

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

1-1-1982

Review of *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, vol. 1 (Aara-Aphlad)

Brunilde S. Ridgway

Bryn Mawr College, bridgway@brynmawr.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs



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

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

Citation

Ridgway, Brunilde S. 1982. Review of *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, vol. 1 (Aara-Aphlad). *American Journal of Archaeology* 86:599-600.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College.
https://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/44

For more information, please contact repository@brynmawr.edu.

uity and development of the site accord especially well with its cultic pre-eminence.

Given the complexity of the problem, Dury-Moyaers' final postulate, i.e., the existence of the legend and cult of Aeneas at Lavinium at least two centuries before their direct literary and archaeological attestation, would have benefited from greater precision in its definition. Knowledge of the legend is one thing; its active acceptance, promulgation and translation into cult, as well as the impetus and reasons for it, are quite another. One needs to distinguish clearly, more clearly than the evidence will permit us at times, between primary and secondary causes. In view of the impressive impact of Greek culture on Lavinium from the 6th c. onward, there is every reason to believe that this story, just as other Greek myths, was known there, independently of Etruscan mediation. But this is still a far cry from its adoption as a foundation legend. The cults of Indiges, the Penates, Minerva and Venus can be viewed as contributory to the growth of the legend and, ultimately, the cult of Aeneas because they could be fitted into a Trojan context as easily as the "Trojan pottery" mentioned by Timaeus in connection with the Lavinian sanctuary (*FGH* 566 F 59). As for the name of the location Troia, I believe, with Castagnoli, and *pace* Dury-Moyaers, that it was a phenomenon resulting from the legend rather than producing it.

As any scholar bound on shoring up an hypothesis—and to her credit, she admits several times that there is (as yet) no direct proof for her central contention—the author downplays the pieces of evidence which do not agree with it. Not much emphasis is placed, therefore, on precisely the major aspect of the newly discovered heroon: its late 4th c. date and its curious integration with the older grave which meaningfully express the transformation of Indiges to Aeneas Indiges after 338 B.C. Similarly, even if Dury-Moyaers is right in her insistence that there is no evidence for an Etruscan cult of Aeneas, the depiction of Aeneas' departure from Troy clearly was in some demand among the Etruscan clients of Attic potters (cf. now Horsfall, *CQ* 29 [1979] 387) and one cannot say, on the basis of the Greek manufacture of these vases, "l'initiative et l'impulsion viennent donc de Grèce" (p. 167).

The author also begs the larger question of the relationship between the Aeneas legend in Rome and the Aeneas legend in Lavinium. She is content with considering the Roman version purely as a creation of Greek historians. Again, recent archaeological discoveries, including an archaic (6th c.) temple in the Forum Boarium with an acroterial group of Hercules and Athena, furnish an impressive testimony to the strength of the Greek presence in Rome at that time. Yet, this was also the time of the Etruscan domination of Rome. While there are risks in trying to systematize the often disjointed literary and archaeological evidence, I would still suggest that Hellenicus' association of Aeneas with Rome, which was abetted by her urban emergence, was not entirely arbitrary but reflects the well attested Etruscan predilection for Aeneas.

Regardless of her arguable conclusions—and I do not

know of any others pertaining to this complex problem that would not be arguable also—Dury-Moyaers' book is a most valuable source of information. Its utility would have been greatly enhanced by the presence of an index.

KARL GALINSKY

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78712

LEXICON ICONOGRAPHICUM MYTHOLOGIAE CLASSICAE (LIMC), vol. 1 (Aara-Aphlad), Text and plates bound separately. Text vol. pp. lxxvii + 881, text figs. 193; Plate vol. pp. 752, pls. 699. Artemis Verlag, Zurich and Munich 1981.

Conceived during 1969–1970, this monumental compendium of mythological iconography has now appeared in its first volume, which comprises approximately half the entries for the letter A. Seven additional volumes are planned (all of them in this double format of text and plates) and at least one supplementary issue, to accommodate the documentation obtained after the first articles were already in press. The total work will not replace the *RE* but will take its inevitable place with the "giants" of the reference shelves in any serious research library of the world.

Appropriately, this is a world project, sponsored by an international organization with the collaboration of 34 countries. In agreement with the aims of the project, each participating nation has in turn organized its own Center for the gathering of the mythological documentation available within its territory, which is then transmitted to the Central Editorial Office of the LIMC in Basel. Thus, the actual publication of the Lexicon is but a step in the massive movement of research, cataloguing and photographing which is taking place within each country, and which will provide a permanent source of information and a springboard for all future research. The value of such an undertaking in the U.S., for instance, has been recognized by the financial sponsorship of the National Endowment for the Humanities, and by the officials of Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, at whose New Brunswick campus the American center has its home. At the international level, the UNESCO has given its moral and financial backing to the enterprise and has allowed the organization of "seminars to train researchers in the Arab countries into the techniques of assembling and analyzing figural documentation" (p. xii).

Because of this international collaboration, the *LIMC* entries have been distributed among various scholars from each participating country; articles have thus been written in a variety of languages, and those not originally composed in English, French, German or Italian have had to be translated. To provide for uniformity and coordination among so many has been an enormous task, and it is fair to say that the whole enterprise would not have succeeded, had it not been for the inspirational efforts of the LIMC Secretary

General, Lilly Kahil. Not only was she the scholar who originated the idea and translated it into practical terms, but through the years she has been the moving force behind the various local centers, the diplomat who has established the necessary contacts, the friend who has advised and urged, the archaeologist who has labored at her own entries and research, thus achieving a level of understanding of the problems involved which no other can equal. The entire scholarly community is indebted to Dr. Kahil for this superb contribution.

This first pioneering volume, as the Introduction disarmingly states (p. xxii), might have benefited from additional work, but it was published as quickly as possible, in keeping with the spirit of the project. Eighty-seven authors, most of them well known scholars, have contributed the entries. Inevitably, any work which requires several years for its preparation and relies on a multiplicity of collaborators suffers from a certain unevenness in approach, bibliography and format, despite all conceivable guidelines. It is a tribute to Kahil and her editorial team that this volume is as close to a finished product as it actually is. The typographical format, however, leaves nothing to be desired and the plates, although the quality of the individual photographs varies, are uniformly clear, each picture large and printed on glossy paper. Many of the objects illustrated are familiar, others are little known and quite a few are previously unpublished. Although selective criteria had to be employed, the catalogue for each entry gives references to available illustrations elsewhere; the visual documentation alone is a contribution of primary magnitude.

Within the brief compass of a review it is impossible to do justice to the contents of this volume, and its range of subjects places it well beyond the expertise of a single reviewer. The focus is on Classical mythology (understood as Greek, Etruscan and Roman), but non-Classical figures are included when they have been depicted in Classical style or have points of contact with the Graeco-Roman world: for instance, the Arab Allath, who can appear under the guise of Athena/Minerva, or the Egyptian Anubis. Some familiar monuments occur under unfamiliar, or at least debatable identifications: Figure A from the Parthenon West pediment is discussed under *Aktaios I*, the Penelope type is included under *Aidos*, the Doryphoros under *Achilleus*. A certain amount of overlapping was inevitable; duplication, and even contradiction, were intentionally retained to insure completeness. Thus the representations of Achilles and Pentesilea are treated twice (with different totals) under *Achilleus* (by Anneliese Kossatz-Deissmann) and under *Amazones* (by Pierre Devambez—the last writing by this great scholar—catalogue by Alike Kauffmann-Samaras). A good system of cross-referencing allows for correlation and additional information.

Entries range from half a column of text to almost 200 pages and ca. 1000 catalogue listings. Each entry begins with a brief introduction; a general bibliography (including ancient sources) is then given, but further references may be provided if the main article is subdivided by mythological episodes. A catalogue lists iconographic types, exhaustively

when only few monuments exist, selectively when large numbers are involved; doubtful and even erroneous iconographic examples are listed—a commendable decision. A date is suggested for many items, but several are left undated within the larger subdivisions, or are assigned to wide chronological spans. When the same monument is treated under different entries, chronological disagreement among authors is possible.

The final commentary attempts to coordinate the various forms of representation, stressing differences and similarities from culture to culture and from time to time; a personal interpretation can thus be given of iconographic phenomena according to the author's understanding. This is the section for which no firm guidelines could possibly be established, beyond the rule of chronological ordering, and accounts range from factual to subjective. Because of the Athenians' propensity for figured scenes, most myths are illustrated by Attic vases, especially of the Archaic period. South Italian vessels, Etruscan urns and mirrors, Roman sarcophagi are also well represented in the documentation, while Asia Minor, primarily because of its few examples of identifiable scenes on pottery, seems underrated. To give one example, in the case of the Amazons, might the total picture be different, were we able to understand the complex iconography of the parapet-frieze on the Archaic Artemision at Ephesos? An early connection of the myth with the goddess would then be established.

Other reviewers might take exception to other interpretations, and omissions could be mentioned. The first volume already includes a page (881) of additional bibliography, both ancient and recent, and the supplementary volume will undoubtedly provide more documentation and further remarks. It is therefore premature to comment extensively on this first publication. Suffice it here to say that whatever faults one may find with the individual entries, the high standards of the whole are beyond doubt. It will take many years to absorb and evaluate properly the usefulness and thoroughness of the *Lexicon*, but the magnitude of the undertaking is already apparent and its success is a monument to international cooperation among scholars.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

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

SOPHILOS. EIN BEITRAG ZU SEINEM STIL, by *Güven Bakır* (Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Kommission für antike Keramik. Keramikforschungen 4.) Pp. xii + 84, figs. 42, pls. 90. Philipp von Zabern, Mainz 1981. DM 120

Sophilos by *Güven Bakır* combines the strengths and weaknesses inherent in the purely stylistic analysis of the works of an early Attic black-figure painter. In a workmanlike and methodical way *Bakır* has examined *Beazley's* lists for *Sophilos* and for those near him, and he has established a