

1988

## Review of *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, vol. 3 (Atherion-Éros)

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. 1988. Review of *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, vol. 3 (Atherion-Eros). *American Journal of Archaeology* 92:138-139.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. [http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch\\_pubs/54](http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/54)

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

nal publications, resulting in no consistent graphic style or scale. In many, a compass indication is lacking, and in some cases, the scale of reproduction renders details invisible. Nevertheless, the plans provide an invaluable assistance in following both catalogue and text. The 180 plates, thematically grouped at the end of the volume, are of generally good quality.

A second appendix contains eight presence-absence charts, three of which summarize the associations of different sanctuary types and material types by period, while the remaining five present the types of objects associated with bench sanctuaries, pillar crypts, and lustral basins. I would have preferred that the author refer to these charts more frequently, as they succinctly abstract information that takes up much description in the text.

The dissertation on which this volume is based was originally submitted in 1972. Expansion and updating were undertaken twice before the press date of 1983 (p. xx). As a result, most recent evidence has been taken into account, or is at least mentioned. While the volume *Sanctuaries and Cults in the Aegean Bronze Age* (Stockholm 1981) is referred to (p. xix), it is surprising that the author has not made more use of it, particularly Hiller's long article summarizing the Linear B evidence for sanctuaries, relevant to Postpalatial Crete.

Discussions of Minoan cult can lose sight of the raw archaeological data for places where cult activity is likely to have taken place. This book presents that raw data for domestic cult, going back as far as is possible to original contexts, and requiring (p. 2) that "distinctive architecture and cult objects both are necessary" to identify a cult area. At times, however, the identification of a cult area is made more on the basis of previous interpretations than on secure archaeological criteria, for example, in the case of the so-called lustral basin. The author accepts the view that these are cult areas without offering proof securely based on archaeological evidence. Thus, to judge from the chart (p. 149) which summarizes finds from lustral basins, only that at Zakro (Room XXIV) appears to have a range of cult objects. Yet a glance at the catalogue (p. 137) shows that all these objects had in fact fallen from an upper story. Fortunately, the extensive catalogue and detailed description contained in the text allow the reader to make up his or her own mind about a particular identification. These features ensure that this book will be valuable as a starting-point for studies of Minoan settlement sanctuaries, and I hope the data presented will be reviewed in the light of Renfrew's recent discussion of approaches to the identification of cult areas (*The Archaeology of Cult: The Sanctuary at Phylakopi* [BSA Suppl. 18, 1985] 11–26).

JOHN BENNET

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS  
VAN HISE HALL  
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON  
MADISON, WISCONSIN 53706

LEXICON ICONOGRAPHICUM MYTHOLOGIAE CLASSICAE  
(LIMC) III. (ATHERION-EROS). Text and plates  
bound separately. Text: pp. xxvii + 1086, figs. 218;

Plates: pp. 826, pls. 741. Artemis-Verlag, Zurich  
and Munich 1986. DM 2100

Only two years after the appearance of *LIMC* II, *LIMC* III has joined it on the library shelf. In the meantime, both previous volumes have received strongly positive reviews in the scholarly literature, and the future of this Herculean international feat seems assured, especially with the financial contribution of the J. Paul Getty Trust which is here acknowledged for the first time. The publishing house has also agreed to maintain the original level of quality and price, for which one must be grateful, despite the considerable expense each issue represents for currently strained institutional budgets. With their wealth of information, bibliography and plates, these volumes are still bargains, as one realizes when trying to obtain museum photographs for personal publications; moreover, the encyclopaedic character of the work begins to be reflected in published articles, where reference to a *LIMC* plate often eliminates the need for illustrations. Even famous and frequently reproduced pieces can be conveniently cited from the single source, and are as useful as the many unpublished or little known items included in the various entries. At the administrative level, the presidency of the *Conseil* has shifted from N. Yalouris to J. Pouilloux, but the life and soul of the enterprise continues to be the indefatigable Lilly Kahil, who still amazingly finds time to teach, travel, lecture, and contribute entries to each issue.

At the scholarly level, it is surprising to note that each volume of the *LIMC* so far has had a character of its own. M. Robertson commented that, if the first concentrated on heroes, the second was primarily on major divinities (*JHS* 106 [1986] 259). The third is a mixed bag, with many short entries on personifications, river gods, Satyrs' and Maenads' names, obscure heroes, and mythological beings. There is also, however, a lengthy treatment of a major deity, Dionysos (pp. 414–514, by C. Gasparri and A. Veneri), with his ramifications in *peripheria orientali*, in Etruria (FU-FLUNS, by M. Cristofani) and in the Roman world (DIONYSOS/BACCCHUS, pp. 540–66, also by Gasparri), for a total of 160 plates—and still the entry on Bacchus in *peripheria orientali* is promised for the next volume! Equally lengthy is the treatment of EROS/AMOR/CUPIDO (pp. 850–1049, pls. 609–727), with Eros in Etruria left for *LIMC* IV. Other major figures considered are Attis, Diomedes, the Charites (by E.B. Harrison), the Dioskouroi (but not yet Demeter). A section of *Addenda* (pp. 1050–86) includes ARIADNE/ARIATHA, ASTARTE, BAGRADAS, with APHRODITE/VENUS postponed for a future volume (s.v. VENUS).

