

1967

Review of *Die thessalischen Grabreliefs: Studien zur nordgriechischen Kunst*, by Hagen Biesantz

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. 1967. Review of *Die thessalischen Grabreliefs: Studien zur nordgriechischen Kunst*, by Hagen Biesantz. *American Journal of Archaeology* 71:99-101.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/101

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

and architecture and puts it beyond the reach of material analysis. Such a treatment is not without pitfalls. By endowing the commonplace and accidental with recondite significance the author has been led to embrace some far-fetched and patently erroneous interpretations of architectural features. Ecstatic utterances about the effect of curvatures sound convincing enough when they pertain to the Parthenon, but when we find equally delicate refinements in secular buildings we have to look elsewhere than to religion for their origin and meaning. The addition of the peristyle to the early form of the cella the author explains not on practical or even essentially aesthetic grounds, but as a measure designed to lift the house of the god out of the secular domain ["Das Haus des Gottes soll durch sie (die Ringhalle) aus dem profanen Bereich erhoben werden"]. He even goes so far as to deny that the temple at Segesta was ever intended to have a roof or a cella but regards it as being in its present form essentially a finished building.

The text is written in beautiful poetic style, a prose hymn to temple architecture and to the religious conceptions that gave the temple form and essence. The author has succeeded by such language and with the aid of superb photographs, taken mostly by himself, and with a few characteristic temple plans to convey and exemplify the reality of compact unity, which he finds to be the fundamental characteristic of the temple—more particularly the Doric temple—of the Classical Greek era.

OSCAR BRONEER

ANCIENT CORINTH

MASTERPIECES OF GREEK ART, by *Raymond V. Schoder*, S.J., Second Edition. Introductory pp. 24, colored plates with commentaries, 96. New York Graphic Society, Greenwich, Conn. 1965. \$13.50.

This attractive picture book on Greek art, first published in 1961, has now appeared in a new and improved edition. The changes, though comparatively slight in extent, are important. The general bibliography, of use to the layman, has been expanded and a brief but useful "Research Bibliography" relating to the objects illustrated in the book has been added.

The author is an idealist and enthusiast. His observations are direct and natural, free from any ambition to show off with originality or erudition. In some cases his comments might be more effective if he had granted the reader greater opportunity to discover for himself the message which the objects convey. But he does not talk down to his readers, he treats them to a simple and free discourse about the objects as they view them on the plates. Some of his comments read rather too much like sales talk. To the classicist they may seem commonplace and redundant, but the layman will find in them a convenient handrail as he ventures into what is to him unexplored territory. The author's unfeigned enthusiasm

cannot fail to communicate itself to the less critical reader for whom the book is primarily intended.

The photographs are the same as in the first edition but in many cases the colors have been much improved. Even so they inevitably leave something to be desired. In some of the vases the background has taken on a greenish or, more often, bright orange color which does not suggest the warm red of the Attic clay. And the monochrome marble and bronze statues, many of which show an unnatural pink tinge, would perhaps have come out more true to the original in black and white photography.

These are points of general criticism which can be leveled at nearly all books of this kind, in which the authors aim at satisfying the needs of the general reader without offending the often unreasonable demands of the connoisseur. The fact that a second edition has become necessary shows the lasting usefulness of the book. To readers wishing to gain an introduction into things Greek or seeking to rekindle their first passion for the art of Greece, the new edition of *Masterpieces of Greek Art* will admirably serve the purpose which the author had in mind.

OSCAR BRONEER

ANCIENT CORINTH

DIE THESSALISCHEN GRABRELIEFS—STUDIEN ZUR NORDGRIECHISCHEN KUNST, by *Hagen Biesantz*. Pp. xii + 204, pls. 8, 2 maps. Verlag Philip von Zabern, Mainz, 1965. \$24.50.

A series of articles and excavation reports in recent German publications had already revealed Biesantz's interest in Thessalian archaeology. His research has now found extensive expression in this magnificent book on fifth and fourth century funerary reliefs. These are seen in the context of all available Thessalian material with sculptural connections, including minor arts and coins, from the eighth to the end of the fourth century B.C.

The work is an outstanding example of thoroughness. It begins with a Catalogue of the 58 extant grave reliefs, each identified with a K plus a serial number. The List which follows (L plus serial number) includes 43 pieces of sculpture in the round, 17 reliefs, 92 statuettes in bronze and terracotta, and 7 pieces of gold jewelry with human or animal representations. All but one of the stelai are illustrated, one by just a drawing because the original is lost, some by more than one view and a few details. Of the other items, 59 are not depicted, but all the most important pieces are shown and there are also three plates each of forgeries and coins. The first three chapters concentrate on the stelai: their chronology, material, shapes, inscriptions, representational forms and content. The scope then widens to include all Thessalian plastic art grouped according to geographical distribution and stylistic affiliations. The evidence of monuments in Thessalian as well as in other Greek or foreign museums is supplemented by that of

