

**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

---

1976

*Review of Samos XI: Bildwerke der archaischen Zeit  
und des strengen Stils*, by Brigitte Freyer-Schauenburg

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. 1976. Review of *Samos XI: Bildwerke der archaischen Zeit und des strengen Stils*, by Brigitte Freyer-Schauenburg. *American Journal of Archaeology* 80:207-209.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. [http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch\\_pubs/72](http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/72)

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

cultural context in the ancient Mediterranean. Indeed I see this volume as a meaningful reference for the students of the Phoenician colonization. It is divided into three parts: the island and its environment; the city itself, namely the South Gate and the North Gate areas, and the assessment of the overall results. The appendices deal with mollusca in Western Sicily, a timber specimen analysis, and the worn tracks at the North Gate. For the publication of this report the authors assembled contributions by several specialists, thus the reader is informed of the geological features of the island, the silt of the lagoon, aerial photography, the electrical resistivity of selected areas, etc.

Motyā, located in the center of a lagoon, some 1700 m. away from the mainland, is connected to Birgi by a causeway that runs northwards out of the North Gate. The lagoon is approximately 1 m. in depth allowing for the traffic of high-wheeled carts. Below its present bottom is a layer of clay containing Phoenician pottery, which suggests that in Phoenician times "the water was some 50 cm. deeper than at present" (p. 24). The causeway, aligned with the bastions of the North Gate, was probably built in the second half of the sixth century B.C. This is very likely the causeway used by Dionysius I in 397 B.C. (p. 29). To the west side of the North Gate region are the city wall, the sanctuary and its temenos dated to the mid sixth century B.C. (p. 74). On the east side of the Gate the authors rightly conjecture the presence of another sanctuary probably in its final phase (pp. 77-78). The stratigraphical evidence of the whole area supports the conclusion that Motyā was an open city until the sixth century. Pre-dating the Phoenician structures of the sixth century there is "a rim of a geometric skyphos of the late 8th century B.C."; other imports include "a few scraps of linear Protocorinthian, and the rim of an Etruscan linear bucchero kantharos" (p. 73).

To the west of the South Gate is the cothon with its masonry quays. The view of the tiny basin still surprises the unadvised visitor. The cothon as well as the tower on the eastern flank of the channel were constructed towards the end of the sixth century. Whitaker amply described the cothon in his book. In the South Gate area the British archaeologists have noticed three phases of occupation. In the earliest phase, Greek sherds of ca. 700 B.C.-675 B.C., seem to indicate that the extant buildings were erected in the first quarter of the seventh century (p. 53). A hundred years later the debris of these constructions was levelled in order to construct the buildings of phase two (see, for instance, rooms 5, 3 and 6: pls. IV [A-A], VII [E-E], and IX [F'-F']). The city wall and the defenses of the South Gate belong to the third phase which started late in the fifth century (pp. 59-65). The fall of Motyā occurred in 397 B.C. This was the end of the urban occupation and there is "no indication compelling us to assume that such occupation went beyond that time" (p. 67). Motyā's history was therefore short. The flourishing period of her political life started after the failure of the Greeks to establish themselves in Western Sicily about 590 B.C., but as the authors

point out, the presence of a Phoenician settlement in the island certainly goes back to the eighth century B.C. (p. 83). Sixteen circular tombs containing cremation-urns and pottery vessels of the eighth century have been unearthed by V. Tusa south of the first city wall (of ca. 600 B.C.) in the northern part of the island (see *Mozia* VII [Rome 1972] 35-36, 53-55 and 79-80).

