1977

Review of *Studien zur nordostgriechischen Kunst*, by Ernst Langlotz

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](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

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. [http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/18](http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/18)

For more information, please contact repository@brynmawr.edu.
article. In lieu of this, I hope to present more specialized references to various of its aspects in other contexts as contributions to the further studies which will surely be elicited by the existence of this basic reference book.

J.L. Benson

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT AMHERST


Exactly fifty years ago Langlotz published his pioneering Frühhchische Bildhauerschulen; he has now returned to the subject of regional schools with his latest, perhaps even his last, book. But this time the focus is on the art of northeast Asia Minor, with other artistic currents included only if related. Even for this geographical emphasis a previous publication had paved the way (Die kulturelle und künstlerische Hellenisierung der Küsten des Mittelmeers durch die Stadt Phokaia, 1966), but Nordostgriechische Kunst goes well beyond the many germinal ideas of the earlier work, and each problem is discussed at greater length with copious illustrations.

Langlotz states that his text is meant largely as accompaniment to the photographs, many of them new or of unpublished pieces. He has written instead a densely packed book, in which every line suggests a new theory or points out an unusual detail, and a staggering knowledge of unpublished material pervades every page. Most of the pieces mentioned were directly examined, often by means of casts now added to the Bonn collection; others, not available, are known through hearsay. Often repeated is the archaeologist’s lament against illicit excavations, the dispersal of precious evidence, the deterioration of ancient pieces reused in modern constructions; above all echoes the scholar’s frustration at the many unpublished antiquities which could so considerably contribute to our understanding of East Greek art. The text is compounded with personal reminiscences and free associations derived from the immense knowledge of a scholar who has lived for years with his material; therefore random comments are likely to occur in various places, regardless of the section headings, and it is deeply regrettable that a book of this nature could not be provided with an index, staggering as the task may have been.

To summarize and review a book of this sort is virtually impossible. There is, to be sure, a definite logical trend linking the various sections together, as there are theories on which one could argue and disagree. One could correct misspelled names and wrong references, or one could add bibliography, since footnotes are uneven, if mostly up to date. But to do so without first stressing the unregimented wealth of the book would be to mislead the reader and do injustice to the author. It is only with this understanding that the following comments are offered.

To isolate the artistic traits of Northeastern art, Langlotz begins with Phokaia’s coinage, which had such importance during the sixth century as to insure the city’s crucial role for the territory between Smyrna and Kyzikos. Coins, regrettably, represent almost the entire artistic evidence from the site, but they are homogeneous and distinctive enough to provide important stylistic clues, especially in the rendering of faces with S-shaped profiles and characteristic hairstyles. From coins, the author moves to terracottas, both architectural reliefs and votive figures, then to the Aeolic treasuries built at Delphi by the East Greek cities or their colonies. He then groups several works found outside Asia Minor, but in territories under its influence, such as Thessaly, and finally considers finds which can rank as exports. In conclusion, four stylistic centers are identified: one at Phokaia, one based on Lesbos and the south Troad, one on the Mimas peninsula, and an Old-Aeolic group. The art of Chios is found to be more closely related to that of south Ionia than to that of the opposite coast, while the reverse is true for Samos, which has many stylistic traits in common with Aeolia, but fewer with the nearby Ionic shore. Constant references to Etruscan and Magna-Graecian Art are scattered throughout.

