a certain attitude appears that can be summarized in the words of C. E. von Glauser (Medi!

ical Islam, 2d ed., Chicago, 1955, pp. 216-17): "The crafts, if it were possible to conceive them from these five points: (1) the material in such a way that work; here goldsmiths and perfumers have the advantages; (2) the product they achieve; and the theoretical context; instruments; (3) the urgency with which their work is needed; (4) their price; they have the advantages; (5) the craftsmanship of their specialties with artisans and sculptors are vitally important for the well of the city: (5) when taken per se, as skills, without regard to utility, etc., prestidigitators, decorators, and musicians are justi-

fied by their accomplishments as such."

Hellenistic Art

year of the formation of the new kingdoms): 280 (marking the stabilization of the Hellenistic world, with the three great dynasties — the Antipatrids in Asia, the Ptolemies in Egypt — securely in power). The end date is advanced by some scholars to 146 B.C., the year of the creation of the province of Macedonia, by others to 86 B.C., the year of the fall of Athens. In the political field the dates 323-31 B.C. can be accepted without serious objections; the death of Alexander initiated a new, long period of Greek history, and the Battle of Actium made Rome the center of the ancient world. The adoption of these dates raises more serious doubts in the field of art history; for here artistic events whose dates are not verifiable may have as sharply determinate a character as political and military events in their sphere. However, there is no need to alter the accepted dates so they have come to be transferred from the field of political history to that of art history, as long as it is borne in mind that their value is largely conventional and practical; in this way the unfortunate errors in historical evaluation that have sometimes resulted from too rigid and enthusiastic adherence to them can be avoided.

The date 323 signifies not so much the beginning as a particularly important stage of the development that led from the ideals of the 4th century (see Classic Art) to those of the Hellenistic age, and it can be advanced or set back without creating serious misunderstanding. The end date, 31 B.C., signals the transition from Hellenistic to Roman art, but since the term "Roman art" has mainly a chronological significance, this transition has little bearing on style. The assumption that a monument of the Roman age, whether it be found in Italy, Syria, Egypt, or anywhere else in the Roman world, expresses Roman rather than Hellenistic ideals is unjustifiable. The history of the art of the period does not echo that of politics or war. The irresistible thrust of Roman power to the east that culminated with the victory at Actium was accompanied by a gradual reaping or dominating Greek art and culture. There is no transition from a Hellenistic art to a Roman art in the strict sense of the word in Greece after 146 B.C., nor in the East after the successive constitution of the provinces of Asia (Q.v.) and Africa (Q.v.); nor in any other region of the Roman world, where the conventions of a more limiting one, paralleling "Greek" as referring to a Grecism that combines Roman rather than Hellenistic tradition, not as a mere passive recipient of ancient Roman temperamen but as the heir to dynamically developing Hellenistic ideals, not as a mere passive recipient of ancient Roman temperamen t. Until the second half of the 2d century of our era, the art of the Imperial age remained closely akin to the Hellenistic tradition, not as a mere passive recipient and imitator of forms but as the heir to dynamically developing Hellenistic tendencies and ideals, as seen in portraiture, conventional narrative relief, spatial illusionism, landscape, painted wall decoration, impressionistic rendering of forms, and architectural features. This art, which can be said to have been Greek art in the service of Rome — or Graeco-Roman — did have new and original aspects, but it was never antibalical to the Greek-Hellenistic genius. No matter how many components are discovered in it, the predominance of the Greek-Hellenistic current is borne. Not only did Hellenistic art have one of its chief theorems in the Italy that was in the process of Romanization: it centered there, to live longer and prosper more than it had in the rest of the Hellenistic world in the course of the two succeeding centuries.

