

**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

---

1972

Review of *Die Entwicklung griechischer Statuenbasen und die Aufstellung der Statuen*, by Margrit Jacob-Felsch

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. 1972. Review of *Die Entwicklung griechischer Statuenbasen und die Aufstellung der Statuen*, by Margrit Jacob-Felsch. *American Journal of Archaeology* 76:335-336.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. [http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch\\_pubs/29](http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/29)

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

interesting way, luxuriously illustrated with plans, drawings and photographs. Moreover, he has conscientiously attempted to take into account developments in military tactics, strategy, siegecraft and weaponry, as derived from the ancient historians and theoreticians of military science, and he has tried to relate the facts of preserved fortifications to all this in order to illuminate both.

His work, then, will be thoroughly interesting and valuable to archaeologists, historians and antiquarians in general as well as to professional and amateur specialists in military affairs, for the information compiled and for the general picture presented. Fundamentally, however, its most important level of meaning may lie in the field of urban planning, in illuminating aspects of this problem effective among the ancients which are not so immediately apparent to us today.

There are, naturally, some aspects of the work which raise questions. For one kind of example it would have been interesting, though perhaps not in the end actually helpful, to have further explored Assyrian defense and siegecraft and its particular relation to that of later powers. But most of the questions or points of disagreement will have to do with one or another of the multitude of facts and individual interpretations for which the data do not really allow clear decision. Taken further, however, these do point to a more general question, that despite the tremendous number of examples observed and studied, and the vast collection of information, one has to admit (the author first of all) that the individual data are still, against the totality of ancient fortifications originally designed and erected, fairly random, incomplete, and often inadequately known. General conclusions from the data, then, must in the nature of the case be considered more tentative than in areas of archaeology where more nearly complete and systematic data are available, though Winter's own treatment does seem judicious and within reasonable probability.

A more fundamental question is suggested by the fact that while Winter rather studiously and cautiously—and quite properly—refrains from elaborate and precise schemata of “types” and “development,” clearly this concept of formulation is in his mind, in his discussion of sites as well as military engineering, and this does affect a little his conclusions or at least the thrust of the work. Granting that there are technological factors involved, and that these relate specifically to dates and have, in this context, certain more or less definable channels of dispersal, one wonders perhaps whether in this field the uniqueness of an individual solution to a particular problem under specific conditions might not be even more meaningful. Would it not be worthwhile also to approach this problem by the overall analysis of particular towns, rather than by walls, towers, gates, etc.? But, then, to do this one would need Mr. Winter's book, and perhaps he will go on to this next inquiry himself.

A word should be said of the format of publication.

The volume is an “oblong octavo” and the type occupies only half a page—one broad column, so to speak. The other half is bare, unless occupied by an appropriate illustration. There is not much blank space, but enough for the reader to appreciate the generosity of the publisher, and the unusual convenience of this method of running the illustrations with the text.

ROBERT SCRANTON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

DIE ENTWICKLUNG GRIECHISCHER STATUENBASEN UND DIE AUFSTELLUNG DER STATUEN, by *Margrit Jacob-Felsch*. Pp. ix + 232, one folding chart. Stifftland-Verlag K.G., Waldassen/Bayern, 1969.

After years of relative disinterest, the setting of Greek sculpture has recently received attention from several scholars. But while two articles have concentrated specifically on the statuary and what could be learned from its positioning (T. Dohrn, “Klassizistische Gesinnung und Aufstellung antiker Statuen,” *Opus Nobile*, Festschrift Jantzen 1969, 31-34; B. S. Ridgway, “The Setting of Greek Sculpture,” *Hesperia* 40 [1971] 336-356), two books have focussed on statue bases: F. Eckstein's *Anathemata* (Berlin 1969, see *AJA* 75 [1971] 342-343), limited to the Severe period at Olympia, and the volume under review. In this last case the author has actually given more than promised by her title, since tripod bases and even architectural choragic monuments are included.

The decision to provide a statue with a separate base, obvious as it may seem, distinguishes Greek sculptors from their Egyptian or Mesopotamian counterparts who did not employ such setting devices. The practice stemmed from a desire to secure an object firmly to its open-air environment, and therefore at first the plinth itself was sunk into bedrock. But where the ground provided no such natural stand a separate base was introduced and later on developed into a variety of forms conditioned by technical ability, location, purpose and even the originality of the master responsible for its creation. The author has carefully followed this development, dividing her material by periods (ca. 650-80 B.C.) and by type within each period. Attention is paid in each chapter to purpose and setting of sculpture. A folding chart of base forms graphically supplements a chronologically arranged catalogue of extant sculpture with securely attributed bases, an appendix of statuary to which bases have been attributed on insufficient grounds, a second catalogue, by types, of bases for which no sculpture is available, and finally a topographical index of all bases mentioned in the text. This last is more comprehensive than both catalogues combined, and raises a question as to the principles of selection. Such a query is perhaps all the more valid in cases where conclusions are drawn from the distribution patterns of specific types, pillar monuments for instance, of which that of Agrippa is said to be the