ancient sources, which include references to outside masters working in Thessaly as well as to Thessalian dedications elsewhere. Finally the author discusses forgeries, attempts an outline of the development of Thessalian sculpture, and summarizes previous trends in the study of North Greek art. The indices give the chronology of first publications (the first piece appeared in 1826; as many as 21 stelai and 40 other items in 1965); lists of museums and collections; places; ancient and modern names; ancient authors; inscriptions; subjects. There are moreover several tables included in the text: a schematic summary of the catalogue with serial and plate numbers and tentative dates (pp. 4-6); a chronological sequence of the stelai (41-42); the dates of single pieces according to Rhomaios, Brommer, Lippold and the author (45-46); lists of local works grouped by sites (Ch. IV); a table of stylistic groups in their regional interrelations (153-154); a list of numismatic illustrations and a correlation of the catalogue number with the respective plates (204). In spite of all this synthesis and visual help, the lack of captions under each photograph is an inconvenient omission. While the catalogue arranges the stelai chronologically within political districts, the plates group them by types (seated female figures; standing female figures; standing youths; etc.) so that pl. 1, e.g., illustrates together K 5, the spinner from Phalanna in Volos, and K 54, the seated matron in the Peiraeus museum. There is also a certain unevenness in the catalogue entries, some of which could be more inclusive: the reader should be informed completely about all details, including, e.g., holes for metal attachments, or the presence of later inscriptions even if not pertinent, rather than having to find references to such items later in the text. It would also have been interesting to hear Biesantz's opinion on the small figure which J. Frel recognized in outline in the damaged area before the Peiraeus lady (*Listy Filologicke* 88 [1965] 18-19, D). If such a personage indeed originally existed, it would support Biesantz's contention that mid-fifth century Attic stelai received their multi-figured repertoire from the non-Attic masters who fostered their resumption after the pause at the end of the sixth century. The two major theses held at present ascribe many-figured compositions in Attic stelai to a gradual inner development from archaic funerary/votive predecessors, or to adaptation of Lakonian heroizing reliefs.

It is obvious that the author is thoroughly familiar with his material and that he has shuffled and reshuffled his file cards into all possible combinations. As a result, a few contradictions and a certain amount of repetition occur, but the reader is left with the impression that all possible angles have been explored. The material itself justifies this unqualified attention, since it constitutes one of the three substantial groups of Greek stelai safely attributable to a region. Of the other two, neither the Attic nor the Boeotian present comparable evidence for the Severe period. The other available stelai, widely scattered in their geographical distribution, cannot be arranged

into groups with a recognizable chronological evolution.

For all its appeal and recent popularity, ancient funerary art is as yet imperfectly known. We tend to think in terms of Attic art alone and visualize its archaic production according to the authoritative schemes laid down by Miss Richter. It is however becoming gradually apparent that Attica neither had a monopoly in the production of figured stelai nor limited its typology to the two well-known formats. Fifth century Thessaly contributes to this issue the evidence of a sphinx monument as late as ca. 450 B.C. and of an archaizing anthemion stele from the Severe period which obviously reflects an established tradition of archaic funerary monuments. Two-figured compositions already exist. The first stelai crowned by pediments, but without side supports, appear around 450 and show an influence of the island style which continues into the third quarter of the fifth century, carrying with it the echoes of the Severe style. Only toward the end of the century does the stylistic freedom of the Parthenon sculptures reach Thessaly and assert itself side by side with contemporary innovations; but a real imitation of Attic art does not begin until well into the fourth century, thus condemning Thessalian sculpture to "provincialism," i.e., lack of individual expression.

This outline in general applies also to the development of Thessalian sculpture. Thessaly appears as a closed artistic province *sui generis*, its art flourishing under the auspices of local rulers, its political centers harboring sculptural workshops subject to mutual as well as outside influence. A conservative trend, which perpetuates traits of the Severe style down to the late fourth century, runs parallel with an Atticizing current, and a local strikingly linear style asserts itself at the same time. The average quality of the extant works is not outstanding, but there are some good pieces, and, as the author repeatedly stresses, the nature of excavations and finds in Thessaly is largely erratic. There are many geographical and chronological gaps in our knowledge, which it is hoped future research will help to eliminate. In an attempt to fill some of them, Biesantz ventures attribution of pieces of uncertain origin, such as the Protesilaos in New York or the Ludovisi Throne. For the latter he revives Flickinger's theory that it might come from the Thetideion near Pharsalos, and without pronouncing himself on the questions of authenticity, chronology and style, Biesantz defends Flickinger's related interpretation of the Boston counterpart. Unfortunately the one superior relief from Pharsalos, the "Adoration of the Flower" in the Louvre (K 36), seems an inadequate basis on which to build stylistic correlations.

