

1992

Review of *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, vol. 5 (Herakles-Kenchrias)

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. 1992. Review of *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, vol. 5 (Herakles-Kenchrias). *American Journal of Archaeology* 96:384-385.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/56

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

Chapter 8, "Conclusions," sets Aegean painting in its eastern Mediterranean, Bronze Age context in order to define its essential characteristics. In turn, Immerwahr probes the iconographic and conceptual features distinguishing Minoan from Thera, and Minoan/Thera from Mycenaean. At the same time, she demonstrates the interdependence of the artistic traditions involved, with monumental wall painting a spectacular manifestation of a painting continuum beginning before the Minoan palaces and persisting long after the Mycenaean palaces were ruins.

The text is complemented by numerous line drawings, some of them freshly juxtaposed for this book, as for instance the eight details of hands shown in figure 32. Ninety-two black-and-white plates and 23 color plates, all of high quality, illustrate representative Aegean paintings. Endnotes, bibliography, a conscientious index, and an exemplary annotated catalogue of published and unpublished frescoes complete a model presentation. In an era when many expensive monographs resemble the products of desktop printing, it is especially pleasing to see this elegantly designed book offered at quite a reasonable price. In sum, *Aegean Painting* is an authoritative, fundamental work that should quickly assume its place among the classic studies in Aegean art and archaeology.

KAREN POLINGER FOSTER

GRADUATE LIBERAL STUDIES PROGRAM
WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT 06457

LEXICON ICONOGRAPHICUM MYTHOLOGIAE CLASSICAE V (Herakles–Kenchrias). Vol. I: Pp. xxix + 1047, with 177 line drawings in text; Vol. II: Pp. 709, pls. 652 (3593 photographs). Artemis, Zurich and Munich 1990. ISBN 3-7608-87511.

With this set of volumes the *LIMC* project has passed the halfway mark: only three more issues remain, which will contain all remaining entries and supplements. The end is therefore in sight for an enterprise that many had doubted could be carried out to completion, and hearty congratulations are due. Each passing year brings new collaborators—the latest being Japan (1989)—and additional support, as well as the continuing help of the J. Paul Getty Trust without which regular publication would be seriously hampered (pp. vii, viii); the academic community at large is indebted to such support. The moving force behind the enterprise remains the General Secretary Lilly Kahil, and the current Président du Conseil (J. Pouilloux) suggests that the work may soon be known as "the Kahil," in the same way in which one refers to "the Roscher" or "the Pauly-Wissowa."

That the *LIMC* has been with us for some time is brought home by two facts: the earlier volumes are beginning to disintegrate from constant use, their bindings inadequate to the task despite their high price; and each new issue is filled with cross-references to previous articles (here see, e.g., ION). In this particular set, the noteworthy case is the entry on HERAKLES, which began in the previous volume with 1,696 listings (cf. *AJA* 94 [1990] 504–505) but is now completed (nos. 1697–3520), with commentary covering the entire presentation so that one part cannot be read without the other (on p. 171, section R, on the Gigantomachy, note a

correction to the drawing of no. 171 that appeared in vol. IV). Despite the considerable length of treatment, even this entry has a large number of cross-references, and H. IN PERIPHERIA ORIENTALI is reserved for a Supplement. But H/HERCULES IN P. OCCIDENTALI is here, as well as H/HERCULE (= H. ITALICUS), and a special entry on HERAKLES (CYPRI).

By a strange coincidence, moreover, many other personages associated with the hero fall within this same volume: e.g., HYLAS, IOLAOS, IOLE, IPHIKLES, and compare the important entry on IUNO that explores the connection of the Italic HERA with her alleged enemy/glory. The entry on HESPERIDES rediscusses their location (on p. 395; cf. HERAKLES 100–101), and suggests that the love story between the hero and the maidens is a modern misinterpretation; the possibility that one of the so-called Three-Figure Reliefs shows Herakles at the Crossroads is not mentioned, but see H. Meyer, *Medeia und die Peliaden* (Rome 1980), who attributes the notion to the philosophical circles of the second half of the fifth century B.C. Herakles freeing Prometheus is mentioned under KAUKASOS, where the three-figure composition from Pergamon (no. 1, pl. 614) is surprisingly called a "votive monument" erected by Mithridates Eupator; this interesting *tableau vivant* in Berlin deserves new in-depth consideration.

