

**Bryn Mawr College**  
**Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr**  
**College**

---

Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology Faculty  
Research and Scholarship

Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology

---

1983

*Review of Caryatid Mirrors of Ancient Greece:  
Technical, Stylistic and Historical Considerations of an  
Archaic and Early Classical Bronze Series*, by Lenore  
O. Keene Congdon

Brunilde S. Ridgway  
Bryn Mawr College, [bridgway@brynmawr.edu](mailto:bridgway@brynmawr.edu)

[Let us know how access to this document benefits you.](#)

Follow this and additional works at: [http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch\\_pubs](http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs)

 Part of the [Classical Archaeology and Art History Commons](#), and the [History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons](#)

---

#### Custom Citation

Ridgway, Brunilde S. 1983. Review of *Caryatid Mirrors of Ancient Greece: Technical, Stylistic and Historical Considerations of an Archaic and Early Classical Bronze Series*, by Lenore O. Keene Congdon. *American Journal of Archaeology* 87:279-281.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. [http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch\\_pubs/23](http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/23)

For more information, please contact [repository@brynmawr.edu](mailto:repository@brynmawr.edu).



---

Caryatid Mirrors of Ancient Greece. Technical, Stylistic and Historical Considerations of an Archaic and Early Classical Bronze Series by Lenore O. Keene Congdon

Review by: Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway

*American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. 87, No. 2 (Apr., 1983), pp. 279-281

Published by: [Archaeological Institute of America](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/504947>

Accessed: 07/02/2012 16:55

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Archaeological Institute of America is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Journal of Archaeology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

*graphy*? To qualify as useful to the latter group, a site report should be written clearly, organized logically, illustrated well, and should contain aids to help the reader summarize and relate various facets of the report to one another. Volume 3 scores positively in all regards, yet the nature of the subject matter and of the excavation itself is such that only the most resolute reader will attempt to digest the more than 500 pages of text and nearly 350 photographic details and line drawings of plans and sections. Problems of comprehension are exacerbated by the unusual number of archaeological findspots (phases) and by the number of separate trenches (sites) and squares. An index (Appendix D) requires 17½ double-column pages to list the nearly 1800 stages and phases that are described separately in the text. In this listing, as in the text, the phases of each trench are treated separately so that, for example, to find the information on strata containing Early Bronze Age material requires looking at the relevant sections of 7 text chapters, each of which deals with the strata in a trench or set of squares. Overall summaries of the EBA and other periods are reserved for the final volume.

Owing to the long period of production, during which time many persons were involved in drafting the many complicated plans and sections, there are some inconsistencies and inaccuracies in presentation which have been corrected by the editor in captions to save the time and expense of redrafting. The result is wholly satisfactory for the serious reader who will, nevertheless, have to look closely at the small-scale sections.

The volume contains two reports by specialists, Appendix A, by I.W. Cornwall on "The Pre-Pottery Neolithic Burials," and Appendix B, by G. Kurth and D. Rohrer-Ertl, "On the Anthropology of the Mesolithic to Chalcolithic Human Remains." Appendix C, "Radiocarbon Dates," was assembled by R. Burleigh. The text and plates are printed separately, a format that makes it possible to refer to the figures at the same time as one is reading the relevant text sections.

In recent archaeological literature, considerable space is often given to the rationale—the historical problem or theoretical interest—for the excavation. A similar space is often devoted to a discussion of the relation between the methods used and the salient research problems. There is none of this here. Kenyon gives 5 pages of background on previous excavations and a few sentences on what she wanted to find. Rarely in a technical discussion of a phase does she refer to methods, and then only to explain a deviation from custom. To Kenyon it was self-evident why one wanted to dig Jericho and, as for her methods, these had been exposed in her text, *Beginning in Archaeology*.

One must bear in mind that volume 3 is strictly focussed on architecture and stratigraphy, although it was originally planned to include the artifacts. Thus, the discussion is unenlivened by descriptions of the artifacts found amongst the strata and bricks, and still less by any interpretation of functional matters that might be inferred from the artifacts. Nor

is one treated to an up-to-date consideration of some of the controversies that have heated the literature in years past, such as the urban status of early Jericho, or the role of agriculture and irrigation in the founding of the settlement. For an overview of the way in which various parts of the site relate to one another and to the history of the region, one should refer to the many previous, shorter publications and the popular books, *Digging Up Jericho* and *Archaeology in the Holy Land*.

