

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

1970

Review of *Untersuchungen zur thronenden Göttin aus Tarent in Berlin und zur archaischen und archaistischen Schrägmanteltracht*, by Helga Herdejürgen

Brunilde S. Ridgway
Bryn Mawr College, 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

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

Custom Citation

Ridgway, Brunilde S. 1970. Review of *Untersuchungen zur thronenden Göttin aus Tarent in Berlin und zur archaischen und archaistischen Schrägmanteltracht*, by Helga Herdejürgen. *American Journal of Archaeology* 74:110-112.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/80

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

earlier. While Kaulen does display erudition and familiarity with both the objects he discusses and the literary sources for the history of the period, his ingenious interpretations do not inspire confidence. In interpreting the significance of individual finds at given sites, he fails to give adequate consideration to alternative possibilities. For instance, could not the presence of Argive terracottas at Perachora signify something other than Pheidon's dominance of the Isthmos region, perhaps cult connections between the two sanctuaries of Hera at Perachora and the great center at the Argive Heraion, or even a trickle of Argive visitors bringing their own votive offerings with them? Reconstruction of political events or alliances on the basis of a few terracottas is highly risky business. The rise of the Kypselids, the fortunes of Sikyon, the Second Messenian War and other important but hazy events are brought before the reader in quick succession. Kaulen believes that Mantiklos, dedicant of the famous bronze statuette in Boston, is none other than a Messenian leader in the Second Messenian War, who was forced to consult the oracle of Apollo Ismenios in Thebes because of the Delphic Oracle's traditional friendship for Sparta. Kaulen's discussion of Athens in the late 7th century B.C. contains some remarkable observations about the sanctuary of Poseidon at Cape Sounion (156-157); he incorrectly dates and interprets the little bronze statuette correctly recognized by Hanfmann as North Syrian work of the late 8th and 7th century B.C. ("A Syrian from Sounion," *Hesperia* 31 [1962] 236-237) as "late Mycenaean" (there are no late Mycenaean bronze statuettes of human figures known to this reviewer), and thus reveals Sounion as a great Attic state sanctuary dating back to the "synoikismos of Theseus." To top this, the Sounion colossi are made to represent the three Attic victors in the Olympic Games during the 7th century B.C., as if the bronze figure from Pantakles' dedicatory tripod were not enough.

Kaulen concludes his remarks about 7th century history and art with consideration of the Daedalids: Dipoinos and Skyllis, and Daedalos himself. The former he dates to ca 660 B.C.; Daedalos is relegated backward to the very beginning of the 7th century. Kaulen assigns the bronze statuette Athens, NM 6619 (his "B-1 Varia," Taf. 1), from the Acropolis, as an original work by Daedalis of around 700 B.C. Kaulen's observations about this fascinating bronze, which probably had face and other parts of the head inlaid in other materials, are useful, but his date is far too early, and his attribution can neither be proven nor accepted.

Daidalika concludes with two appendices: a discussion (170-173) of 7th century "Sikyonian" pottery and a consideration of the chronology of Cypriote sculpture. On the basis of comparisons between the plastic heads on Protocorinthian aryballois and pyxides with "Sikyonian" terracottas and bronzes (32-38, 11-17 respectively), Kaulen tries to revive a theory that Payne's *Necrocorinthia* showed decades ago to be mistaken: that Protocorinthian pottery was made at