As in previous issues, one may note here a certain amount of bibliographical and scholarly unevenness, some discrepancies in format, some overlaps in entries, and even some contradictions, as well as healthy differences of opinion. P.E. Arias, for instance, includes the Delphic kouroi under BITON ET KLEOBIS, while A. Hermary likes them as the DIOSKOUROI and reopens the issue on the identification of the Sounion kouroi. Other cases are more complex and occasionally even puzzling, at the present state of our knowledge—e.g., the discussion of the Dionysos from the

West pediment of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi as if it were an independent head with replicas (no. 205, "from the Dionysion" [?]), while the pedimental composition itself (no. 489) is listed under "raffigurazioni perdute." On the other hand, that same article is remarkably up-to-date in including the latest readings of the Siphnian Treasury friezes (no. 651, correctly paired with Themis), which are ignored in the entry on Eos. Other remarkable examples of "latest information" are the depiction of BRITANNIA on the panel from the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias, and the *Nachtrag* to CHARU(N) on the Tomb of the Blue Devils found in 1986. Given this meticulous updating, it is tempting to cite here two additions: an Albanian Hellenistic gravestone (*RA* 1986, 136–37, fig. 20) showing the deceased descending a ladder from the world of the living into Charon's boat (especially since the latter seems to appear on only one other stele, where it is therefore questioned: CHARON I, no. 57); and a representation of the Punishment of Dirke on the cuirass of a late-Republican marble statue found recently on Naxos. Much more uncertain but perhaps worth mentioning is a possible identification of the so-called Porticello Philosopher as Cheiron, which has just appeared in print (DAI Athens, *Archaische und klassische griechische Plastik II*).

As usual, it is difficult to comment in detail on the many and varied entries, which chronologically may range from possible Mycenaean prototypes (a gold ring from the Agora, for the dancing CHARITES; the Kea terracotta statues for the dancing ARIADNE), to Hittite rock reliefs and Lycian late-Roman votive monuments (DODEKATHEOI, 2, 65), to Coptic textiles and manuscript illustrations (e.g., EROS *in per. or.* 84, CHEIRON 75). Specific points therefore inevitably reflect personal interests and biases. Of special significance seems to me the fact that several mythological personages or episodes occur exclusively in vase painting or in the minor arts, never in sculpture (e.g., the encounter of Herakles and Busiris). A Classical Diomedes in the round is preserved only in marble replicas of a type that has been restored as holding the Palladion (38); but are the grounds for the restoration any stronger than the stylistic ones given for the attribution to Kresilas? The rendering would precede by at least 300 years the very different marble statue in Athens (58) which, it should be mentioned, is unfinished and therefore difficult to date, probably later than the suggested second/first century B.C. The Sperlonga group (79) is the next extant (and variant) example ("early first century B.C."); other single statues admittedly could be Odysseus. The popularity of Diomedes and of the "Theft of the Palladion" theme on Italic soil is emphasized.

F. Heger, who contributed the entry on Dirke, is preparing a monograph on the subject. He maintains that the Toro Farnese (7) is the very group mentioned by Pliny (1), an original made on Rhodes ca. 160–150 B.C., probably in honor of the two royal brothers of Pergamon, Eumenes II and Attalos II, who would be symbolized in the guise of Zethos and Amphion; Antiope would allude to their mother Apollonis, the bull to Dionysos, and Dirke to Galatia. The total monument, for which a bronze original in Pergamon is therefore postulated, would then be an allegory of the Attalid victory over the Gauls. That such a Hellenistic original

would survive and be the proper size for inclusion into the Baths of Caracalla seems, on present evidence, somewhat improbable.

Among the other interesting theories, mention should be made of H. Gabelmann's suggestion that all statues in the round of the sleeping Endymion are second-century Imperial creations, rather than copies of Hellenistic prototypes. A. Hermary doubts the funerary significance usually attributed to the Greek EROS; thus even the meaning of the Roman AMOR "funéraire" is questioned (N. Blanc/F. Gury, p. 1047). The innumerable representations of this popular deity are classified according to a variety of criteria, but I emerge with a rather unclear picture of development; I am still doubtful about the proper assessment of the Eros Soranzo (77), the "Praxitelean" types (78–85), and even the Ly-sippan archer (352–354 with significant comments). As is also the case for Dionysos (and clearly emphasized by the sequence of photographs), many of the extant marble types seem Classicizing decorative works made for a Roman clientele. In both the DIONYSOS and the EROS entries, I miss references to the Hellenistic friezes with Bacchic thiasoi, e.g., at Knidos, Kos, Teos. The connection of Daidalos/Ikaros with Ephesos, as attested by a literary source and an inscribed Roman base, should be mentioned. For Eos at the fight between Achilles and Memnon, I wonder at the omission of the relief from the Artemision at Corfu, which would provide the only known example outside vase painting (except for the Chest of Kypselos and, more remotely, the Siphnian Treasury). In reviewing representations of ATTIS, I am struck by the difficulty of distinguishing some types from depictions of Paris, Hermaphrodite, Ganymede, even Orpheus, Perseus, Mithras, especially in the case of single heads, where the only attribute is the Oriental cap; even full figures such as no. 9 (in Seville) seem hardly different from the servant found in the Belevi Mausoleum, and it is clear that provenience and context may be as essential as iconography in determining identity.

We have only begun to tap the surface of the great mine of information provided by each *LIMC* volume. All readers shall again find rich and rewarding veins within each entry of the present issue, to be explored according to individual needs and wishes.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

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

DIONYSIAN IMAGERY IN ARCHAIC GREEK ART: ITS DEVELOPMENT IN BLACK-FIGURE VASE PAINTING, by *T.H. Carpenter*. (Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology.) Pp. 143, pls. 32. Oxford University Press, Oxford 1986.

This book makes a welcome contribution to the recent trend toward examining the iconography of Greek vase painting as an independent source of information rather than an illustration of literature. Carpenter uses the paintings to argue that ideas of Dionysos in sixth-century Athens