only one outside of Delphi (p. 100). Yet at least one other comparable pedestal stood in Athens in front of the Stoa of Attalos (*Hesperia* 19 [1950] 317-318). The Ionic column list omits the monument to the Battle of Marathon (*Hesperia* 35 [1966] 93-106) and the archaic sphinx and column from Cyrene (see most recently *AJA* 65 [1971] 47-55). Some articles perhaps appeared too late to be included in the book, but one wonders at the omission of E. Harrison, *Agora* 11 (1965), from references to archaic and archaistic Agora material. In brief, both bibliography and catalogues show some peculiar gaps, yet by and large the work is most valuable and its general conclusions are very interesting and plausible. I select for mention here only a few specific statements.

Originally the impulse to give a base to a statue may have come from Neo-Hittite/North Syrian areas, and the early examples mostly stem from Ionic territory; but in the late and sub-archaic period Attica moves into the foreground, probably stimulated by Ionic masters. Innovations and changes in bases occur only after a new sculptural trend has already asserted itself, so that bases seem always to lag slightly behind the monuments they support. Yet a late fourth century archaistic work was given an archaizing base, and the Severe style brought back a simple type of stand which had virtually disappeared during the late archaic period. A two-stepped base is postulated for the Delphi Charioteer, since this seems to have been the standard pedestal for chariot compositions at the time. Paionios "invented" the triangular pillar, since presumably he was responsible also for the two Delphic examples. Pheidias, in turn, was probably the creator of the "orthostatic base" as well as of the more complex form used for the Promachos (partly stepped, partly socle-like) which found its real development only in the fourth century. The orthostatic base also continued into that period, witness the Mantinea Base which the author dates ca. 330/320 B.C., though without stating her grounds. In general, chronology seems mostly derived from sculptural or epigraphical criteria, a reasonable and perhaps inevitable, though somewhat circular procedure, whereas one might wish for more independence within the specific field of statue bases. A good example of such independence is the suggested chronology for the Praxitelean Hermes' pedestal at Olympia: not earlier than the first century B.C. because of the strong upper taper of the middle block (p. 93).

The period between 410 and 315 B.C. saw no innovation in typology, but creativity set in again with the different outlook on sculpture in the Hellenistic period. Now the spectator may be provided with a bench, under the same roof, to sit and look at statuary at his leisure. But the fourth century had already introduced covered enclosures for votive offerings, partly as protection against weathering, partly as substitutes for treasuries. Thus a roof is postulated over the Navarchoi at Delphi (to the left of the sacred road, therefore not simply an open niche because not required by the terrain), and a whole structure for

Daochos' dedication, which may have earlier housed Neoptolemos' shrine. Finally, with ship bases, the purely stereometric form of previous pedestals was replaced with a conscious imitation of a shape from "real life." The idea, born probably in maritime Rhodes around 280 B.C., spread rapidly and led naturally to the increased illusionism of Roman times.

In this wealth of material and information I shall take issue with two points. The author states that originally base and statue were made in the same place and therefore the pedestal could be inscribed rather than the sculpture. When the latter instead carries the dedication one can assume that statue and stand were made at different spots. I would suggest that the practice of carving inscriptions directly on the statuary is Ionian, presumably prompted by Oriental and Egyptian prototypes where the text had great historical and magical significance. In Greece proper a more "naturalistic" conception of sculpture must have discarded the Ionian convention, and the consequent greater respect for the integrity of the human body as reflected in a statue must have prompted the shifting of the inscription to the more amorphous base. My second objection is to the theory that the Ionic column was adopted as a pedestal for statuary from the realm of architecture, witness the basic disharmony between the main view of a sphinx and that of its supporting Ionic capital. I find that the exaggerated elongation of the early volute capitals may have been determined by the very need to support the length of a reclining feline body, and that the idea of placing animals on high columns for protective purposes may well have been derived from Assyria, where no architectural connections existed.

As the author notes, Greek statue bases were always individual creations, never mass produced; this study will therefore prove of interest to all students of sculpture and architecture.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

FIGHTING ON LAND AND SEA IN GREEK GEOMETRIC ART, by *Gudrun Ahlberg* (Skrifter Utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen, 4<sup>o</sup> XVI). Pp. 114, figs. 114. Berlingska Boktryckeriet, Lund, 1971. Sw. Crs. 75.

The combat scenes on Greek Geometric vases form a small and specialized *corpus*. Most occur on large funerary kraters produced in Athens in the workshop of the Dipylon Master, who was active about the middle of the 8th century B.C. In spite of the relatively small body of material, however, the group of scenes is of great interest for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is the fact that within these fragmentary and schematized representations may lie the genesis of the Athenian narrative style. Ahlberg restricts herself to a consideration of the painted pottery, and treats only scenes in which the figures actually engage