At the time of the project, Kenyon was at the forefront of excavation archaeology, as exemplified by her careful stratigraphic exposures through the depth of the mound, designed to answer specific questions about the succession of events at the site. Her methods, themselves derived from those of Sir Mortimer Wheeler, continue to be emulated around the world, but she herself was mindful as she wrote the text of still newer techniques and she lamented, for example, that flotation had not been invented in the 1950s. She defended not sieving all the soil on the ground that she would never have reached the bottom. She is right on both scores—much more might have been recovered by more meticulous methods, but then we might not know the singular importance of this site for the early Neolithic. There is sufficient material left for another excavation; we may hope that an equally astute field technician will one day resume the job where Kenyon left off.

FRANK HOLE

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY  
YALE UNIVERSITY  
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT 06520

CARYATID MIRRORS OF ANCIENT GREECE. TECHNICAL, STYLISTIC AND HISTORICAL CONSIDERATIONS OF AN ARCHAIC AND EARLY CLASSICAL BRONZE SERIES, by *Lenore O. Keene Congdon*. Pp. xiv + 288, 264 photographs in 97 pls., figs. 29, tables 5, map 1. Philipp von Zabern, Mainz 1981. DM 390.

Congdon's book, announced several years ago as forthcoming, has been a long time in the making. Completed as a Harvard dissertation in 1963, the text was expanded and revised by 1968, but the process of updating and reorganization continued until 1976, when the final list of mirrors and the bibliography were set in galley proof. The Preface bears a closing date of March 1977, and copies of the book began to reach libraries late in 1981. This belabored genesis bespeaks the great love of the subject which sustained the author through such prolonged gestation, but it also explains defects in the final product.

Congdon has catalogued all the caryatid mirrors that she can confidently assign to Greece proper or to East Greece. Nos. 1–109 are supported by female figures, 110–13 by male; 114–19 are related to the main series but could belong to Magna Graecian workshops (and in fact many of them recur in the briefer descriptions of Western mirrors which

follow the catalogue proper); 120–34 are miscellaneous figurines at some time identified as mirror caryatids but considered questionable. Appendix I-H lists 18 items which could originally have been accessories to mirrors, e.g., flying Erotes and small animals. Efforts have been made to include objects in private collections and mirrors now lost or of unknown location; the author pleads to be informed of possible addenda. The main items in the Catalogue (nos. 1–119) are illustrated almost without exception, often in more than one view and in excellent halftones, even when the quality of the obtainable photographs leaves much to be desired.

Although catalogue entries are usually extensive, the section preceding the Catalogue occupies almost half the volume. The mirrors are reviewed in terms of their possible origin (Egypt); the meaning of the caryatids (goddesses, possibly Aphrodite, and/or temple attendants and musicians); the nature and development of the component parts (e.g., base, cradle, brace, disc); techniques; areas of manufacture and distribution; and chronology. The caryatids themselves are considered the most significant diagnostic element, especially since, as the author stresses, detachable parts have often been combined by dealers with non-pertinent mirrors to form new “wholes.”

Most informative and authoritative is the section on techniques, based on the author’s personal experimentation. The variety of casting methods exemplified by the component parts of a caryatid mirror would support Congdon’s assertion that these are products of high quality which required considerable individual attention. Her suggestion that discs were “water-cast” by pouring melted wax into heated water introduces a new technique accounting for the slight convexity of some surfaces hardly obtainable by manual processes. Although some comments on steel production in antiquity may have to be revised in light of more recent discoveries, this part of Congdon’s study may prove of enduring value.

Regional and chronological attributions seem less permanent. Little objective evidence exists, and stylistic assessment will not meet with general agreement. A virtually simultaneous publication, R. Tölle-Kastenbein’s *Frühklassische Peplosfiguren I* (= *FKP I*, 1981; see review, *AJA* 86 [1982] 139–40), although not specifically concerned with mirrors, includes 61 items also catalogued by Congdon; yet regional attributions coincide in only 3 cases. If *FKP I* has the advantage of placing mirror caryatids within the larger context of contemporary bronzes, Congdon can, to some extent, corroborate her stylistic analysis through typological study of accessories. Yet her drawings charting the evolution of motifs and shapes of component parts, although potentially helpful, may not be reliable: cf., e.g., p. 93, fig. 15, drawing of no. 60, with pls. 54–55; or fig. 15 no. 87 with pl. 82. Not only are contours simplified or altered, but relative proportions are not respected. As for stylistic comparisons

with works of major sculpture, Congdon still dates the Idolino ca. 420 B.C. (p. 104) and, despite her female repertoire, often draws her parallels from Richter’s *Kouroi*.

Drapery is not fully exploited for chronological clues, perhaps because Congdon’s treatment of costume is ambivalent. In her Appendix on dress (I-A, p. 107), she draws only three variant forms for the Ionic and two for the Doric costume, and on p. 7 explains the differences between peplos and Doric chiton only in n. 3. But the various entries allow for greater complexity, and items such as a poncho-like short garment (no. 7A), “a thin shawl formed of two semi-circular pieces” (no. 21), and a long diagonal himation (e.g., no. 27) are mentioned. This reviewer does not always agree with Congdon’s interpretations of the attire, but admittedly these caryatids are often more idiosyncratically dressed than any of their larger marble sisters and deserve more study from the specific point of view of Greek dress. Nos. 37 and 71 are considered archaic and dated between 480 and 450; but an elaborate peplophoros-mirror in Copenhagen (no. 93) is accepted as belonging to the third quarter of the fifth century. I would agree with *FKP I* (pp. 43–44) that it is an Augustan imitation of a classical prototype.

According to Congdon’s classification, caryatid mirrors begin ca. 620 with a remarkable series of naked female supports which persist into the fifth century. Although few mirrors were made before 550, the appearance of the “Standing Ionic” caryatid at that time quickens the tempo, with peaks of production toward the end of the century. New impetus is given around 490 by the introduction of the “Standing Doric” type, but manufacture decreases after 450, with only one example assigned to 425–400 or later. Of regional workshops, the Laconian is the earliest and lasts longest (until ca. 480), followed by the more sporadic production of the Eastern Greek (ca. 550–450); Corinthian mirrors fall between 540 and 520, and a gap separates them from a group of Peloponnesian caryatids of tentative attribution (“Argive”; “Sikyonian”; “Argo-Corinthian” and “Corinthian”) which may have been spearheaded by Argos. Only two Caryatids are assigned to the “Attic” group, and two more are considered related (contrast *FKP I* and its emphasis on Attic workshops). This highly complex picture would be of great significance if regional attributions inspired more confidence; Congdon herself admits that some of her caryatids could be Magna Graecian; see, e.g., nos. 86 and 88.

The book has suffered from the lack of an English-speaking editor, and contains an unusual number (for von Zabern) of typographical errors. Nos. 56–57, of unknown location, are Athens N.M. 14618 and 7622 respectively (*FKP I*, nos. 26b and 26c). Congdon is extremely fair in presenting her evidence and has provided numerous tables, indices and cross-references; the amount of work expended in her study must have been staggering. That her conclusions may be challenged does not detract from the value of having a clearly established terminology for the various mirror parts, and

a careful technical discussion. The photographic documentation assembled by the author is impressive and her corpus of mirrors will form the core of all future research.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL AND NEAR EASTERN  
ARCHAEOLOGY  
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE  
BRYN MAWR, PENNSYLVANIA 19010

INSCRIFTEN AUF KORINTHISCHEN VASEN. ARCHÄOLOGISCH-EPIGRAPHISCHE UNTERSUCHUNGEN ZUR KORINTHISCHEN VASENMALEREI IM 7 UND 6 JH. v. CHR., by *Fritz Lorber*. (Deutsches Archäologisches Institut. Archäologische Forschungen 6.) Pp. x + 138, figs. 59, pls. 46. Gebr. Mann Verlag, Berlin 1979. DM 130.

Humfry Payne, *NC* (1931), lists 75 Corinthian inscriptions on vases, none on pinakes or metopes, but he does use the latter as comparanda. R. Arena, "Le iscrizioni corinzie su vasi" (1967) lists 96 inscriptions on vases and none on pinakes and metopes. His curtailment of evidence is odd in view of his aim, which is a philological commentary. Lorber's collection numbers 154 inscriptions, most of them, in accordance with his title, on Corinthian vases, but including also selected pinakes and metopes. His wider selection is welcome for itself and useful for the principal theme of his investigation—letter shapes and lettering styles.

Lorber, in a catalogue, gives full descriptions of vases and inscriptions. In a concluding essay he expresses faith in the efficacy of a chronology based on shapes and dispositions of letters. The essay also includes notes on spelling errors, use of non-Corinthian letters, the genitive case, the article, painters' signatures (5, representing 3 painters) and figures from saga. At the end, he compares painting styles with lettering styles. Indexes follow, listing proper names, other words, uncertain readings, nonsense inscriptions, alphabets (three) and non-Corinthian names. The plates are of good quality.

Besides pinakes and metopes, Lorber includes much other interesting and valuable material that appears in neither Payne nor Arena, e.g., nos. 4, 5, 6, 33, 47, 48, 49, 50, 57, 58, 59, 60, 67, 68, 82, 95, 96, 98, 99, 112, 128, 131, 132, 133, 134, 136, 146, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 154. Regrettably, more than half the total number of inscriptions appear without facsimiles, and of those that Lorber does present, 55 are drawn from others' photographs or published drawings, not from autopsy. Consequently when Lorber makes some fine observation concerning the thickness of a brush stroke or the cursiveness of a letter, a reader often has no immediate way of seeing what he means. For the same reason, his persistent criticism of the quality of Arena's facsimiles does not carry the weight it might. Furthermore, notions like "Ausgewogenheit" and "Gleichmäs-

sigkeit," confidently invoked as canons, are left floating, without referents. It is an especially serious lack in a study of this nature that there are no charts or schematic representations of letter forms as postulated for different eras.

The following notes on particular items are offered as an addition to those of A.W. Johnston in *JHS* 101 (1981) 223–24. No. 2: Two of the 3 sherds presented here, those labelled (a) and (b), originally belonged to a single pot and presumably to the same inscription. The sherd labelled (c) is from a different pot and preserves part of a different inscription. It ought therefore to have a number of its own. As for date, K. De Vries advises me (*per litt.*) that all 3 pieces, found with abundant and comparatively homogeneous contextual pottery, belong to a time bounded by Early Protocorinthian (ca. 720–690) and Middle Protocorinthian (690–675). No. 4: The printed text does not represent all vestiges of letters shown in the facsimile. No. 5: Add that the inscription is a graffito. No. 39: Among dubious instances of O = OY in early Corinthian orthography, Lorber offers *ηρακλεος* without noting that he may be creating thereby an anomalous intrusion of Attic spelling. For the Doric genitive of "Herakles," see, e.g., LSJ<sup>9</sup> s.v. Of more moment, Lorber elects (improbably) to believe that *IG I<sup>2</sup> 927* might be Megarian. He thus disembarasses his theorizing of refractory data and can proceed, answerable only to the accuracy of his own observations (of photographs and drawings, let it be remembered) and his own requirements for internal consistency. Small wonder then that in his "Vorbemerkung" (p. 1) he can speak optimistically of applying his findings to "... den *bisher* schwer datierbaren archaischen Stein- und Metallinschriften. . ." (my italics). No. 40: From my own examinations of this vessel, I note that no. 40.2 may possibly be read ΣΟ[ΣΙ]ΘΕΟΣ, and that the middle letter of Troilos may be a square digamma written backwards (◻). No. 82: Zeta, clear in the facsimile, has dropped out of the printed text of the alphabet. Identification of the last two letters is provisional. The middle letter of Troilos seems to me (again on personal inspection) to be a square digamma (◻). Digamma in the alphabet on the same aryballos is formed differently (Ϝ) but that sort of inconsistency is not without precedents. No. 121: A printed text showing some six names has been unaccountably omitted here. Sarpedon et al. of this inscription are accordingly absent from the index.

Some missing items (again supplementing Johnston) are: *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 584, no. 63, fig. 1; *REA* 49 (1947) 36; *SEG* 11.157, 196, 197, 200, 229; 16.237; 22.208; 25.343–45.

Although students may well be wary of using Lorber's constructions to date Corinthian inscriptions, it is good to have this handsome, well printed collection of material that is not in its entirety otherwise easy of access.

ALAN L. BOEGEHOLD

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS  
BROWN UNIVERSITY  
PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND 02912