual. Each sculpture is tied to an endlessly expanding network of formalistic relations, and all such relations can potentially have a bearing on how the forms could be interpreted.

I have tried to acknowledge this ever expanding network of related forms in the layout of the study as a whole. Here we see the seated female in Geneva, and the satyr in Rome. Next to them we have two sculpture-groups which will also be analyzed in my monograph. The book will include one chapter devoted to each of these sculptures, performing an analysis such as that outlined above for the seated female and the satyr.

The crucial point here is that all of the sculptures singled out for case studies are formally interrelated.
The two sculptures that have been presented here are, of course, linked through the coin-images from Pautalia and Kyzikos.
The third case-study deals with the sculpture-group believed to represent Pan and Daphnis. Here we can recognize Pan’s head-type from the sculpture in the Vatican, including our seated female and a standing Pan.
Lastly there is the so-called Ludovisi symplegma, seen here on the right-hand side, which includes a female figure who’s facial features are the same as those of our seated female. Only details of the hairdo separate these two head-types.
In this manner, then, the four case-studies that make up the complete monograph do at least hint at intertextuality’s endless network of interrelated sculptural forms, and at the impossibility of securely stabilizing ONE fixed, unified meaning inherent in a particular repeated form.

And with that said, we have reached the end of this paper.

[Animation]

I thank you all for your kind attention!