

**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

---

1978

*Review of Greek Sculpture of the Archaic Period: The Island Workshops*, by John Griffiths Pedley

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. 1978. Review of *Greek Sculpture of the Archaic Period: The Island Workshops*, by John Griffiths Pedley. *American Journal of Archaeology* 82:120-121.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. [http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch\\_pubs/39](http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/39)

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

One group of the Hymettos inscriptions, those with abecedaria and *egraphse*, is particularly interesting because they are not paralleled at other sanctuaries, even early ones. The inscription itself is the dedication and not the pot on which it is written; indeed the pot in several instances was already broken when the inscription was made. Langdon draws the reasonable conclusion that "writing must have been still so new that its accomplishment was being stressed" (p. 46). The general appearance of the letter forms also leads him to believe that these graffiti belong near the beginning of writing in Attica.

The catalogue of pottery and other finds in the third chapter begins with no. 174, an Early Helladic sauceboat, and ends with no. 349, a fragment of a sixth century A.D. lamp. There is a small amount of material from the Bronze Age as well as a fair amount from Late Protogeometric (some pieces are quite nice, such as nos. 190 and 192) and Early and Middle Geometric. But the bulk of the material is Late Geometric II and Subgeometric or Protoattic. Offerings were still being made in the sixth century B.C. but were down sharply, and the sanctuary was certainly little used from that time until the end of antiquity when fragments of some 120 lamps attest renewed activity.

Notes on the LG-SG-EPA material: The horse's head on no. 243 is close to the Hirschfeld Workshop's treatment. The captions for nos. 277 and 278 are interchanged on pl. 23. The comparison for no. 283 on *Ker. V. 1*, pl. 107 should be inv. 319, not 352. The hourglass shields on nos. 288 and 291 are interesting; the shape of no. 288's is unparalleled, to my knowledge. The scene on no. 293 with lion followed by man standing on another animal's tail is also unusual. Bearded elements in the spirals of no. 294 and also on the reverse S's of no. 298 remind me of the Mesogeia Painter. The proportions of the legs on no. 294, probably an amphora fragment, would be appropriate for either the Analatos or Mesogeia Painter; at any rate, this piece came from a more important vase than the general run of the finds. There are no figures on no. 298, an elegant kotyle. The figure on no. 295 is important because he carries a round shield with a blazon (a bird), probably a hoplite shield; the tree behind him is also interesting; compare the tree on the Early Protoattic stand in Munich, no. 8936. The shape of no. 295, a flat-bottomed conical oinochoe, is fairly unusual in Attic; it strikes me as a nice piece. Perhaps most of the pots dedicated are small because one could not climb a mountain with a pot the size of Athens 804 or even 894!

Langdon believes that the site is probably to be identified with the sanctuary of Zeus Ombrios on Hymettos mentioned by Pausanias and discounts a rival theory which places the altar mentioned by Pausanias above Koropi overlooking the Mesogeia plain. The finds indicate that the sanctuary was most visited in the Protogeometric-Geometric-Archaic and Late

Roman periods. He draws the reasonable conclusion that the activity of the sanctuary reflects the agricultural history of Attica. People must have gone there to pray for rain, and rain was really important when the inhabitants of Attica were dependent on their own soil for basic grain supplies. In the classical period Athens imported grain and was not so dependent on rain. There is also some evidence for drought in the Late Geometric period (a large number of wells in the Agora were closed then)—note the paper on this subject given by John McK. Camp, II, during the Christmas 1976 meetings, *AJA* 81 (1977) 240—and prayers for rain would have been especially important.

The first of the two appendices covers other deities connected with Hymettos either by Pausanias or by inscription. The most important is Zeus Hymettios who had a statue, according to Pausanias; a white limestone stele found in the depression could have been its base. Cuttings would indicate a small bronze figure; there were slight traces of a four-line inscription, but not legible. Since the stele was too heavy to be taken down the mountain, it was reburied in the hollow. Gaia might be mentioned in a graffito, but the reading is disputed; Heracles might be associated with the so-called Heroon. The second appendix covers other mountain-top sites both in Attica and elsewhere in Greece with attempts to identify similar sanctuaries and to draw wider-ranging conclusions. Many of these sanctuaries were most active at about the same time as the Hymettos sanctuary, the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. Langdon climbed to many of these sites himself; others were off-limits to him because of military restrictions, and he warns us to expect further military expropriation.

This book will be useful not only for its fine treatment of the Hymettos material, but also as a standard reference for mountain-top sanctuaries in Greece. It is a first-class production.

CYNTHIA KING

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS  
WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY  
DAYTON, OHIO 45431

GREEK SCULPTURE OF THE ARCHAIC PERIOD: THE ISLAND WORKSHOPS, by *John Griffiths Pedley*. Pp. 69, pls. 47. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz, 1976. DM 78.

