Originalveröffentlichung in: Archeologia 47, 1996, S. 127-128

GUNHILD PLOUG, *Catalogue of the Palmyrene Sculptures. Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek*. Copenhagen 1995, pp. 269, with numerous illustrations.

This is a comprehensive catalogue of the largest collection of Palmyrene sculpture in existence outside Syria, covering all 130 pieces preserved in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek in Copenhagen. The bulk of the collection was acquired by Julius Løytved, the Danish consul in Beirut in the 1880s, together with many other antiquities, from dealers in Beirut, Damascus and Homs. Some more sculptures were supplied soon thereafter by a German diplomat E. Puttmann, acting as an intermediary for Johannes Østrup, and several others were purchased by Harald Ingholt between 1929 and 1937.

The Ny Carlsberg collection was first published in 1889 by D. Simonsen in a small booklet, difficult to find now and obviously outdated. But it has inspired another Danish scholar, Harald Ingholt, to study the Palmyrene sculpture in more detail. Employed in the Glyptotek from 1925 to 1930, he published in 1928 his *Studier over Palmyrensk Skulptur*, a book that remains to this day a fundamental treatment of the subject. It is to be feared, however, that it is more often quoted than read in the original Danish text.

Harald Ingholt excavated in Syria in the 1930s, in Palmyra and Hama. He went soon to America to become professor at Yale for the rest of his active life. Sadly, he published very sparingly, and the only public record of his work in the necropolis of Palmyra consists of several articles, mostly epigraphical in content. He never offered an updated version of his dissertation on the Palmyrene sculpture.

Now Ny Carlsberg holds the Ingholt archives (or a part thereof ?), at any rate including his photograph collection covering all sculptures he used for comparison but did not illustrate in his book (referred to as PS with a serial number up to 528), as well as monuments of which he became aware later, all in all over 1500 items. This is the largest documentation of the Palmyrene corpus in existence, no doubt including some unpublished material, though a catalogue of the Louvre collection that Ingholt certainly knew has recently appeared (J. Dentzer-Feydy, J. Teixidor, *Les antiquités de Palmyre au Musée du Louvre*, 1993). On the other hand he could not know most of the monuments from fifteen tombs excavated in Palmyra after his time and now made available by A. Sadurska and A. Bounni, *Les sculptures funéraires de Palmyre*, Rome 1994 [cf. K. Parlasca's review in this volume, pp. 125–127].

Gunhild Ploug has announced her forthcoming study on *The Relative Chronology of the Palmyrene Busts*, in which she could use the material from the Ingholt archive. The main conclusions of this work are already outlined in the present volume, but we should suspend judgment until the other book is out. It appears that the now familiar Ingholtian classification into three groups (ca. AD 50–150, 150–200, and 200–250) shall be put to rest and replaced with a more refined scheme.

For the time being, we have a very detailed catalogue of 130 sculptures in Ny Carlsberg. The Danish version has appeared two years before (F. O. Hvidberg-Hansen, G. Ploug, *Palmyra Samlingen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek*, Copenhagen 1993). It is more concise, but on the other hand it includes the treatment of inscriptions by the first author, omitted now and reserved for a further volume. It also contains, systematically, side views of the bust slabs, seldom if ever illustrated elsewhere. With the appearance of the expanded English volume we can confidently refer to it for all matters except these.

Each piece of the present collection is illustrated with an excellent photograph and systematically described using a detailed template, avoiding arbitrary judgements of value. The categories used in the description are explained in minute detail in the introduction (pp. 13–33). Especially valuable is a typology of folds, which should prove very useful in a future work on workshops and hands. The description of each piece is followed with a comparative section arraying a wide range of monuments generally close or presenting a similarity on a particular point. As there are only 8 dated portraits in the book, this exercise is not a futile show of erudition but the only means of assigning an approximative date to most sculptures of the collection, and indirectly to many others.

The collection is mainly funerary and consists of busts or detached heads, with only a few full-figure stelae or banquet fragments. Only four small votive altars and a head of a goddess fall clearly outside of the funerary context. The proportion is typical of all collections formed, as this one, of monuments of unknown provenience purchased from dealers. To some extent, this may reflect the real proportions of various subjects in Antiquity, though it should be kept in mind that the honorific sculpture was mainly in bronze and did not survive, while the

[12] Studia Palmyreńskie 8, 1985, 119–130.

