

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

---

10-1-1995

### Review of *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, vol. 7 (Oidipous-Theseus)

Brunilde S. Ridgway

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

Follow this and additional works at: [https://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch\\_pubs](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. 1995. Review of *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, vol. 7 (Oidipous-Theseus). *American Journal of Archaeology* 99:743-744.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College.  
[https://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch\\_pubs/57](https://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/57)

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

added a Corinthianizing black-figure style to their repertoire in the sixth century. By about 575 B.C. Chian painting reached an acme in the unusual polychrome vases of the Grand Style depicting human figures in a variety of generic and mythological scenes. Both reserve and black-figure styles continued through the first half of the sixth century, but vase painting declined and virtually disappeared on Chios in the second half, at least partly because of Athenian competition.

Lemos carefully traces the development of both shapes and decorative styles from the seventh to the end of the sixth century. She tackles the problem of dating, although Chian pottery relies heavily on stylistic criteria for its chronology and most vases can only be assigned to quarter centuries. She also presents the first comprehensive overview of the distribution of Chian pottery on overseas sites since R.M. Cook's article on the topic (*BSA* 44 [1949] 154–61). What appears to be an overseas Chian workshop, not precisely located yet, whose products appear at Thasos, Neapolis (Kavala), Oesyne (New Peramos), and Ainos (Enez) on the Thracian coast, is also examined. Lemos suggests the nearby Chian colony of Maroneia as the likely home for these vases.

The starting point for Lemos's study is a catalogue of over 1,600 Chian vases and fragments, a commendable attempt at completeness. Of these she illustrates almost 1,000, including 80 in color. Numerous drawings of ornament and shape profiles accompany the text. Many Chian pieces from Naucratis held by the British Museum are published for the first time, as is material excavated at Rizari in Chios town, and a small number of vases from sites in Anatolia.

Besides the two Chian workshops apparently established overseas (posited at Maroneia and Naucratis for the bespoken kantharoi at least), Lemos distinguishes four workshops on Chios itself. One of these began work in the early sixth century, producing the black-figure Sphinx-and-Lion Style that featured repetitive friezes of lions facing right and sphinxes left. Its vase shapes, however, are innovative, omitting the chalice entirely but commonly decorating large bowls with lids and lekanai. A minor workshop, fuzzily defined, is credited with producing black-figure Grand Style vases ca. 570–560 B.C., and several other late vase types. A mere 10 fragments are attributed to this black-figure Grand Style, of which three show influence from Laconian pottery. They are "Grand" only because they depict scenes of myth comparable to the Chian polychrome Grand Style vases.

The other two "workshops," however, are the most important. The first produced patterned chalices in a Sub-Geometric style down to the end of the seventh century. Its distinctive signature is a saw pattern in the handle zone. After an apparent gap of a generation in the early sixth century, the same workshop is credited with developing the Chalice Style, characterized by simple reserved animals or human figures on the chalice walls. Lemos believes that this same workshop produced black-figure Komast chalices and Animal chalices in the second quarter of the sixth century, also with simple figures on the walls and a saw pattern in the handle zone. One wonders, though, whether the simple decoration and saw pattern in the handle zone constitute sufficient evidence to claim a single workshop tradition lasting over a century with an apparent 20-year gap in the middle.

The one other "workshop" distinguished by Lemos uses the same shapes and many similar ornaments, except the saw pattern. This "workshop" is credited with introducing the Wild Goat Style to the Chian repertoire about the mid-seventh century and developing the related Animal Chalice Style in the sixth. Before ca. 575 B.C., it was perhaps influenced by wall painting and began to produce human-figure scenes, many with polychrome decoration, in the Grand Style.

Lemos capably subdivides these various styles into groups, not all of which are coherent, as she admits, and she distinguishes several individual painters. The lists of attributed vases occasionally need paring and the features of both the groups and the individual painters' styles often require more explanation to justify decisions of attribution. One example is a dinos fragment (no. 275) from Rizari with a goose and probably boar attributed to the Painter of the Würzburg chalices; however, the goose is closer to examples on the name vase of the Painter of the Aphrodite Bowl (no. 252).

