

1994

Review of *Lexikon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, vol. 6 (Kentauroi et Kentaurides-Oiax)

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. 1994. Review of *Lexikon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, vol. 6 (Kentauroi et Kentaurides-Oiax). *American Journal of Archaeology* 98:371-373.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/59

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

30-page chapter focuses on the use of the ceremonial wagon. Here Pare examines not only the burial contexts, but also symbols such as water birds and horse trappings that are regularly associated with wagons. He shows that the wagon was both an object of special cult significance, and a sign of elevated social status. Pictorial representations and models from central Europe, Greece, and Italy emphasize these special meanings of the wagon.

The volume concludes with an extensive catalogue of all of the wagon finds and plates illustrating objects described.

The text is copiously illustrated with line drawings and photographs and with distribution maps. All of the illustrations are of excellent quality and show the details needed by the scholar. This book will probably be the standard reference work on Early Iron Age wagons for the foreseeable future. The author has done an excellent job in pulling together all of the information and discussing it lucidly and comprehensively, and the publisher has produced a very attractive and well-illustrated volume.

The principal audience for this book will be archaeologists working in later European prehistory. The connections with the Mediterranean world will make the book of interest to classical archaeologists, and it will be important for those concerned with the history of technology, especially transportation technology.

PETER S. WELLS

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
215 FORD HALL
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55455

LES BÉOTIENS: AUX FRONTIÈRES DE L'ATHÈNES ANTIQUE, by *Henri van Effenterre*. (Collections Civilisations U). Pp. 212, figs., pls. Armand Colin, Paris 1989. Fr 170. ISBN 2-200-21244-5.

Since antiquity, Western civilization has been subjected to Athenian negativism about Boiotia. Wise people were cautioned to avoid Boiotia, whose inhabitants were piggish and infinite in their vices. Tales of Boiotian stupidity and ignorance became proverbial: even today the word "Boeotian" is defined in *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* as "a dull, obtuse individual: a boorish opponent of art and letters." Thus has an ancient regional prejudice become universal.

In the last 30 years, however, vigorous efforts have been made to change this concept of Boiotia and Boiotians, in the belief that the land of Hesiod, Pindar, and Plutarch deserved more than the residue of Athenian prejudice. Extensive archaeological, historical, and literary scholarship has raised Boiotia to its rightful place as a significant region of Greece. It has also become one of the best known, as the numerous yearly entries in the bibliography *Teiresias* testify.

Henri van Effenterre first came to Boiotia 50 years ago. Although the major thrust of his scholarship has been elsewhere, he produced as an initial volume of the *Collection des Néréides* (now renamed *Civilisations U*) this elegant work, which is perhaps the first synthesis of Boiotian culture. There are no footnotes and only a scant bibliography, but an unusual and extensive collection of visual representations. In

fact, this may be the finest collection of photographs of Boiotian art and landscape yet published. Included are a number of historical scenes, such as a 1913 view of Lake Kopais before the modern drainage, or one of the 1889 excavations at Thespias, and other rarely seen pieces of Boiotian or Boiotian-inspired art, such as the Musée Vivienel portrait generally said to be of Korinna—if so, the only one extant—or a Mycenaean sealstone from Thebes showing two graceful pigs.

The work is synthetic, with a rough chronological framework. There are some personal comments, especially regarding early French work in Boiotia: Maurice Holleaux and Michel Feyel were among the pioneers of Boiotian scholarship. Chapters describe the landscape itself, Mycenaean Boiotia, Boiotian technology, and the heyday of the Boiotian federation. Particularly detailed is a chapter on cults and religion. Van Effenterre's experience in prehistory is evident in a lengthy discussion of Bronze Age Boiotia. There is also a brief summary of the history of archaeology in Boiotia. But only the last 20 pages are devoted to Hellenistic and Roman Boiotia, unfortunately a rather limited view of these particularly dynamic and fascinating periods.

Because the author is not primarily a Boiotian scholar, occasional errors have crept in: perhaps the most extensive is his mistaken impression that the LH IIIC larnakes discovered in 1968 near the village of Bratzi are associated with the ancient site of Tanagra. Although Bratzi was renamed Tanagra, the ancient city is 5 km east at Graimadha, and does not seem to have been occupied in the Bronze Age. Yet continued references to the Bratzi larnakes as Tanagran have led van Effenterre and others to erroneous conclusions about a nonexistent Bronze Age city of Tanagra.

Nevertheless, van Effenterre can hardly be blamed for continuing an error perpetuated even by the excavators of the larnakes, and the problem does not affect the overall value of this work. Although not a profound piece of scholarly research—most of the material is derivative—the book is important in its visual record of Boiotian art and its synthesis of the history and culture of this much maligned region of Greece. The fact that a semipopular work about Boiotia can now appear is indicative of the recent diversity of Boiotian studies.

DUANE W. ROLLER

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
4240 CAMPUS DRIVE
LIMA, OHIO 45804

LEXIKON ICONOGRAPHICUM MYTHOLOGIAE CLASSICAE VI (Kentauroi et Kentaurides—Oiax). Vol. I: Pp. xxx + 1,091, with 152 line drawings in text; Vol. II: Pp. 779, pls. 718 (3,752 photographs). Artemis, Zurich and Munich 1992. ISBN 3-7608-8751-1.

Faithful to its biennial deadline, the *Lexikon* appears with truly remarkable regularity, considering the mass of information and the many authors writing the different entries (several new and less familiar names in this volume), from the now approximately 50 contributing countries, the num-

ber of which increases yearly, most recently joined by Albania and Georgia. When the American branch was established in 1972, I for one doubted that such an ambitious project could be finished within my lifetime; yet we are now within sight of the last two volumes and the Indices, promised before the end of this century. The current President of the Council is G. Camporeale, but the General Secretary is still the indomitable Lilly Kahil, who provides the indispensable constant to the enterprise, as the Getty Trust continues to furnish much needed financial support.

Although the range of coverage indicated by the title begins with KENTAUI, the entry itself is one of the many postponed for the *LIMC* Supplement, so that the first item is on KEPHALOS, comprising additions to the earlier article on EOS. There are also three official Addenda: HEKATE (and H. IN THRACIA), the very extensive HEROS EQUITANS, KAKASBOS, and KEKROPS. As a whole, this seems a volume of shorter entries and lesser personages, covering a vast number of personifications—rivers, cities, abstract concepts. Some of these (e.g., LIBERALITAS) are iconographically attested solely on coins, although scenes illustrating the concept are occasionally mentioned. In general, increased attention seems to have been paid to numismatics, which therefore may tend to shift the emphasis toward Hellenistic and Roman examples. Several entries (e.g., LETHAM, MA, NEHALENNIA) concern only one culture, the characters having no counterpart in other areas of the classical world. Major divinities are represented by LETO, MERCURIUS, MITHRAS (including CAUTOPATES and CAUTES), and NEMESIS (KUBABA/KYBELE will appear in the next volume). Minor in religious hierarchy but iconographically important are MOIRAI, MOUSAI, NEREIDES, and NIKE, this last entry including many Canosan vases and Hellenistic figurines typologically divided; the large and numerous Late Archaic–Early Classical terracotta Nikai at Delphi, Olympia, and other centers seem particularly important because they are less well known. Among heroic and mythological personages, I may single out KLYTAIMESTRA (MENELOS is scheduled for the Supplement), LAOKOON (a very lucid account of the complex iconographic evidence, by E. Simon), LEDA, MARSYAS, MELEAGROS, NARKISSOS, NIOBIDAI, and ODYSSEUS. Of a different nature, but important because of its extensive and tabulated presentation, is the treatment of MENSES (by D. Parrish).

Cross-referencing occurs increasingly not only among volumes but also within single issues. This is an indispensable practice because various authors inevitably hold different opinions, especially on chronology. For instance, the metopes at Foce del Sele, s.v. KERKOPES 11, are dated ca. 550, but 570–550 s.v. KLYTAIMESTRA 20, and 550–540 s.v. LETO 39. Other examples could be cited, but the overall impression is one of open-mindedness and acknowledgment of opposing points of view. Notable once again is the effort to include unpublished and recently uncovered material (e.g., KERKYNOS 1, an Apulian pelike by a forerunner of the Dareios Painter; MEDEIA 1, a bucchero olpe found at Cerveteri in 1990).

Specific comments are, as usual, shaped and limited by the reviewer's interests and knowledge, and by recent publications. Under KLYTAIMESTRA (with cross-reference to

LEDA 33 and NEMESIS 210), I would add the suggestion by K.D. Shapiro Lapatin, *Hesperia* 61 (1992) 107–19, who sees Klytaimestra among the female figures on the Rhamnous base, with political implications. The entry on KORONIS states that her tryst with Apollo is not known in Greek art, and that Epidauros avoided that gruesome aspect of the story; but N. Yalouris identifies the episode in Athens NM 4723, the central akroterion of the east facade of the Asklepieion there: *Archaische und klassische griechische Plastik* 2 (Mainz 1986) 183 and fig. 2 on p. 184. Parthenon west pedimental statue A is considered an uncertain depiction of KRANAOS (1); but statue A*, the "pillar-torso" as a mountain-man under Athena's horses, is not mentioned, although more plausible and proposed by E.B. Harrison as early as 1965 (*AJA* 69, pp. 185–86). KYKLOPS/KYKLOPES includes several possible representations of Polyphemos, although not the major groups at Sperlonga, Baiae, and Ephesos, promised under P in the next volume; for the last two, however, see ODYSSEUS 85–86. It is hoped that the future entry will include a photograph of the large second–fourth century A.D. terracotta of the monster found at Colle Cesarano near Tivoli in 1989 (S. Moscati in *La Stampa*, 25 May). The newspaper illustration shows damage to the statue's face, as mentioned in the *LIMC* for other such representations, perhaps for protection against its evil-eye.