[13] Sadurska, *Le Tombeau de famille de 'Alainê*, 37–41; 76–125.

religious monuments certainly tended to cluster around temples where they were exposed to vandalism in Late Antiquity. Still, it seems highly probable that the tomb sculpture was most prolific. What is more, tombs were, and to some extent still are, the obvious place where to look for sculpture without too much trouble. The local providers have effectively cleared long ago all the tower tombs and have visited many underground chambers, with the results that can be observed today in many museums in Europe and America. The special, though not exclusive, interest of Løytved in Palmyrene sculpture made the Ny Carlsberg collection the richest in this respect, except the one in Palmyra itself. The assets of the Palmyra museum are naturally more varied, but even there the funerary largely prevails.

In a couple of cases the author's dating is somewhat surprising. So, for instance, no 26 (pp. 95–97), the bust of Ḥannâ, is placed about AD 140, while the inscription on the plinth is clearly in the 1st century ductus, much less evolved than inscriptions on sculptures assigned to the early 2nd century. It is true that the examples of sculptures safely dated to the 1st century are very few and so difficult to assess. The very earliest dated funerary head is no 1 (pp. 35–36) of AD 65/66, but more monuments of apparently the same period are known.

The rare hairstyle with two floating locks behind the head of a man on the double bust 85 (pp. 208–21) is taken as characterizing a slave. Because the man, clad in a richly embroidered tunic, is being comforted by his female companion, she is supposed to be of servile condition, too. This reasoning does not strike me as very convincing. At any rate the accompanying inscription cannot help, as it is not merely "illegible" but crudely faked.

The 'slave-locks' appear also on a feminine bust of Bittî donning a fancy cloak (84, pp. 205–207), clearly a free-born "daughter of Yarḥai". There is no reason to suggest that her mother was a slave, nor should her otherwise short hairstyle induce bizarre suppositions, also expressed in relation to the bust 60 (pp. 155–157) of a short-haired lady represented with a child, such as her being an eunuch (M.A.R. Colledge, *The Art of Palmyra*, London 1976, p. 72) or a lesbian (Ploug, *l.c.* and also p. 256). It is hardly possible that the latter particularity would be avowed at that place and time, let alone advertised on the tombstone of a person. The proposal is blatantly anachronistic.

The locks in question appear also on two unmistakably masculine figures (126, pp. 255–257, and Colledge, pl. 80, in Istanbul), in both cases associated with writing implements, and on the Ny Carlsberg stele obviously showing a servant. However, none of the other servants depicted in sculpture display the floating locks. This hairstyle's meaning is thus far from explained, in spite of the original suggestion of Ingholt (Berytus 2, 1935, p. 74), accepted by Colledge (p. 143, n. 530).

It is naturally possible that some detached heads had belonged to honorific statues rather than to funerary banquet slabs, as e.g. nos 92 and 97, though they seem too large for statues set on column brackets, as Klaus Parlasca (quoted p. 222) has observed. The only means to prove their honorific character would be to show their representing identifiable celebrities, and this cannot be done at present. True, Harald Ingholt has suggested that the oversize head no 97 (pp. 227–230) may represent Odainat the Elder, the presumed father of the husband of Zenobia (*Palmyre – bilan et perspectives*, Strasbourg 1976, p. 115 s.) Naturally, this would greatly enhance the interest of the Ny Carlsberg head (and of a rather close copy of it in Istanbul) and quite understandably Ploug has discussed the possible dating at length. After thorough discussion she confirmed the Ingholt's proposal to place both heads in the period ca AD 230–250. This could fit Odainat as a model, but certainly not Odainat the Elder who never existed, as I believe to have demonstrated elsewhere (Syria 62, 1985, pp. 251 s.).

The new Ny Carlsberg catalogue is a piece of thorough, systematic and well-informed work. Together with the announced volume on chronology it will set new foundations for any future study of the Palmyrene sculpture.

Michał Gawlikowski

Instytut Archeologii UW
Krakowskie Przedmieście 1
PL – 00-927 Warszawa