How essential it is to read the commentary, and not the single catalogue entries alone, is brought home by HERMES, another personage closely linked to Herakles. For instance, under Polykleitan types in sculpture (nos. 930–942) the traditional attributions are reviewed, but the commentary (p. 379) points out that the accepted series gives rise to two methodologically opposed hypotheses, and the entire discussion on the plastic evolution of Hermes iconography is sensible and illuminating; the vase painting evidence is considered "too Attic" (p. 379). The treatment includes some unexpected bonuses: sections on images without legends and legends without images, on Hermes' clothing, on the language of hands and the caduceus, accompanied by line drawings; these last analyses suggest that variations may be attributable to contexts, periods, and geographic areas, although statistics seem a bit tenuous. The Apollonia (Albania) gravestone, missing under CHARON, appears as no. 615bis, pl. 249. There are also some surprises: no. 394, the Olympia statue, is given to the famous Praxiteles, and no. 926, the "Phokion" in the Vatican, is considered an Imperial copy of an original by Kalon of Elis, 420–410 B.C., according to Pausanias 5.27.8! How can we possibly tell? An extensive section on herms and their problems gives only brief attention to the issue of the Alkamenean type, for which the Ephesian version is preferred over the "archaizing" Pergamene.

It is, as usual, impossible to do justice to the many entries and important discussions. Among the major personages, note HESTIA/VESTA, the Greek manifestation with only 28 entries and one uncertain, versus the Roman's 52 plus six uncertain; HYGIEIA; IRIS; ISIS. Entries omitted from previous issues are EPONA, GALATEIA, and HELIOS in his various manifestations; the treatment of IO includes the only discussion of ARGOS I. Conversely, some expected entries will appear in Supplements, e.g., HYPNOS, although SOMNUS is here. The HORAI/HORAE happily fall in this same volume with their male versions (KAIROI/TEMPORA ANNI). There is the usual sprinkling of regional personifications, rivers, and springs; surprising, under KASTALIA

I, is a tentative inclusion of the pedimental kore with the horizontal mantle from the Archaic Temple of Apollo at Delphi (pl. 613).

Names compounded with Hippo- abound, and include warriors, rivers, and satyrs; among the heroines, HIPPODAMEIA I and II from the east and west pediments of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia are included, but with some surprises. Under HIPPODAMEIA I, no. 16, for the east gable, acknowledges the uncertainty of choice between Figures F and K, but pl. 311 illustrates F. Under II, the wife of Peirithoos, no. 3 (pl. 314) gives the west group H/I (the "beautiful" woman and her centaur), but many believe that it should be group N/O, whose woman wears the only chiton/himation costume of the scene, thus suggesting bridal apparel; no. 4 lists the victim on Parthenon south metope 12, because of compositional similarities to Olympia, thus squarely placing the sequence within the Lapith Centauro-machies; no. 5 (pl. 315) sees Hippodameia on the Bassai slab BM 524—the woman clutching the idol while being unclothed by a centaur—but B. Madigan's forthcoming study of the entire frieze will offer a different interpretation.

It is intriguing that HISTORIA should appear only once, on the so-called Apotheosis of Homer Relief, which, to my mind, is dated too early around 130–120 B.C. HYBRIS I is represented by a late-Imperial relief (pl. 380) with cross-reference to DIKE and NEMESIS, but it is misleading to suggest that this is the only instance of such visual personification, since other examples of Nemesis stepping on a female figure are known, including a possibly Hellenistic statuette from Dion. The entry on HOMONOIA/CONCORDIA, a comparable case, comprises monuments connected with the *concept*, e.g., those showing the *dextrarum iunctio*; the Greek section could have profitably expanded on the similar motif of the crossed cornucopiae (cf. HOMONOIA no. 7).

