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ing suggestion that it occurs with the transformation of the Kabeirion to the site of a mystery cult instituted by the Athenian Methaplos (Paus. 4.1.7).

**Susan Helen Langdon**

**American School of Classical Studies**

54 Odos Soudias

Athens 140, Greece

**From Athens to Gordian: The Papers of a Memorial Symposium for Rodney S. Young** (Held at the University Museum the third of May, 1975), edited by Keith DeVries. (University Museum Papers 1.) Pp. xix + 168, frontispiece, figs. 144 (photos, plans, line drawings). The University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 1980. $17.50.

The nine papers presented in this volume together express a coherency that is evident only in light of the many interests and achievements of Rodney Young: from Athens, where his impressive career began, to Gordian, where a quarter century’s involvement preceded its end. A profile and bibliography place his record of accomplishments in perspective, while an introduction by Margaret Thompson adds a series of personal observations on Young’s life and character.

Two papers recall pre-Gordian years. In “The Tomb of Clytemnestra Revisited,” Homer Thompson draws upon the evidence of a later hero cult in the dromos to make the provocative suggestion that the fluted half columns of the monument’s façade may have been visible as a source of inspiration for the Doric column. Eugene Vanderpool argues persuasively and effectively that a sizable complex initially cleared by Young to the northwest of the Areopagus was “The State Prison of Ancient Athens.”

Gordion provides the direction for no fewer than four papers. In considering “Greeks and Phrygians in the Early Iron Age,” Keith DeVries uses the rich archaeological evidence from the site to present a revealing portrait of life in the time of Midas. Correspondences with Homeric society indicate that certain attitudes and values displayed by the heroes saw currency at least in Phrygia ca. 700 B.C. Hans Guterbock employs second millennium seals from Gordion to initiate an informative survey of “Seals and Sealing in Hittite Lands.” A review of types precedes investigation of the various uses and users of seals in Old Hittite and Empire times. Ellen Kohler emphasizes burial customs, wealth and external contacts as revealed by four “Cremations of the Middle Phrygian Period at Gordion.” Careful descriptions of the individual interments accompany thoughtful observations on their furnishings. Machteld Mellink shares her views on the style, content and composition of “Archaic Wall Paintings from Gordion.” The architectural context suggests to the author a sacred or cultic environment for this program of ca. 525 B.C.

Gordion is left but not forgotten in three concluding papers. “On Lydian Sardis,” by G.M.A. Hanfmann, examines various aspects of urbanism in the capital of Phrygia’s western neighbor. The study also embodies a comparison of Lydian and Phrygian attitudes toward an urban scheme. Crawford Greenewalt, Jr., exercises skillful command of the literary testimonia to elicit a picture of the variety and renown of “Lydian Textiles.” A supplement by Lawrence Majewski looks at the scant yet enticing physical evidence from an early Lydian tomb at Sardis. Prompted by the interior arrangement of Gordian’s Megaron 3, Robert Dyson, Jr., addresses “The Question of Balconies at Hasanlu” to determine whether a series of large buildings in Period IV provides a structural parallel. The possibility is justifiably dismissed in favor of a support system which anticipates later Iranian hypostyle halls.

In a “Postscript” by G. Roger Edwards, readers get a glimpse of Rodney Young’s personal approach to archaeology through excerpts of letters written from Gordian. The news in each case is the discovery of a wealthy burial, presented unemotionally and with a characteristic blend of understatement, wit and germane observation.

The papers would have appealed to Young. Each is a witness to the only kind of scholarship he could tolerate, that which employs fair and sensible use of the evidence to say something worth saying.

**Kenneth Sams**

Department of Classics

212 Murphey Hall

The University of North Carolina

Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514


It is not the policy of the AJA to review translations of earlier publications, but this Italian edition of Humfrey Payne’s seminal work on the Archaic Marble Sculpture from the Acropolis (1st ed. 1936, 2nd ed., with bibliographical additions by J.D. Beazley, 1950) has been given such an extensive Introduction by P.E. Arias as to become almost a new work in its own right. This review concentrates on this first section. Indeed, Payne’s pages need no further comment: they have stood the test of the years and remain fundamental for any study of the archaic period. The Italian translation follows the 1950 English text closely and, although one or two idiomatic expressions may have escaped understanding, Margherita Pottoni Tommasi has done a remarkably good job of rendering Payne’s sensitive and deceptively terse writing style. The plates have been reproduced from those of the 1950 edition, because the original blocks could not be found and the negatives had been de-
stroyed in the bombings of World War II. Since, however, the scale has been kept the same and the Italian book has retained, as much as possible, the format of the British, the screen is not disturbing in most cases, and the somewhat dark reproductions are good rather than just serviceable. It was a wise decision not to replace the original illustrations with new ones, since Payne’s text was written as a commentary to Mackworth-Young’s inspired photography. One more plate, with pictures of Phraskileia and of the kouroi found with her, has been added.