Discussion begins with chronological problems. Langlotz questions a Netos-amphora dated to ca. 610 B.C. when its figures are similar to the Akropolis Triton (Hekatompedon) pediment placed after 580 B.C. And why is Kleobis, usually dated 590/580 B.C., related to a Chigi vase belonging around 640 B.C.? Graves, including the Marathon tumulus, give misleading pictures of contemporary ceramics, therefore Early Corinthian can begin ca. 600 B.C., and turn into Middle Corinthian around 585/580 B.C. Finds from Old Smyrna cannot all date before a 600/590 B.C. destruction, witness a Sophilos fragment (ca. 580 B.C.) with traces of fire; later habitation is also postulated. The famous Aiakes in Samos was made around 500 B.C.; though unrelated to Polykrates’ father, it represents the dedicant himself. Most of the Akropolis korai make sense only after the tyrants’ expulsion in 510 B.C. In general, Langlotz lowers traditional dates and defines peculiarities of fashion and hairstyle in chronological and regional terms in a most stimulating, if controversial, chapter. The next section, on coins, points out the Northeast Greek predilection for head ornament over the temples, before the ears, thus assuring an Aeolic (Thessalian?) context for the “Adoration of the Flower” in the Louvre: a comment which recurs like a leitmotif throughout the text. Then follow six sections on the Delphic treasuries, though the ex-Knidian head is discussed again much later (pp. 62-63; 140-43). The Massiliote Treasury may have had columnae caelatae; in its frieze (Gigantomachy or Amazonomachy) note the motif of the victorious oppo
ment stepping on the defeated victim, which is usually considered an expression of Magna-Graecian brutality, but occurs both here and on an unidentified treasury in early Severe style. The Knidian treasury, smaller than the Siphnian, could not have used the large karyatids presently attributed to it, which perhaps belong to the Klasizist. Their style dates them ca. 525 B.C. New photographs of many architectural sculptures in Delphi remind us how attractive the less well-known are; but even the more famous Siphian treasury raises a barrage of questions. In discussing terracotta revetments, Langlotz plays down mainland Greek influence, stresses Oriental connections, suggests that the change from black to red figure originated in Asia Minor. Typical votive figurines have a pointed cap: the Etruscans’ *tutulus.* Lists of sculptures from Northeast Asia Minor include many unpublished pieces. A few important monuments are discussed at some length: the kouros from Pitane, other draped male figures, several asymmetrical heads (that of a “kouros” from Keramos should belong to a sphinx or siren, p. 177), a peplos kore in the Terme museum. Among related pieces from other find-spots, Langlotz ascribes to Northeast Greek schools the Tarentine kore in Berlin and Akr. 685, which share a similar draping of the diagonal himation with long central fold running obliquely from the right shoulder. The Athena head from the Palatine in Rome is an East Greek palladion; East Greek are also the ivory heads in Delphi, the Fauvel head in the Louvre, the seated “prophet” from Didyma in Istanbul.

Other sections discuss the Dionyshermos in the Louvre, a series of small bronzes, works related to the ex-Knidian head (which include the naked Aphrodite in Orvieto, usually considered Etruscan; the Phormis at Olympia and the Leonidas in Sparta confirm that East Greek masters were working in Lakonia). A section on the Webb head reopens the question of Antenor’s kore, which should be settled by new and proper examination of the base. Langlotz considers the kore East Greek, as well as the Webb head (overrestored original, not Flavian copy) and the pedimental marble sculptures from the Delphic temple which definitely belong around 510 B.C. A section on a small horseman (Akr. 623) includes the comment that all marble sculpture on Aegina was also done by East Greek masters. Brief remarks on the stylistic group of a bronze youth (British Museum 515), mirror support from Thebes (British Museum 224), the Louvre torso from Miletos (not from Paros, but from an Asia Minor workshop) are followed by a section on the Apollo Klarios, which had appeared in much shorter version in *Mélanges Mansel*; Langlotz considers the Chatsworth head a good contemporary echo of the famous cult statue. A page on Cybele reliefs precedes more extensive notes on works from Samos, Paros, Chios, and Naxos. Here, as elsewhere, Langlotz refutes several of his 1927 attributions in the light of new material, but insists, again throughout the book, that only modern marble testing will solve stylistic arguments. Note that Langlotz considers the Sounion kouroi Naxian, but attributes the Dipylon and New York kouroi to Parian sculptors. A lengthy chapter on some East Greek masters convincingly argues that Endoios was an Ionian who later emigrated to Greece. The final section has an extensive discussion of Northeast Greek pottery, with original ideas also about Italic and Etruscan wares. An insistence on vessel shapes points out forms unknown to the Attic repertoire, but rooted in Anatolian tradition. Many familiar masters, both potters and painters, are given an Asia Minor origin. The text is especially valuable since it can take into account much unpublished material.

Though based on intangibles, the total picture of a coherent Northeast Asia Minor style manages to emerge from the penetrating text and the cleverly juxtaposed photographs. Readers will disagree with many individual attributions, but we shall all be richer because of this last tour-de-force by a great connaisseur of Greek art.

Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway
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In 1975 two important works by the great classical scholar and archaeologist Carl Robert, *Bild und Lied* (1881) and *Archäologische Hermeneutik* (1919), were reprinted in an Arno Press collection of studies in “Ancient Religion and Mythology.” The rebirth of these timeless works has thus coincided with the republication in the same year of essays and articles by Karl Scheufold in a volume celebrating his seventieth birthday, the title of which was deliberately chosen by the author as a tribute to Robert’s earlier work.

Predacing the essays themselves are a sensitive introduction written by Ernst Berger, a Tabula Gratulatoria, and a Bibliography of the writings of Karl Scheufold from 1966 to 1974 which supplements the list of earlier publications which had been drawn up in *Gestalt und Geschichte. Festschrift Karl Scheufeld, Antik 4.* Beiheti (1967) 5-12.

The author and celebrant has himself made the selection of essays and articles to be published here and has attempted to include characteristic works representative of different phases and areas of his wide-ranging scholarly activity, with some preference given to those which have appeared in publications which are often not easily accessible. With the exception of the article “Erscheinungen der Götter Homer,” the essay entitled “Dass nochmals Wachstum bricht aus