As usual, illustrations have been chosen with an eye for the less familiar and the unpublished, the total view as well as the detail. Their quality, in general, is remarkable. It is no longer necessary to sing the praises of the LIMC—like the photocopying machine and the computer, we wonder how we ever did without it.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL AND NEAR EASTERN
ARCHAEOLOGY

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

BRYN MAWR, PENNSYLVANIA 19010

ATTIC SCRIPT: A SURVEY, by *Henry R. Immerwahr*. (Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology.) Pp. xxiii + 214, figs. 42. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1990. ISBN 0-19-813223-9.

ATTIC LETTER-CUTTERS OF 229 TO 86 B.C., by *Stephen V. Tracy*. (Hellenistic Culture and Society, 6.) Pp. xvi + 291, figs. 70. University of California Press, Berkeley 1990. ISBN 0-520-06806-8.

Each of these important books represents many years of meticulous study of a large corpus of Greek inscriptions.

Both make major contributions to our understanding of Athenian writing, Immerwahr by illuminating Attic vase-inscriptions, ca. 740–400 B.C., Tracy by identifying and dating the most active cutters of stone inscriptions, 229–86 B.C. Both books are richly documented, generously illustrated, and fitted out with copious indexes. Although both are innovative on a large scale, they also form such massive compendia of useful information that each will serve for its own period as a manual or standard reference work for many years to come.

Immerwahr argues that Attic vase-inscriptions give more evidence than their stone counterparts for recovering lost manuscript writing on papyrus, wax, or other perishable materials. They are more numerous; Immerwahr studies a selection of about 1,000. They form a complete series, each stage of which is securely dated by the style of the figured decoration. As authentic specimens of the handwriting of individual painters they exhibit a wider range of letter forms and spellings and reveal more about the state of education of their writers and knowledge of the alphabet than we might infer from inscriptions on stone. They demonstrate that literacy was widespread and highly valued.

Part I, "Historical Survey" (pp. 7–127), consists of 10 short chapters each covering a separate period with catalogue entries integrated into the text. Part II, "Survey of Letter-forms" (pp. 131–69), is a detailed account of the several shapes of each letter keyed to a useful chart. "Some Conclusions" (pp. 171–77) are followed by appendix I, "The Ionic Alphabet in Attica," and II, "Panathenaic Prize Amphorae." There are five indexes and 42 clearly legible plates (170 items).

Immerwahr regards Athens before the time of Drakon as a cultural backwater. It was Corinth that took the lead in adding inscriptions to vase-painting, and the first significant group of Attic dipinti imitated Corinthian writing. Sophilos was its leading representative, 620–570 B.C. After the François Vase and its contemporaries, a major modernization of script was introduced by Kleitias, Nearchos, Exekias, and the early Little Masters, accompanied by the earliest *kalos*, mock, and nonsense inscriptions. Stone texts at this time are few and mainly private, carved in a coarse style below the standard of the vase inscriptions. A great outburst of writing activity follows, ca. 530–480 B.C., which Immerwahr illustrates in lively discussions of Olto, Euphronios, Euthymides, Phintias, the Kleophrades Painter, the Berlin Painter, Douris, and others. Among them he finds both a fine style and a sloppy or hasty style, together with a strong influence from Ionian writing due to the increased presence of foreign artists in Athens at this time. Informal writing is exemplified by the ostraka. Ca. 475–450 B.C. Immerwahr traces a separation between private inscriptions and publicly inscribed documents of an official or religious nature. He links the increasing number of the latter to the reforms of Ephialtes. The classic form of the flat, broad stele inscribed on its front surface now develops from the earlier pillar. The stoichedon style begins to influence vase-painters and writers of ostraka, who increasingly adopt the Ionic alphabet, some *in toto* by mid-century, others using a mixed alphabet until ca. 420 B.C. when Ionic becomes standard. The first truly cursive forms appear ca. 400 B.C. when the early history of Attic script comes to an end.

Since "old-fashioned" and "modern" forms of the same letter often coexist on the same vase, Immerwahr rightly warns against assessing the style of an inscription by isolating