In the eleventh chapter Isserlin discusses some of the urban features that Motyā has in common with other Phoenician or Punic towns such as tall houses (p. 91), an acropolis, a main road leading from the harbour region towards a piazza, buildings of a public character adjoining this piazza (for instance, the sanctuary of Apollo at Carthage mentioned by Appian, *The Punic Wars* 127), a main road traversing the town (the interior of the island remains as yet unexcavated, but see V. Tusa, *Mozia* VI [1970] 51 for the presence of a *quadriuium*), tophets and cothons. The Phoenician city walls, contrary to what Assyrian reliefs show, were rather low and had battlements crowned by semicircular tops (an architectural feature that derived from Egypt, see p. 88). Another element of interest is the use of masonry of a *telaio* type which can be seen not only in the house ruins of the Cappiddazzu (V. Tusa, *Mozia* II [1966] 23, pl. XX), but also at other Punic towns; occasional examples from Tell Abu Hawam, in Palestine, can be brought in for comparison, see R.W. Hamilton, *QDAP* 4 (1934) 2 and 6, pl. II, 1. Relying on a passage from Strabo (3.4.2), who refers to a distinct Phoenician city plan, Isserlin points out that the Phoenician urban lay-out was different from the Greek town plan (see also his article in *Rivista di studi fenici* 1 [1973] 135-52). Of course at Motyā the Phoenician and Punic traditions and those of the Greek and Italian were certainly interrelated. In the Mediterranean towns, however, the differences between Phoenician and Greek planning must have been striking enough to justify Strabo's remark.

The present report broadens the horizon helping the reader to figure out a true Phoenician perspective within which the Mediterranean settlements can be understood. It is a valuable and exemplary piece of research, well documented with plans allowing the reader readily to comprehend the excavated areas.

JAVIER TEIXIDOR

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK—PURCHASE

SAMOS XI: BILDWERKE DER ARCHAISCHEN ZEIT UND DES STRENGEN STILS, by *Brigitte Freyer-Schauenburg*. Pp. xi + 244, Pls. 95. Rudolf Habelt Verlag, Bonn, 1974.

For many years the field of Samian Archaic sculpture was dominated by the personality and knowledge of E. Buschor. Mrs. Schauenburg therefore modestly states in her preface that her work is meant not to replace, but to prepare the ground for, Buschor's theories, and that he wrote Samian art history, while she supplies just a catalogue. Perhaps for strict ad-

herence to this task, she limits her introductory comments to a definition of the material included (no perirrhanteria or minor stone objects), a discussion of absolute chronology (only two firmly dated pieces), and general statements on kouroi, korai, masters and dedicants. However, a careful reading of the 172 entries soon reveals the extent of the author's personal contribution, the changes she has made to Buschor's groupings and reconstructions, and the many points on which she takes issue with previous positions. The text therefore goes well beyond the mere assessment of the immediate sculptures and, through comparisons, provides interesting glimpses of Archaic developments outside of Samos.

The material, of course, is glorious! Though restricted to finds of proven Samian provenience, even if scattered through various museums, it includes some of the best known masterpieces of Archaic sculpture. Among the 28 korai, for instance, are the "Hera" in the Louvre and the second Cheramyes' dedication in Berlin. The 27 kouroi and two offering-bearers dated before 500 B.C. include at least three colossi over 5.50 m. high (three times life size) and several others of heroic proportions. The groups comprise that veritable sampler of Greek Archaic types, the "family" by the sculptor Geneleos. The seated figure is best represented by the Aiakes, but fragments of another are important in showing that his statue was not unique on the island. In addition, there are single reclining figures (Geneleos's innovation as a major art form?), a cuirassed warrior (Polykrates or one of his generals?), draped men, a possible cult image of a bearded colossus, several lions and other animals. In poros comes a whole series of anthemion stelai; and in the field of architectural sculpture, three temple friezes, an altar frieze and fragmentary sphinxes decorating antae. The 34 Severe pieces are classified on the basis of changes in style rather than chronology alone. The first item is in fact dated ca. 500 B.C., but shows a naked youth in motion, therefore an athlete rather than a kouros. In this group fall another temple frieze, all the figured stelai, a possibly pedimental warrior, and the only Severe female head from East Greece, sole Samian example of inserted eyes.