Sikyon, as proposed by Friis-Johansen. The resurrection of this defunct theory is inexcusable. Flying in the face of the enormous body of accumulated excavation evidence from Corinth itself, from Perachora and the Isthmian Sanctuary of Poseidon, as well as the overwhelming majority of painted and incised inscriptions on the vases, which are clearly in the Corinthian script, Kaulen erects an edifice of fantasy for a workshop for which there is not the slightest scrap of excavated evidence, from a city which still awaits systematic excavation. He claims to be able to distinguish "Sikyonian" from Corinthian clay by color; in rebuttal, cf. the astute remarks of A. N. Stillwell, *The Potters' Quarter. The Terracottas, Corinth XV:2* (Princeton 1952) 4-7, in which Corinthian clay is shown to embrace an astonishing range of hues. Perhaps the best reply to Kaulen's "Sikyonian Revival" is the conclusion of the late T. J. Dunbabin in *Perachora II* (Oxford 1962) 3: "The same reason, the stylistic unity of both Protocorinthian and Corinthian styles and the interrelations of the workshop groups into which the styles can be divided, makes the attempt to detach any significant part of the body of Corinthian vases unpalatable."

The second appendix is a digression upon the chronology of Cypriote sculpture; while containing some cogent observations, it stops far short of the thoroughgoing new treatment of this material that is needed. Footnotes, abbreviations of works cited in the text, a catalogue of objects discussed, each with basic data and bibliography, and the nine illustrations, conclude the book; there is no index.

Unfortunately, this book makes no substantial contribution to the clarification and expansion of our knowledge of early Greek history and culture. Kaulen does at times make interesting and helpful observations about objects that he is discussing. Such defects, however, as his readiness to embrace shaky presumptions and construct fantasies, his chronological eccentricities, his dependence upon equating specific bronzes with victors in specific Olympiads and then using the results in his chronological framework, and his revival of defunct theories on no evidence combine to make this book a hindrance rather than a help to anyone who wants to deepen his understanding of major problems and events in the political and artistic history of Greece in the 7th century B.C.

DAVID GORDON MITTEN

FOGG ART MUSEUM, HARVARD UNIVERSITY

UNTERSUCHUNGEN ZUR THRONENDEN GÖTTIN AUS TARENT IN BERLIN UND ZUR ARCHAISCHEN UND ARCHAISTISCHEN SCHRÄGMANTELTRACHT, by *Helga Herdejürgen*. Pp. 94, pls. 16. Stifftland-Verlag KG. Waldassen-Bayern, 1968.

This unmanageable title will inevitably be abbreviated *Die thronende Göttin aus Tarent in Berlin*, yet for this reviewer the main interest of the work

lies in its study of the diagonal mantle during archaic and post-archaic times. The text falls clearly into two sections, the first dealing specifically with the Seated Goddess and the second with the development of the so-called Ionic costume; but while the former is a diligent investigation of all problems connected with the statue, it has relatively few new ideas to contribute; the latter section contains instead much that is new, not simply in terms of material but also of organization. The individual reader will perhaps disagree with some of the suggested chronology, but is bound to profit from the careful analyses of drapery renderings and the many interesting observations on stylistic features.

Though the first section does not entirely supersede previous studies, some of its conclusions are important. The most provocative is perhaps that the statue once held two phialai in a libation gesture, partly on the evidence of a terracotta reproduction but especially because of the "motion pattern" of both shawl tips on either side of the throne and the uneven level of the arms. This pouring action may perhaps be simply a symbol of divinity, but it seems awkward in a seated figure; one wonders whether the minor asymmetries throughout the work are determined not so much by the pose as by the sculptor's desire to break the law of frontality—a powerful wish in the early Classical period.

Stylistically, the statue is a Tarentine product, although a recent news item still defends an illicit transfer from Locri to Taranto (p. 7 n. 4). The broad central pleat in the chiton skirt, sinking between the legs, from which curved folds branch off, is an Ionic component which the Berlin Goddess derives from Milesian prototypes of ca. 550-540 B.C. But the seated deity most closely resembles Aeginetan sculpture of ca. 500-490, especially in the shape of eyes and mouth. Since, however, these traits are not peculiar to one region, they are not an adequate basis for attributing the statue to that island. Comparisons with works from Magna Graecia provide the best parallels and emphasize the rather eclectic character of Western Greek sculpture, with lingering Ionic elements from an earlier period, affinities with Cyrenean works and definite Aeginetan influence especially concentrated in the Tarentine area.

