Review of *Influences and Styles in the Late Archaic and Early Classical Greek Sculpture of Sicily and Magna Graecia*, by R. Ross Holloway

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: [repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs](http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs)

Part of the [Classical Archaeology and Art History Commons](http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs), and the [History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons](http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs)

Custom Citation


This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. [repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/47](http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/47)

For more information, please contact repository@brynmawr.edu.
tutes a corpus in itself. The composition of both text and plates shows an obvious devotion to order and clarity. These are principles that have not invariably been observed in the CVA, and it is perhaps this fact that has inspired the authors of MMA 4 not simply to aim at a commendable publication of the vases, but to embody in the fascicle an ideal canon of presentation.

The neck-amphorae are treated in thirteen divisions and subdivisions based on distinctions of shape. Discussion of the individual vases is also divided into separate sections (accentuated by headings in block letters) in the following order: shape and ornament, subject, dimensions and condition, accessory colors, bibliography. Where commentary is added it follows the bibliography, but without a separate heading.

Perhaps the greatest single interest of the fascicle will lie in the opportunity it offers to survey the numerous variations of shape that fall under the category of neck-amphora. So far as decoration goes, few of the vases are of outstanding merit, but none are insignificant. Readers will think first, probably, of the neck-amphora by Exekias (generously illustrated on four plates, 16–19; plate 18 is especially fine, providing excellent views of the shoulders scenes along with intelligible details of the heads of the figures on the body). It will be recalled that the museum possesses a fine neck-amphora by the Affecter, substantial portions of another, and fragments of a third (pls. 9–11). There is an interesting example of the Kleophrades Painter’s work in black figure (pl. 40, 3–6). The list could be prolonged. All are treated in a text of impeccable scholarship and illustrated with photographs of superlative quality, with extraordinary attention given to considerations of logical sequence and appropriate scale. Facsimile drawings of graffiti and dipinti are inserted in the text, but profile drawings, lavishly furnished in some recent fascicules, are conspicuous by their absence. One can only assume that the authors did not find anything which by its nature would warrant inclusion.

Something more must be said about the compartments into which the text is divided. They raise a question which has been the subject of amiable disagreement between the reviewer and the chairman of the American committee for the CVA, who happens also to be one of the authors of MMA 4. The chairman takes the undeniably practical view that the CVA will be used as a reference work, not read in extenso, and that everything possible should be done to facilitate such use. The reviewer clings to the romantic notion that someone may choose to read a CVA entry from beginning to end and feels challenged (perhaps rashly) to write connected prose. This attitude is open to the objection that it leads to discursive and cluttered writing that slows the pace and impedes the user. On the other hand, the compartmental method carries with it the danger that the system may come to be regarded as something sacred in itself.

It should be said, however, that the authors often relax the strict discipline of their schema and indulge us with highly interesting essays, on riders dismounting (p. 30), on chariots wheeling round (pp. 34–35), on topknots on horses (p. 51), and on the wearing of the aegis (p. 67), to mention only a few examples. It is more than enough to show that they are not indifferent to the spell exerted by Attic vases. But their principal objective has been to provide us with the next best thing to having the vase itself in our hands. Ultimately they must be judged on what they set out to do, and this they have accomplished to perfection.

Cedric G. Boulter
University of Cincinnati


Despite recent attempts to increase our knowledge of Magna-Graecian sculpture, this aspect of Greek art remains one of the most ill-defined and understood. Sicilian and South-Italian museums rank among the richest in Classical treasures, yet their material largely comes from chance finds or from very early excavations, which took only relative account of stratigraphy and context and often remain unpublished. By contrast, recent research has set models of accuracy and advanced technique, and new museums employ all the latest museological devices; but they too remain basically unknown and unpublicized, or only partly covered by popular picture books. Finally, scholarly articles by Italian excavators tend to appear in publications of local interest and circulation which seldom reach American libraries. With this state of affairs, the book under review will be welcomed by all students of Greek art.

The value of the work lies undoubtedly in its many illustrations, which often show a piece in more than one view and gather together recent as well as old and poorly known finds. Even Langlotz and Hirmer’s The Art of Magna Graecia cannot compete in this respect, though its plates are larger and better, since Holloway has aimed at completeness and therefore includes objects regardless of their state of preservation. Each caption gives height, provenience, and present location—information often difficult to obtain.

A second bonus is an extensive bibliography, either in footnotes (which indeed represent well over one third of the main text), or in the Bibliographical Index (pp. 43–52), which substitutes for a general index and where objects are grouped by sites. Despite the overall thoroughness, this system is not foolproof: for instance, I could find no reference on p. 19 for the
Some interesting points have been raised, but a complete stylistic history of Magna-Graecian sculpture between 550 and 450 B.C. still remains to be written.

Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE


Originally a dissertation directed by Massimo Pallottino, this first volume of a new series, “Museums and Collections of Etruria,” reviews material from the region of Viterbo collected in the early 1900s by an enthusiastic and meticulous amateur archaeologist, Luigi Rossi Danielli (1870–1909), whom early death prevented from publishing his excavations and acquisitions. The area has been fortunate in its excavators: recently the Swedish Institute of Classical Studies in Rome carried out successful excavations at Acquarossa, together with the King of Sweden, who became a familiar figure in Viterbo (Gli Etruschi. Nuove ricerche e scoperte [Viterbo 1972]).

There is a short introduction and a catalog, in two parts, the first including objects whose provenances could still be traced and tomb groups reconstructed. Much more numerous, unfortunately, are the objects in the second section, with unknown or uncertain provenances, listed individually under types and materials in chronological order. Two appendices deal with inscriptions and lost objects, a third contains an unpublished excavation report.

A critical review by Marina Cristofani Martelli studies the cultural contexts and historical implications of several objects which, though artistically negligible, are of archaeological importance, for example a wine amphora of a type used for export, bucchero oolai from Orvieto, Ionian cups, brick stamps, Megarian cups (Prospettiva 4 [1976] 42–49; see also her publication of an early tomb group, Nuove letture di monumenti etruschi dopo il restauro [Florence 1971] 17–23). We are grateful to the Italian editors and publishers for planning to make private collections known to scholars—an aim more of us should imitate—and to the author for bringing us the catalog of this rich and varied collection reflecting a wide range of southern Etruscan material, from a Villanovan belt to Hellenistic sarcophagi, with its tomb groups, its ceramics (impasto and bucchero, Italo-Geometric, Etrusco-Corinthian, East Greek, Etruscan, Faliscan, Roman), its engraved bronze mirrors (two illustrate the Toilette of Malavisch and the Judgment of Paris), its terracotta models (from a votive deposit of a sanctuary at San Giuliano), and much, much more.

Larissa Bonfante
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY