

1990

## Review of *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, vol. 4 (Eros-Herakles)

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. 1990. Review of *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, vol. 4 (Eros-Herakles). *American Journal of Archaeology* 94:504-505.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. [http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch\\_pubs/43](http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/43)

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

Over 60 m long and with fine mosaic floors (*Albanien* 127, fig. 85), this building was set on fire during the battle between Alexius I Comnenus and the Norman Robert Guiscard on 18 October 1081.

Much effort has been devoted to the origins and development of the major native settlements during the pre-Roman period. The results of this work are summarized by Selim Islami in the Clermont-Ferrand volume (65–69). A dry-stone wall enclosing ca. 4.5 ha at Gajtan near Shkodra is seen to represent a “pre-” or “proto-” urban settlement already established in the fifth century. Similar enclosures are known at more than two dozen places, mainly in northern and central Albania but also around the Korça basin. The move from this stage to a true urban center is dated in the South, notably at sites around the lower Aous (Vijosë) valley to the fifth century. In the North the growth of Illyrian “cities” at Lissus (Lezha), Shkodra, and Antipatreia (Berat) is dated to after the middle of the fourth century. Selca e Poshtëme in the upper Shkumbi valley has been identified as Pelion in Dassaretia, a fortified stronghold well placed for attacking Macedonia, which figures in Alexander’s Illyrian campaign (Arrian 1.5.5). This is the location of the princely tombs, cut into the rock behind facades of Classical architecture (*Albanien* 51–57), which some have compared with the contemporary Macedonian burials at Vergina. The early third century B.C., when the Epirus of King Pyrrhus dominated the region, witnessed dramatic development in some of the older Illyrian settlements. The Bylliones moved their town to a nearby but more commodious hill location where it expanded to cover ca. 40 ha (*Albanien* 74–79). Elsewhere defenses were refurbished in dressed and coursed masonry, with ditches and gates designed for the new techniques of siege warfare. Several places away from the coast acquired the character of cities, with public buildings and amenities, in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. The suggestion that this was due to a relatively independent advance to urbanization on the part of the Illyrians—rather than cities being a mainly Hellenistic implantation—rests on the question of conditions in the fifth and early fourth centuries. So far no remains of permanent structures or the like have come to light to disprove the view that many of the early enclosures were refuges for shepherds or the populations of nearby villages. While not overlooking the value of prompt summaries and interim reports, we still look to our Albanian colleagues for fully documented excavation reports, with plans, photographs, and analyses of stratified deposits (as we now have for the settlement of the Illyrian Daorsi at Osanići near Stolac in Hercegovina by Z. Marić in the *Glasnik* of the Sarajevo Museum 30/31 [1977] 5–99).

The continuity from Illyrians under Roman and Byzantine rule to the Mediaeval Arbër is the subject of a contribution to the Hildesheim volume by Skender Anamali (148–55). The hypothesis rests on an interpretation of the Komani-Kruja culture which is represented by the contents of around 25 burial grounds in central and northern Albania (see the map in *Albanien* 122). Dated to the seventh and eighth centuries, these inhumations, some with grave goods of Byzantine origin along with local imitations, are held to represent the indigenous Illyrian population that, having been freed from imperial rule represented by the coastal cities, were destined to become the Albanian speakers of the

early Ottoman period. According to this Illyrian hypothesis the Byzantine belt-buckles and jewelry amount to no more than a reception of “external” manufactures. Yet a series of detailed studies by V. Popović (e.g., in Garašanin, *op. cit.* 269–83) leaves it a near certainty that the Komani burials represent a Romanized population surviving in the former province Epirus Nova—in effect the ancient Greek Illyris—and hemmed in on all sides by new Slav settlements, and where in the ninth century was to be established the Theme of Dyrrachium. As with prehistory so with the Middle Ages; the hypotheses forced upon the archaeological record appear devised to sustain simplistic ideas of a national continuity and identity and do little justice to the real achievements of an outstanding generation of Albanian archaeologists.

J.J. WILKES

INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE  
LONDON WC1H 0PY  
ENGLAND

LEXIKON ICONOGRAPHICUM MYTHOLOGIAE CLASSICAE IV (Eros–Herakles). Vol. I: Pp. xxix + 951, with 222 line drawings in text; Vol. II: Pp. 716, pls. 630 (3660 photographs). Artemis, Zurich, and Munich 1988.

The volumes of the *LIMC* are now appearing with remarkable regularity, every two years, despite the enormous effort this schedule must involve, and they have become the established source of iconographic information and reference within the scholarly world. The number of contributing nations is still increasing, this time with the addition of Egypt—a fitting tribute and undoubtedly a source of personal satisfaction to the moving spirit of the enterprise, Prof. Lilly Kahil. Two previous volumes (II and III) have received special prizes bestowed by the French Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres (the Gustave Mendel and the Le Fèvre Deumier de Pons prize respectively), and the volume currently under review is bound to be a serious contender as well. As on previous occasions, I shall limit myself to pointing out its main features, since it is impossible to provide an in-depth review of its many entries within the brief compass of this assignment.

The alphabetical range “Eros–Herakles” of the title is somewhat misleading, since “Eros” appears only as a supplement to the treatment in the previous issue, as “Eros in Etruria.” As for “Herakles,” of the 12 sections outlined in the Plan of the Catalogue, only three are covered here, and the rest will be published in Vol. V. Thus all his Labors are missing, his expeditions, his principal adversaries and companions, and other mythological events connected with his mature life and death. Here we see only the hero’s early years and his main iconographic types in isolation. By way of compensation, the Addenda are numerous and important: “Cernunnos,” “Demeter,” “Ceres,” “Bacchus (in periphéria occidentali),” and “Erechtheus” (which includes “Erichthonios”). Even one subject treated in full within the main text, “Helene,” has one more example cited on the last page (951): a remarkable marble egg with the heroine carved

within, from a Metapontine tomb of ca. 400 B.C., discussed for the first time by M. Torelli in a newspaper article as recent as 16 July 1988! The find is connected with Orphic beliefs and practices so popular in Magna Graecia and therefore carries more than purely iconographic significance.

Major divinities treated in this volume comprise Hades/Pluto, Hera and Hephaistos, although Iuno/Uni and Vulcan are postponed to a later issue. Hekate and Helios are also in the future, although Helios/Sol is included here. Some non-Greek divinities can also be considered major: Eshmoun, Harpokrates, Hathor, and the Heliopolitani Dei, with their peculiar iconography. Of the minor divinities, Ganymedes and Hebe, Ge and Eubouleus should be mentioned. Among the more intriguing entries are those on "Fluvii" and "Fons," as general categories, although individual accounts on specific rivers are also given throughout the opus. There is the usual sprinkling of satyrs', Maenads', and Nereids' names, and obscure Homeric heroes, especially if they appear in the visual record, but I am more intrigued by two entries ("Eunostos," and "Glaukos III"), for which no catalogue is provided. Their existence is purely literary, and one marvels at the completeness achieved by the *LIMC* editors.

Two lengthy treatments cover "Gigantes" and "Gorgo, Gorgones." The first provides also a list of Giants' names, with an asterisk following those iconographically attested. Most of the major Archaic and Classical monuments are included, often with line drawings for architectural sculpture. The topic seems to drop off in sculpture during the fourth century, to pick up again, albeit sparingly, during the Hellenistic period, but since vases appear to close the gap, the latter is not immediately obvious. It is regrettable that the commentary, in this and other cases, cannot go to greater depth or discuss at length problems of interpretation and distribution. As for the second topic, I may mention that the Medusa Rondanini appears only under "Gorgones Romanae" (no. 25) and is considered Classicizing. I am sorry that the splendid colossal head in Veria (Beroa), no. 40, was not illustrated.

This volume makes ample use of cross-references to previous entries and illustrations, in order to avoid repetition as much as possible. Collaboration is frequent and fruitful, with some authors confining their efforts to the gathering of literary sources and others concentrating on the visual material. Many nationalities are represented, with a judicious balance between established names and young contributors. The plates, as usual, are excellently reproduced and carefully laid out.

I close with a rapid-fire series of personal comments that are meant as queries and bibliographical supplements rather than as criticism. Why, for instance, couldn't the famous "Eubouleus" type be illustrated even if its identification is uncertain (cf. no. 3, s.v.)? Is there any true basis (besides Pliny's vague description) for considering the Antonine group of Ganymede and the Eagle in the Vatican (no. 251) still the closest rendering of Leochares' original? Why are the Lokroi *pinakes* included as representations of Hades and Persephone, but not the very similar plaques from Franca-villa in Sicily? The entry on Gorgons takes into account S. Stucchi's comments in *Divagazioni archeologiche* 1, but they are ignored in the description of the Corfu pediment under "Gigantes." This latter entry also attributes to J.C. Carter a

third-century date for the coffers of the Athenaion at Priene (no. 26), although I had understood him to believe that they were by the same workshop active at the Halikarnassos Maus-solleion. The entry on "Geryoneus" should be supplemented by a reference to the article by B. Kilerich, *OpAth* 17 (1988) 123–36, who believes that the so-called Bluebeard from the Athenian Hekatompedon can only be the one famous three-bodied character in Greek mythology. It would be helpful to have Lilly Kahil's expert opinion, s.v. "Helene," on whether the Archaic terracotta plaques from near Sparta can truly show the return (or the kidnapping) of the heroine, as part of the metopal decoration of a local shrine: G. Steinhauer, *ASAtene* 60 n.s. 44:2 (1982) 329–40. I would be more inclined to read them as individual votive *pinakes*, comparable to the Lakonian Hero reliefs, especially given their relative thinness, the apparent purity of their clay, and the lack of decorated metopes elsewhere in the Peloponnesos at that time. Finally, could the so-called Pseudo-Seneca Type (the Old Fisherman) be a depiction of "Glaukos I," the Old Man of the Sea? And can one ask L. Beschi, who originally published them, why he did not include the faceless busts from Cyrene in his entry on Demeter, even if these are among the uncertain representations?

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

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

GREEK GODS AND FIGURINES. ASPECTS OF THE ANTHROPOMORPHIC DEDICATIONS, by Brita Alroth. (*Boreas*. Uppsala Studies in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Civilization 18.) Pp. 120, figs. 60, tables 20. Uppsala 1989.

Alroth is a recent recipient of the Ph.D. from Uppsala University. This slim volume is her dissertation, published (if I understand the accompanying blurb correctly) in advance of its defense. She poses two problems for herself: whether the appearance of votive figurines may be influenced by the cult image of the sanctuary in which they are dedicated, and whether a figurine of one god may be dedicated to ("visit") another god. In both cases she responds with a qualified "maybe."

Alroth notes that she has examined the figurines from more than 50 sanctuaries (p. 18). The study, however, is restricted to the anthropomorphic figurines (chiefly of the Archaic and Classical periods) from some 20 shrines. She seems uneasy with the incompleteness of her dossier, and repeatedly cautions that her book constitutes only a small sample of the evidence (e.g., 66, 108). She nowhere, however, offers a reasoned justification of her selection and exclusion of certain shrines.

In her attempt to isolate the influence of the cult statue on the votive figurines, Alroth encounters a predictable difficulty: there are rarely any detailed representations of Archaic cult statues; in fact, cult statues are often reconstructed on the basis of the votive figurines. She has little new to say about this problem, yet nevertheless devotes a