Concerning the development of figured painting on Chios, only three vases (nos. 247, 264, 273) are considered Early Wild Goat Style by Lemos, but all are suspect and should be withdrawn. The Group of the Bull Oenochoe, considered Middle Wild Goat I, is more likely early in Middle Wild Goat II, which means the introduction of the Wild Goat Style on Chios probably occurs after ca. 625 B.C.

Although the book lacks a site index, chapter 6 on "Distribution" does list the catalogued vases from each of 81 sites producing Chian pottery other than those on Chios itself. Plate references, especially to vases on the color plates, would have assisted the reader, as would catalogue numbers of vases whose ornaments appear in figures 24–40.

Lemos must be commended for tackling this very fragmentary group of vases with such thoroughness, for improving and extending the existing system of classification, and for making important observations about the influences both on and from this vase painting school.

GERALD P. SCHAUS

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS  
WILFRID LAURIER UNIVERSITY  
WATERLOO, ONTARIO  
CANADA N2L 3C5  
GSCHAUS@MACH1.WLU.CA

LEXICON ICONOGRAPHICUM MYTHOLOGIAE CLASSICAE VII (Oidipous–Theseus). Vol. I: pp. xxxi + 1,065, with 191 line drawings in text; vol. II: pp. 816, pls. 750 (4,353 photographs). Artemis, Zurich and Munich 1994. ISBN 3-7608-8751-1.

I shall, once again, attempt to do the impossible—give the *AJA* readers a sense of what is contained in a *LIMC* issue. Yet this time the end is in sight: *LIMC* VIII, already in preparation, will complete the alphabet and the supplements, so that only the index volume shall remain. The President of the International Council is still G. Camporeale, but the true element of continuity is provided by the General Secretary, Lilly Kahil, who, through all her personal vicissitudes, has been the inspiration behind the *Lexicon* from the planning stages. Among the most faithful

collaborators remain J. Boardman and E. Simon, although many new authors are represented each time. The Getty Trust has again provided vital support, and two Italian institutions have contributed to covering the expenses for this specific issue, yet the financial situation is difficult, as both the President and the General Secretary stress.

*LIMC* VII contains more articles and photographs than previous volumes, and the latter deserve comments. Not only are they of invariably high quality, but details are often provided together with the larger picture. Coins and gems (of which there are many) are reproduced at legible scale, and text illustrations are also more numerous, not all of them as sheer line drawings. Among the sculptures, note the excellent sequence of the Telephos frieze (pls. 590–94); only the unusual monument in the Vatican showing Pentheus up on a tree being shaken by a frenzied Maenad (PENTHEUS 5) could have benefited from a larger reproduction. Inevitably, cross-references are on the increase as well, so that it is almost impossible to read single entries in isolation. This particular volume, among the Addenda, publishes the second installment on MUSA-MOUSAI, continued from vol. VI and beginning with no. 156; among the Roman examples (MUSAE) a special section is devoted to sarcophagi, and it includes diagrams of iconographic types (pp. 1034–37). Other addenda are KASSANDRA, KYKNOS, and NESTOR. There is also PAX as counterpart to the earlier EIRENE, and SELENE/LUNA (vs. Greek ASTRA), but OKEANOS appears solely in its Greek manifestations.