Finally, chronology. The shape of the sakkos, the hair-style, the facial features point to the post-archaic period, but the clinching argument for a date around 460 B.C. is the specific rendering of the attire: an archaic garment is shown in a post-archaic arrangement. To prove this point, Part Two gives an excursus into mantle fashions from early archaic to late Hellenistic times.

Since the writer is only interested in the diagonal himation, her survey starts with the earliest statues in that dress, not with the earliest korai. The garment makes its appearance around 575, presumably in Samos. There is also a Milesian version beginning ca. 550-540, with a few variants under cross-influence. A transitional period follows (540-530 B.C.), with the

fashion spreading to other parts of the Greek world in slightly modified form. This evolves into the Ripe Archaic phase (540/530-500/490) with somewhat different renderings in East Ionia and West Greece as contrasted with the Ionic islands and Attica; Roman copies of Ripe Archaic prototypes are also included in this section. The Late Archaic Phase (500/490-480), even more greatly favored by Roman copyists and imitators, allows fewer generalizations and regional distinctions, with Asia Minor out of the picture because of political circumstances and Aegina becoming a leading archaic center.

All these archaic phases are characterized by evolution and change in the rendering of the himation, with several groups and sub-groups of possible arrangements. Obviously one can object that these renderings seem to develop along coherent lines because the author has arranged them so: a criticism valid for any series based on one specific detail. But Miss Herdejürgen seems so convinced of her grounds as to defy some well-established chronological tenets. She dates Antenor's kore ca. 505 B.C. (p. 57) and the Knidian Karyatid ca. 535 (p. 44), leaving open the question of whether this low chronology still allows its attribution to the earlier-dated Treasury.

After 480 B.C. the diagonal mantle undergoes basic modifications: from short it stretches to foot length, with an overfold which in length and draping resembles the archaic garment, and instead of being buttoned along the upper arm, it is only fastened at the shoulder, with zigzag folds cascading from that point rather than from the elbow. This specific arrangement clearly marks the "wearers" as post-archaic, yet the general impression is still that of an archaic garment—hence the archaizing appearance of many works. This consideration has a bearing on the larger problem of the beginnings of archaistic art. Miss Herdejürgen attempts to solve it by suggesting that archaizing sculpture originated immediately after 480 B.C., with peaks of popularity (but not actual beginnings) both around 400 and 200 B.C. She then sketches the evolution of the himation during subsequent periods, from the 5th to the 1st century B.C.

This is undoubtedly the most difficult part of the entire book. A continuous evolutionary trend is more difficult to observe and therefore analyses are bound to be more subjective. The author's archaic divisions may perhaps be questionable because different renderings continue beyond their period and can be contemporary, but at least her basic thesis of a general progression from one form to another can be accepted. Her groupings, were they to prove geographically inaccurate, would still have the merit of calling attention to the many varieties of cross-bands, ruffles, zigzag edges and central folds in archaic works. But once classical prototypes are accepted, who is to say whether a specific rendering influences a comparable archaistic rendering during the same period or much later? For instance, the author dates the so-called Munich-Pergamon Tyche ca. 390/380 because her mantle border, running under both breasts, achieves

the same effect as the high girding of 4th century statues (p. 79). By the same token, however, one could defend an Augustan chronology based on her similarity with Roman statues (e.g. the Livia Orans in the Sala dei Busti, Vatican) which, admittedly, also go back to classical models especially popular in early Imperial times. Miss Herdejürgen stresses the difficulty of distinguishing true Roman copies from adaptations of post-archaic works, but a similar or even greater difficulty certainly exists in dating archaic art of the classical period if her chronology can almost consistently be at variance with that suggested in recent studies. It is perhaps fairer to admit that much more work should be done in this field, and in this respect her book is certainly a step in the right direction.