Arias, in his lengthy Introduction (73 pages), is trying not so much to update Payne’s contribution as to place it in its proper context within earlier and later writings on the subject, thus underscoring its significance for its own time and its continuing value. He begins with a brief account of the finding of archaic sculptures on the Akropolis and of their discoveries. He then outlines the major studies preceding Payne’s publication: by H. Lechat, G. Perrot, H. Brunn, J. Overbeck, W. Klein, W. Lermann, E. Loewy, A. Della Seta, E. Pfuhl, E. Langlotz, G. von Lücken, W. Deonna, C. Picard. The summaries stress advances and flaws, and Arias interjects many personal comments. Each author is seen against his formative background and as part of national “schools” which favored certain approaches or opinions over others; the great controversy of Ionic versus Attic predominance, now almost forgotten, looms large in these early studies.

Payne’s ideas, when seen against this scenario, seem remarkably “modern.” Arias emphasizes how the young English scholar, whom he remembers personally, marked a turning point in the approach to archaic sculpture, analyzing the objects themselves with keen eye and reuniting *disjecta membra* with astounding success. The summary of Payne’s book (pp. 33–37) is followed by accounts on more recent discoveries and research: by R. Bianchi Bandinelli, E. Langlotz (in collaboration with H. Schradier and W.-H. Schuchhardt), C. Karouzos, G.M.A. Richter. Section IV of this Introduction focuses then on research about individual archaic masters: by A. Rumpf, C. Tsirivakou-Neumann, W. Deyhle, U. Knigge, G. Schmidt, J. Kleine. N. Kontoleon’s work elicits comments on the art of the Cyclades and its relationship to Attica; D. Willers’ book is cited for archaic, M. Robertson’s as an example of a particularly insightful treatment of archaic art within a handbook of general scope. This reviewer’s *Archaic Style* forms the subject of the last summary; E.B. Harrison’s *Agora* 11 is a surprising omission (although cited on p. 57, n. 131). A fifth and last section summarizes present knowledge on archaic masters, including signed works and citations by ancient sources. Endoisis, Aristion, Aristokles, Phaidimos, Antenor and Krítios are thus reviewed. The quest for artistic personalities is considered, in the Conclusions, as the major difference in recent studies on archaic sculpture; the direction of the future is seen in the determination of regional schools and their idiosyncratic contributions to archaic and eventually to classical art.

This initial part of the volume, much more than Payne’s text in translation, is marred by typographical errors, differences in fonts, and on pp. 68–70 the footnotes have slid out of correspondence with the text. But the summaries, although the fruit of personal selections, are useful especially for students who may be unaware of the slow process of evolution behind certain critical positions current at present. Some final additions should be mentioned: three biographical notes on Humfrey Payne, written after his death by his own wife, J.D. Beazley and E. Buschor (pp. 79–82); a bibliography and a photograph of the British scholar whose contribution is honored in this edition.

Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL AND NEAR EASTERN ARCHAEOLOGY

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE, THOMAS LIBRARY

BRYN MAWR, PENNSYLVANIA 19010


Together with the recent catalogue of the exhibition, *Enea nel Lazio: archeologia e mito* (Rome 1981), the present work by Dury-Moyaers offers the most up-to-date and comprehensive discussion of the recent archaeological finds at Lavinium, especially in relation to the Aeneas legend. The author re-examines the literary (in the lengthy Ch. I) and archaeological sources: her work is thesis-oriented. Her *thèse*, in so many words, is that the legend and even the cult of Aeneas were alive and well in Lavinium by the 6th c. B.C.

As is so often the case with such theses, her work represents a strong reaction against a previous scholarly trend, in this case that of Alfoldi and others, who interpreted the various legends and cults as a reflection of the Etruscan influence on Latium. Even the archaeological evidence available in Alfoldi’s time, such as the tectonic forms of the 13 Altars, indicates, as I put it in 1969 (*Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome*, p. 153) that “Etruscan traditions did not dominate Lavinium, and Lavinium derived much inspiration directly from the Greeks.” (I might add that Dury-Moyaers has read the copious secondary bibliography although, for items written in English, not always accurately; in addition, the omission of all N. Horsfall’s work is strange.) The more recent excavations, in particular those at the sanctuary of Minerva Trionia at Lavinium, have removed any doubt about the impressive and direct Greek influence on the cults, architecture and art of the city in the 6th c.

Nor was Lavinium a backwater before then. One of the most useful aspects of the author’s work is her systematic presentation of the archaeological evidence from the Bronze Age (starting with the 15th c. B.C.) to the historical period. Lavinium, the Sant’Omobono area in Rome, and the environs of Ardea are the only sites in Latium that were continuously occupied from the 15th c. B.C. onward. The antiq-