The farther removed one is from the Orient or Rome controversy and other disputes that punctuate a clear break between Hellenistic and Roman art and set East and West in opposition as fundamentally different cultural worlds, the more apparent is the necessity of reconstructing a unity so heedlessly broken up. The historic role that Rome played in reviving Hellenistic culture and in disseminating Greek art must be acknowledged. In this respect Rome took over the function of the Hellenistic kingdom: as they had stimulated the diffusion of Greek art in the vast regions of the East, Rome brought Greek art to the West, thereby transmitting this inheritance to the modern age. The year 31 B.C., then, may be taken to mark the phase in which Rome became the center of artistic production in the Mediterranean world but not to mark the end of Hellenistic art. Not until the 3d century of our era, or slightly earlier, did newly predominant artistic ideals seem to transcend Hellenistic. But even then it cannot be asserted that Hellenistic culture was submerged — its figurative tradition was to live on continuously until the end of the ancient world and then, with other elements, to merge with the Byzantine and Western art of the Middle Ages. Before the neoclassic "rediscovery of Greece" in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, it was the Roman elaboration of Hellenistic art, not classic or archaic Greek art, that the modern age looked to as the antique.

The perpetuation of Hellenistic artistic traditions and names in the Roman age and beyond accounts for the expressions "Hellenistic-Roman," "Hellenistic of the Roman age," "Hellenistic-imperial," "Neoclassicism," "Neo-Hellenism," "Neo-Greek," "Neo-Hellenic" as well as the simple "Hellenistic," to refer to late-antique and early medieval stylistic modes that are really of Greek tradition.

The difficulty in defining "Hellenistic" as applied to style is apparent. It is vain to attempt to define Hellenism in terms as precise as those applied to other great styles — to Gothic, the baroque, the rococo, impressionism, and the rest. We may, in the words of the art historian Bianchi Bandinelli: "the artistic forms preserving the essential organic unity of structure which was fundamental to Greek art and to its naturalistic bent" — as distinguished from the schematic or ornamental use of organic form and its distortion for expressionistic ends which are characteristic of the new ideals of the late-antique period (q.v.).

General Considerations. If, broadly speaking, in its political and cultural aspects the Hellenism of 4th-century Greece is in its infancy, nonetheless it is clear that in many respects it differed profoundly from the Greece of the preceding period.
With the establishment of the great Hellenistic kingdoms, the Greek cities lost their political autonomy and became vassal states. The new Hellenistic states had no resemblance to the old Greek city-states. The individual, not the city, was the center of the political life of the state in the Hellenistic world. Yet the new rulers accelerated the development of the individualism that had taken hold by the 4th century; cultural specialization, virtuosity of technical achievement, and the individualization of spiritual life proceeded at a comparable pace. The Hellenistic man was a citizen of the world. The narrow limits of the civic space were no sabbath for the spirit. In the world of the East, the art and culture flourished, benefiting from the establishment of such institutions as the Museum and Library in Alexandria. The science of philology was born and developed rapidly; the methods of its creators in the field of art, the vitality and staying power of its achievements in poetry, the orientation of spiritual life toward individualism, technical virtuosity, universality of culture, naturalism, even realism. The decline of the great ideals of the past, poetry, when not erudite or courtly, turned to the particular; genre subjects, romantic impressions of nature, and amorous sentiments were the preferred themes and types. Similarly, philosophy turned from abstract metaphysical problems to a largely religious concern with the spiritual life of the individual. Stoicism and Epicureanism, more especially; with Cynicism, renounced the main directions taken by philosophical thought; significantly, they also had great success with the Romans.

Historians do not agree in their interpretation of Hellenistic culture — its uniformity, the role of Eastern elements in its formation and development, its intrinsic significance. In point of fact, because of its remarkable extent in time and space and the heterogeneity of its consistent elements, the Hellenistic world, of transcultural unity, presents a series of profound affinities. From region to region, from the East to the West, there is no aspect of Hellenistic life which does not have its own precedents in that period of ferment and crisis in Greek life that was in evidence by the 4th century; the crises of the poles and of religion, the first penetration of Eastern doctrines, the expression of spiritual life toward individualism, technical virtuosity, universality of culture, naturalism, even realism. To find precedents for Hellenism in the classical age is not necessarily to pass it over, even in the East. This would be difficult to achieve, given the incompleteness of scholarly studies in the field and the serious gaps in our knowledge of Hellenistic art, and such an approach might lead to confusion rather than clarification. Hence the