Only one major divinity is discussed: POSEIDON, with its Etruscan/Roman counterparts NETHUNS and NEPTUNUS, his renderings in the northwestern provinces (from Pannonia to Britannia), and two Appendices: on dedications to Poseidon, and on Neptune's attributes. The Greek repertoire illustrates several of the Corinthian (Pentaskouphia) pinakes and some Lakonian lead figurines. There are many lesser deities, including some purely Etruscan or Roman (PORTUNUS, REA SILVIA, SALUS, SILVANUS), and some not especially classical, like PTAH, SARAPIS and OSIRIS — this last accompanied by that peculiar manifestation called O. KANOPOS. Heroes, both epic and mythological, abound, and some are most important: PERSEUS, THESEUS, and, happily within the same issue, BELLE-ROPHON s.v. PEGASOS (why no mention of the Limyra akroterion?), as well as TANTALOS, PELOPS, OINOMAOS, PEIRITHOOS. Among the personifications, there is the POPULUS ROMANUS, understood primarily as the Genius P.R. (but an entry on GENIUS is reserved for a Supplement) and considered in combination with the Genius Senatus, although SENATUS ranks independent treatment. RES PUBLICA is included, but ROMA will come with the supplements. Among the concepts, there is PARIDIS IUDICIUM and PELIOU ATHLA. SEPTEM deals with the Seven against Thebes, and an unusual entry lists TABULA CEBETIS, a fictitious painting known only through literary allusions. Some names (e.g., TARVOS TRIGARANUS) exist only in a few inscriptions. The range and variety of personifications, lesser characters, and concepts are such that almost any mythological topic could be looked up with profit.

Comments must be kept to a minimum because of space restrictions, and are, as usual, personal and subjective. PROMETHEUS 77, the panel from the Aphrodisian Sebasteion,

is interestingly dated ca. A.D. 150 but without comment, although other mythological scenes from the same building (s.v. PENTHESILEIA, nos. 52d, 53a, 64) are given the excavators' chronology in the Claudian period. The "God from the Sea" is identified as Poseidon (no. 28) in preference to Zeus; the Lateran P. type (no. 34 = NEPTUNUS 14) is attributed to the School of Lysippos although its motif is acknowledged as much earlier (p. 478) and particularly popular in figurines. I would tend to agree with E. Bartman, *Ancient Sculptural Copies in Miniature* (Leiden 1992), who sees it originate at small scale, especially since the statue from Ephesos in the British Museum (no. 34a) looks to me fully Roman. NEPTUNUS 119 is the marine thiasos relief from Palazzo Santa Croce, dated 97 or 70 B.C.; yet persistent allusions consider it *spolia* (see, recently, e.g., A. Kuttner, in P.J. Holliday ed., *Narrative and Event in Ancient Art*, Cambridge 1993). Marble analysis would be highly desirable, to settle the issue once and for all. The Hephaisteion E frieze possibly (no. 175), and the Sounion Temple frieze surely (nos. 56, 275), are still listed under the exploits of THESEUS, although reference to the alternative theories by F. Felten might have been made.

Bibliography is usually up to date, but I missed M. Fullerton, *The Archaistic Style in Roman Statuary* (Leiden 1990) 108-18, under SPES, and comments on why this personification should be almost consistently shown in archaizing fashion. Under PENELOPE, speculation on her distinctive pose with crossed legs would have been welcome. It is striking that the wounded PENTHESILEIA motif (version C) should be so widely used for Roman personifications (Sicilia, Armenia, Britannia), and I would still date its prototype in the round later than 150 B.C. That the seated Maenad restraining another on the Derveni krater may be PENTHEUS in disguise (no. 69) is an intriguing suggestion.

In a work of this scope, errors are inevitable, but I mention a few I noticed, in the hope that the last, Index volume may add a list of Corrigenda. Some are misleading, like turning a date after Christ into one B.C. (e.g., OIDIPOUS 1, OKNOS 7); in PEGASOS 233, reference to *Agora* XI should read 126 (not 216); and PERSEUS 2 cannot possibly be ca. 550 B.C., but its reference is untraceable.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

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

TABULA IMPERII ROMANI, HOJA K-30: MADRID (CAESARAUGUSTA — CLUNIA), edited by G. Fatás Cabeza, L. Caballero Zoreda, C. García Merino, and A. Cepas Palanca. Pp. 339, map 1. Consejo superior de investigaciones científicas (Centro de estudios históricos) and Instituto geográfico nacional, Madrid 1993. ISBN 84-7819-047-3 (paper).

The history of the monumental, collaborative, international enterprise, the *Tabula Imperii Romani*, has been checked. Inspired in 1923 by O.G.S. Crawford, it has inched