More conclusive is the evidence of a male head (L 34), also from Pharsalos, with obvious resemblance to the famous Agias in Delphi. Biesantz concludes that both monuments retain echoes of Lysippos' art as represented by the original bronze Agias in Pharsalos, and convincingly suggests that the Delphic dedication might have been executed by two Thessalian sculptors, Hippokrates and Herakleides of Atrax, who

had already made another group for the same sanctuary. In support, he stresses (p. 105) the copy-like dryness of the other statues in Daochos' dedication—a quality shared by other undoubted Thessalian pieces—as contrasted with the greater tridimensionality of the Agias. I personally find the Agias fairly frontal, but this trait might be the consequence of adapting a single statue to a paratactic group composition; on the other hand it is more difficult to separate stylistically the Agias from the Agelaos, as stressed by E. Sjöqvist (whose article in *OpusAth* 1 should be included in the bibliography).

The author's major contribution lies in the province of funerary stelai. He reviews Akurgal's theories on the geographical distribution of formats in the Severe period and concludes that, since all the shapes can be found in Thessaly at the same time, no regional validity can be attached to such distinctions. Throughout the text runs a sensible stress on the everyday connotation of scenes and objects in the grave reliefs, as contrasted with the symbolic and metaphysical approach of both earlier and recent studies. Detailed analysis of costumes, ornaments, footwear, headdresses, hairstyles, weapons, attributes, animals and plants, furniture, as they appear in the stelai, confirms their "human" character and provides useful information on Thessalian fashions (one manner of wearing the mantle in partial nudity may have "heroizing" undertones). I like the suggestion that children, servants, or other family members were added to the initially solitary figure of the deceased as a means of further characterization: the dead person seen not only as a man, a rider or a warrior, but also as a member of a household, a father, a pedagogue.

The one criticism one may direct at the book is that it is trying to do too much with too little: that some of the reliefs discussed may be votive rather than funerary and thus less significant than they are made to appear; that stylistic affiliations or attributions to specific workshops are not always convincing; that the gaps are more extensive than the evidence and therefore conclusions are somewhat dangerous. Yet there is great need for courageous attempts of this kind, and Biesantz's contribution will retain primary importance for the study of Thessalian art.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

I FRONTONI DEL TEMPIO DI APHAIA AD EGINA, by *Antonio Invernizzi* (Università di Torino, Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, vol. 16, fasc. 4). Pp. vii + 271, pls. 27. G. Giapichelli Ed., Torino, 1965. Lit. 4000.

This book was written either too early or too late: too early because it could not fully take into account those changes in the appearance and composition of the pedimental sculpture which the current removal of all modern additions is bringing about; too late because this work of restoration was already well in

progress when the author visited Munich (p. vi) and must have prevented him from examining the statues with ease. As a doctoral dissertation Invernizzi's manuscript was completed by the end of 1963; I myself was in Munich in the summer of 1965 and still could acquire only a general impression of the innovations and changes in the Aeginetan sculptures, despite the cordial assistance of the museum authorities.

The book, therefore, remains what a dissertation is almost bound to be: a painstaking collection and summary of previous bibliography, a somewhat theoretical discussion of methodology and a rather lengthy description of style and composition with a closing statement on attribution and chronology. But the analysis of the individual figures suffers from lack of prolonged examination of the originals (rather than of casts and photographs), and some of the statements on composition, though aesthetically penetrating and convincing, have already been undermined by the new arrangements I saw in Munich. It would be useless to try to discuss now which arrangement is more satisfactory, or whether Invernizzi might still be correct in some of his assumptions; nor is it fair of me to use information acquired orally and which by necessity must be considered of a provisional nature. We must wait for the final publication by the Munich archaeologists, who have had the unprecedented opportunity of handling the Aeginetan pieces in their original state, of examining and attributing fragments once discarded because of their poor "public" appearance, of correlating the evidence of the sculptures with that of the architectural blocks now back in situ. Only when this information is available shall we be able to evaluate the evidence and perhaps draw our own conclusions. From this point of view one might almost say that Invernizzi has had considerable courage in presenting his opinions so shortly before the thorough republication of the subject.

Under the circumstances, what Invernizzi might have done, but did not or could not do, was to provide a new discussion of some physical features of the statues which are still open to interpretation or comments despite Furtwängler's accurate exposition. What comes to mind, for instance, is a study of the various supports and bars that fastened the statues to the tympanon or allowed for the proper balancing of heavy marble accessories. Another item of interest is the use (or the lack of use) of metal attachments. Furtwängler had discussed some of these features and provided some general comments, but many holes on the marbles themselves have not yet been satisfactorily explained. Invernizzi introduces at times some remarks on these technical characteristics, but casually, almost *en passant*, within the more general description of anatomical details. The chapter devoted to "Considerazioni tecnico-stilistiche" actually contains a refutation of the current theory of bronze influence on Aeginetan sculpture, and a somewhat subjective definition of the Aeginetan school, characterized, according to the author, by an unusual "plastic" conception of pedimental figures as statues in the round with a definite position in space. The author probably could