Like all books that develop from doctoral dissertations, this suffers from an over-diligent gathering of material without adequate illustration, especially in the case of unpublished pieces, but the few plates show unusual statues of considerable interest. The inclusion of seated figures and terracottas helps our understanding of the diagonal mantle on typical korai, even after the appearance of G. M. A. Richter's book on the subject. Indeed, this is a useful and informative work which may become a basic tool in all future studies of archaic and archaic statuary in Ionic attire.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

OLYMPIA. THE SCULPTURES OF THE TEMPLE OF ZEUS, by *Bernard Ashmole* and *Nicholas Yalouris*, with new photographs by *Alison Frantz*. Pp. 5 + 188, pls. 139, figs. 25 (line drawings). Phaidon Press, Ltd., London, 1967. \$15.00.

This handsome volume is designed to fill the need for a simple, introductory presentation of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia, a purpose it admirably fulfills. More than this it represents the best series of photographic studies of great Greek sculptures thus far produced. One would have expected such quality from Miss Frantz's lens; but the imaginative angles from which many of the figures are portrayed lend wholly new insight into the sculptors' method of thought. The ancient spectator saw the finished product in a single plane from 60 feet below. Thanks to these plates, it is possible almost to join the artists as they grapple with their material. The Kladeios (East Pediment A), for example, or the Lapith Woman and her rescuer (West Pediment R and T), present an astonishing vision of these giant figures conceived as thrusting their bulk dynamically into space. In every picture, whether it be the entire statue or a very small detail, the selection of the angle and the interpretation through light and shade is as exquisite a presentation of the subject as two dimensions can ever hope to give to three.

Phaidon publications usually are valued for their

illustrations more than their texts. In this case the editors have chosen two authors of skill in their profession and with the written word. The text is divided into two parts, in the first of which Professor Ashmole fluently summarizes the standard interpretation of the sculptures. Briefly he presents the setting of the shrine itself, its probable date, the disposition of the sculptures and their authorship. Of particular interest is his discussion of the problems involved in the transportation of the huge marble blocks from their quarries on Paros, the need for many artisans to carve them, and the certainty that a single authority ensured their uniformity of style.

The analysis of novelties, whether in variety of type or realism, and the importance of gesture are beautifully expressed. So, too, the compositions and the individual sculptures of both pediments and metopes are described vividly and with a minimum of academic debate. This portion of the text ends with a brief summary of the history of Pheidias' cult image and the conclusions officially pronounced for its date, as first advanced by Winckelmann two centuries ago and still adhered to by the excavators of Pheidias' Workshop in 1954-58.

The problem of condensing so large a mass of material into so short a space has been met so laudably that it seems ungracious to cavil at any part of it. One could wish, however, that once Professor Ashmole had decided to speculate on the handling of the marble blocks before they were installed on the temple he had spared a few words for the known method of fixing them in place. The temple is built of soft shell conglomerate, and Libon, the architect, seems to have had reservations about marble. Surely he did not expect these Parian giants to rest on the pedimental floors he had provided. How was this problem solved?

The author, discussing the addition of metal adjuncts in late times, sees Lapith T in the West Pediment supplied with a bronze knife of Hellenistic date. The marble hilt of this knife still exists as an integral part of the hand that grasps it; and without this weapon the whole pose of the figure has no meaning.

Finally one must note a small, but crucial, misinterpretation of Pausanias' ancient text, appropriately reproduced here in both Greek and translation. This document begins: "The temple and statue were made for Zeus from spoils when the Eleans destroyed in war Pisa and those of the surrounding inhabitants who conspired with the Pisatans." Professor Ashmole paraphrases this to read: ". . . when the destruction of Pisa brought (the rulers of Elis) great wealth. . . ." Pisa represented a federation of small, farming hill towns whose sack might have paid for the artificial mound on which the temple and all its adornments were erected. These, including the colossus of Zeus, were of the value of the ransom of many kings.

In the second section, Dr. Yalouris discusses the history of the sculptured fragments, their recomposition and their allocation to positions on both pedi-