Mrs. Schauenburg has concentrated on pointing out what is typically Samian about this group of sculptures, and finds only two possible "imports" from nearby Miletos. Around 530 B.C., however, outside influences began to be felt on what was otherwise a distinctive regional style. In turn, Samian innovations made their impact elsewhere, especially in the rendering of the kore type, which was especially popular on the island and seems to have preceded the appearance of the kouros by over 50 years. The "invention" of the gesture of pulling the skirt aside, probably for greater ease in walking, is attributed to Geneleos, who connected it with the active hand, the right, and therefore produced korai stepping forward with the leg on the same side. This pattern was reversed to the canonical Archaic stride, presumably under Attic influence, since the Lyon kore is the earliest female statue advancing

with the left leg. Karyatids are an accidental example of the shift, since they are built as mirror images, but before ca. 540 B.C. one cannot assume, on the evidence of Geneleos's sisters, that every right-stepping kore had a matching counterpart. Yet I wonder whether the idea for the shift may not have come from the Cyclades, perhaps through the Karyatids themselves; could even the Lyon kore have had architectural functions and matching image?

The same question of Attic versus Cycladic influence can be asked for the inception of figured stelai. After a series of gravestones decorated only by an anthemion finial, two fragmentary shafts show frontal youths (nos. 143-44, ca. 500-480 B.C.), five others have profile figures. Mrs. Schauenburg accepts Athenian inspiration for the latter, and considers the former (together with the Leoxos stele from Olbia) a short-lived Ionic attempt to establish a new type. That the frontal figure rendering may have had an earlier origin in the Cyclades is suggested by a similar relief youth from Naxos (*Praktika* [1960] pl. 199 a-b, p. 261; N. Kontoleon, *Aspects de la Grèce Pré-classique* [1970] p. 52, pl. 22: 1-2), and by the Cycladic-inspired stele with a frontal girl from Giase-Ada (Thrace, ancient Stryme, *AJA* 61 [1957] 285 pl. 86: 17). Samian contacts with the funerary art of the islands are also confirmed by Cycladic anthemion on Samos. Once the Samians had accepted the "foreign" idea of a figured stele, they could have developed other motifs on their own, or at least without Attic inspiration, (1) because no gravestones were being produced in Athens at that time, and, (2) because the depiction of a living and a non-living creature together (the so-called man-and-dog theme) is, to my mind, not an Attic but an Ionic trait. I am convinced that more figured stelai from East Greece will eventually be found, thus changing our present understanding of Archaic funerary art.

Mrs. Schauenburg finished her text early in 1970, and some bibliography has accumulated since. A new study of the inscription on Geneleos's reclining figure now provides . . . *ilarches*, integrates *agelarches* as a title rather than a name and returns to an earlier interpretation of the group as all-female priestesses (G. Dunst, *AthMitt* 87 [1972] 132-35). I don't see how . . . *ilarches* can give *agelarches*, and even accepting the title-theory, would side with Mrs. Schauenburg in considering the reclining statue male and the entire group a family of worshippers. The Aiakes inscription has now been connected with the establishment of the right of asylum and dated ca. 500 B.C. (id., pp. 116-21), though the statue itself is earlier. Mrs. Schauenburg considers it male, a depiction of Polykrates' father. I still prefer the Hera identification, and find the long locks over the chest either a female or a heroizing coiffure inappropriate for a man. I also have some reservations on the author's tentative assumption that the so-called "calf-leader" is instead Theseus battling the Minotaur. The early date of the torso and the Attic connotation of the myth militate against the theory. But Mrs. Schauenburg's arguments against the previous reconstruction are convincing, and her second

suggestion (an archer?) seems closer to the mark.

Other contributions are the elimination or the shifting of some fragments from the architectural friezes as recomposed by Buschor, with the result that the so-called Small Frieze from the Heraion (in five courses) can no longer be seen as a procession of offering-bearers. The carving of friezes on weight-bearing blocks seems a Samian trait going back to Hekatompedon II, since the three engraved warriors are accepted as part of its wall decoration rather than as doodles. Note that a continuous frieze in a comparable many-courses technique has now been found at Parco del Cavallo, S. Italy (*AttiMGrecia* n.s. 13-15 [1972-1973] 62-66). Other suggestions include the so-called Three-figure Group, which is no longer connected with an altar, and therefore not necessarily divine. The circular marking may have rather been for a cauldron on a pillar, and the kourous was set in front of it in a secondary use, without its original flanking companions.