Studies of Archaic sculpture have in recent years taken a new direction, or rather, they have returned to the problem of isolating regional traits and schools after the pioneering efforts of Gisela Richter established the basic affinity and widespread distribution of statuary types. Thus Richter's theory of stylistic development along naturalistic lines forms one of the basic premises of Pedley's study, but modified by the belief that such development did not proceed at

a uniform pace in the different areas of the Greek world. The author acknowledges that, with increase in naturalism, discerning workshops becomes proportionately more difficult, so that late sixth century sculptures can be seen as part of a stylistic and technological koine. But he sets out to distinguish schools for the early periods, and most of his groupings carry conviction.

Methodology is based on common sense: works found at a site of little or no religious importance, in an area provided with marble quarries, are likely to have been made locally, especially if unfinished. For attributing works at large, signatures of artists, dedicatory inscriptions and scripts are "useful, if tricky"; the geographical origin of marbles is "deceptive but useful in certain circumstances," historical probability "is helpful" (p. 13). Exact dating is not a primary consideration. After the general chapter on methodology and definitions, three chapters discuss individual workshops: on Naxos, Paros and Samos, this last with a section considering that island's stylistic relationship with Miletos. The Parian chapter includes a section on Phrasikleia, defined Attic in style. Each chapter opens with a catalogue raisonné of sculpture with established provenience; attributed works follow, progressively numbered and discussed along the same lines; a brief summary ends the presentation by distilling whatever stylistic elements have emerged from these groupings. Thus style is not the starting point but almost the consequence of attributions based on external evidence. The items of sculpture total 55, but to call the treatment "catalogue-like" is misleading, for, if factual information is kept to a formula, the main text is varied, terse, lively and highly readable. Style is described in elegant and felicitous terms which are not empty words but point to verifiable details and convey a definite picture. This is the kind of book that can and will be read from cover to cover.

If a main criticism can be directed at the work, it is that there is not more of it. Pedley tantalizes the reader by showing what can be done in identifying styles, but drops the subject too soon. Would he, for instance, accept the Cleveland kouros and several of the late male figures in Delos as Parian? Does he see Naxian influence on the Sounion colossi? He did not have the benefit of consulting *Samos XI*, since his main research was carried out in 1972-73, and much of the material from Paros and Naxos is unpublished; thus Pedley's picture is largely based on well known pieces, with no new material, though his splendid plates make old acquaintances worth a second look.

Despite Pedley's restraint, even his carefully documented and circumscribed picture will be open to some questions. For instance, the "Naxian" capital of the sphinx in Delos (his pl. 3) has now been called typically Parian, after several finds in that island (*AAA* 1 [1968] 178-81; *AA* 1972, 379 and fig. 36).

The draped man from Cape Phoneas on Samos was smuggled in from Asia Minor by an island fisherman who buried it only to see it re-excavated too soon, if we believe Langlotz (*Studien zur nordostgriechischen Kunst*, 142 and n. 13). Thus it cannot be truly Samian in style, as Pedley believes (p. 58); on the other hand we now know that it is not the only example of the type from that island (p. 49). Archaeology moves so rapidly that the time needed to print a book may make some of its comments outdated. Thus the fragments of the very early kore from Samos have now been attributed to more than one figure, and more korai will soon be known from Paros, one of them gigantic. Other points may be a question of opinion. Pedley still visualizes the Branchidai lined up along the Sacred Road at Didyma in the sixth century, but I believe Tuchelt (*Die archaischen Skulpturen von Didyma*, pp. 212-14) who considers this a rearrangement after the Persian wars and postulates an original location within the temenos. And to me (a mere 1.65 m. in height) the Nikandre, 1.75 m. tall (2 m. with the base), seems over-life sized. But it is gratifying to see that Pedley attributes meaning to scale and refuses to include figurines within his stylistic groups.

All in all, this is a stimulating book which makes important points and raises meaningful issues. May it be the forerunner of many other studies in the same direction.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL AND  
NEAR EASTERN ARCHAEOLOGY  
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE  
BRYN MAWR, PENNSYLVANIA 19010

ANTIKE PLASTIK, Lieferung XV, Ed. *Felix Eckstein*. Pp. 117, figs. 101 (in text), pls. 48. Gebr. Mann Verlag, Berlin, 1975. DM 200.

The fifteenth volume of *Antike Plastik* consists of nine articles on varied sculptures, of different periods and quality. Therein lies the importance of this series. A work lacking artistic quality may nevertheless have iconographic or historic worth and therefore deserves study. Moreover, unknown works in private collections, or statues with old and incomplete publications also receive careful discussion.

The first article is by Max Wegner, publishing a statue of a wounded youth in the Museo Arqueológico in Seville. Of unknown provenance, the fragment of torso and upper legs falls obliquely to the ground, in frontal view, supported by the right arm and cloak. It is visibly pedimental, from near the right corner. The back is more summarily treated than the Olympia pediments. Wegner cites parallels with the Niobid supported by the pedagogue on the Lateran/Wilton House type of Niobid sarcophagus. Though differently oriented, the Seville torso could