In general, Mrs. Schauenburg tends to use common sense rather than imagination, and therefore avoids specific identifications. Kouroi and korai are just pleasant gifts and not representations of divinities, veils and offerings *may* but need not denote a priestess or a goddess. While applauding her healthy caution, I believe that these generic types carried different meanings at different times and places, and that divine connotations should not be entirely excluded, especially for funerary statues or for kouroi as enormous as the Samian giants, which could bear no immediate reference to a human being. As for the veil (whose sculptural evolution is so usefully traced on p. 54), granted that it is an East Greek garment unattested in Greece proper, its use may indeed be ritual if the three Geneleos sisters do not wear it, while other young "korai" do.

The book has few misprints, and none of great importance, but kore no. 28 is illustrated on pl. 18 (*not* 15), and on pl. 26 the identification of 41A and B is reversed. The photographs are generally good, but a few are muddy and not all views of a piece are always given. Descriptive captions would have improved comprehension of some difficult fragments. All in all, this is an excellent catalogue of exciting and controversial material carefully described and objectively discussed—a definite contribution to the study of Archaic Greek sculpture.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

ATTISCHE GIEBELSKULPTUREN UND AKROTERE DES FÜNFTEN JAHRHUNDERTS, by *Angelos Delivorrias*. (Tübinger Studien zur Archäologie und Kunstgeschichte, vol. 1.) Pp. xvi + 208, pls. 64, folding pls. 5 (line drawings). Verlag Ernst Wasmuth, Tübingen, 1974. DM 56.

The core of this Tübingen dissertation consists in the presentation of discoveries made by the author in

the Athens National Museum while he was serving there as assistant to Christos and Semni Karouzos. Delivorrias warmly acknowledges his debt to these fine scholars, whose sensitivity to style and quality he often shares.

The first discovery illustrated is also the most important, a strikingly beautiful pedimental figure of a seated, Aphrodite-like goddess in late fifth-century style which D. literally recreated by joining together three separate fragments, one in the National Museum and two in the Acropolis Museum. The search for a home for this figure led him to consider the pedimental compositions of two fifth-century Athenian temples of suitable size, the Hephaisteion (I use the author's terminology) and the Temple of Ares. Meanwhile he had also attributed some fragments to the Temple of Poseidon at Sounion.

Using the pieces from various sources which he has identified as probably belonging to the three temples, D. essays reconstructions of their pediments and akroteria. Only the west end of the Sounion temple is omitted for lack of evidence. Appendix I lists "other pedimental fragments from the magazines of Athenian museums," that is, pieces whose attribution is more tentative than that of the fragments discussed in the main text. Parian fragments are considered possible for the Hephaisteion, Pentelic for Ares. One Thasian marble fragment of Roman date (Acropolis 8925) has slipped in among the Parians. Most of the pieces in Appendix I actually appear in the reconstructions in the folding plates. Appendix II gives brief résumés of scholarship on 21 Greek temples with sculptured pediments and akroteria, ranging from the late archaic to the Hellenistic periods.

Both the main chapters and the appendices are crammed full of interesting observations and carefully assembled references. Reverence for scholarship goes so far that names of modern scholars are always printed in capital letters. The indices are full and helpful. The plates are well reproduced at generous size, mostly from excellent photographs, but have, regrettably, no captions. The drawings in the folding plates, by K. Eliakis, are beautifully executed, accurate in scale as well as in form. They in no way disguise whatever difficulties exist in the author's reconstructions.

Apart from the seated goddess, the most welcome contribution is that made by D. to the reconstruction of the akroterion, Athens NM 3397, a Nereid riding a dolphin. He identified a fragment comprising the Nereid's lower legs, which joined a piece from the Agora previously assigned to this figure by the reviewer, and subsequently S. Triantis added from the NM storerooms a joining left shin and a piece of the dolphin's tail, which are also illustrated here. D. further assigns a non-joining left hand and a head. The hand seems certain because of congruence of style, marble and weathering. The head is unsuitable on all three counts. Before we can definitely attribute this and other akroteria to the Temple of Ares we need to understand better than we do now the riddle of the