The entry on LEDA 6 perpetuates the attribution of the original (dated ca. 360 B.C.) to Timotheos despite the lack of any mention in the literary sources, but no. 73, discussing the replicas of the type in Roman times, is more cautious and dates the prototype ca. 380–370 B.C. Given the existence of a comparable iconography before the fourth century, we need not assume a "major master" behind the rendering favored in later periods, but simply a greater taste for the more sensuous version of the group. I am also uncertain about the "post-Praxitelean or post-Lysippan" model postulated for the various statues of a standing NARKISSOS with raised arms (nos. 41–43, 55, echoed on many sarcophagi; the "Polykleitan" type leaning on his left arm, no. 69, is rejected as Narkissos, as well as Hyakinthos or Adonis). The popularity of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* attested by the many pictorial representations may also have inspired the creation of a figure in the round patterned after early Hellenistic Apollo types, as argued in an earlier *LIMC* volume for the iconography of Endymion. I see the same Ovidian inspiration at work in the LETO with the children (nos. 25–26, cf. LATONA 10–12), and read the sculpture as the goddess fleeing from the Lycian peasants whom she will later turn into frogs. Although my article is cited, the episode is listed only among the literary sources and the Roman monuments are treated as if connected with the killing of Python. To recognize traits of the Severe Style in Roman works does not necessarily imply acceptance of an Early Classical prototype, since retrospective features were popular in Roman creations. As for LATONA 2, the Sorrento base is likely to reproduce Imperial, not Classical, images as well, as argued by L. Roccas, *AJA* 93 (1989) 571–88, esp. 576.

More bibliography: A. Weis's book on the Hanging Marsyas, here announced as forthcoming, is out (Rome 1992) and a splendid expansion on the corresponding entries in this volume. The Myronian group is judiciously separated from Pausanias's mention of an Acropolis monument

(no. 15), and is thus cited only according to Pliny's description (MARSYAS I. B.a, commentary on pp. 377–78). A more convincing political explanation can be supported if the statuary type M.11 indeed goes together with the so-called Frankfurt Athena. The Amazonian tiara under the goddess's Corinthian helmet has been interpreted as an allusion to the victory at Marathon, with the companion satyr standing for the defeated Eastern enemy: E.R. Knauer, in *Festschrift K. Schauenburg* (Mainz 1986) 124 and, more recently, *AA* 1992, 379–80. C. de Grazia Vanderpool (*AJA* 97 [1993] 299, abstract) sees close numerical correspondence between the dimensions of Riace Warrior B and the statues of Gaius and Lucius Caesar at Corinth; this relationship would undermine the suggestion (MERCURIUS 7a–b) that the Julio-Claudian figures derive from the fourth-century Hermes Richelieu type—or perhaps strengthen the supposition that the Riace bronzes are themselves eclectic and late. To the lengthy entry on NEMESIS (P. Karanastassi and F. Rausa) add the book by M.B. Hornum (*EPRO* 117, Brill 1993), with extensive catalogue and commentary on attributes and iconography; its author convincingly argues that the goddess's presence at *munus* and *venatio* games was closely connected with the *ludi's* function to express the proper order of Imperial society.

A few (and rare) corrections: p. 132, s.v. KRESPHONTES II no. 1, for Attalos III read Attalos II. If MAKEDONIA 10 (AR denarius, 55 B.C.) is correctly described as wearing the *causia*, her obviously metal headdress cannot carry the same name as the cloth cap on Makedonia 15 (the Boscoreale fresco); that the latter is the true *causia* is supported by B. Kingsley, *AJA* 85 (1981) 39–46. The MERCURIUS 3b of the three-sided pedestal in Boston does indeed wear a petasos slung over his back, as mentioned in both the Caskey and the Comstock-Vermeule catalogues of the Museum of Fine Arts. The reliefs from Isthmia (NIOBIDAI 15m) probably belong to the armrests of Amphitrite's throne, not (as the Kalydonian boar hunt figures) to the base.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

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

PERSONIFICATIONS IN GREEK ART: THE REPRESENTATION OF ABSTRACT CONCEPTS 600–400 B.C., by H.A. Shapiro. Pp. 301, figs. 186. Akanthus, Kilchberg 1993. ISBN 3-905083-05-1.

Personifications in Greek Art is a revised version of H.A. Shapiro's 1976 doctoral dissertation. The book is a well-written, comprehensive appraisal of an important phenomenon. Shapiro has reorganized his original chronological survey into an alphabetical presentation of 29 personifications from Adikia (Injustice) to Tyche (Fortune). Its iconographic core is augmented by a catalogue of known representations and five indices (personifications, mythological, ancient authors, museums, and illustrations), as well as an introduction and conclusion containing more synoptic discussions. The updated notes showcase the author's abso-

lute command of relevant bibliography. The volume's attractive design enhances ease of reference by means of footnotes rather than endnotes, clear headings that label the pages of each section, and copious black and white illustrations dispersed throughout the text, topped by captions listing the characters represented. This encyclopedia in miniature is certain to become a standard source, notwithstanding the articles on individual personifications in *LIMC*, to which Shapiro himself is a major contributor.

In Archaic and Classical art, personifications of abstract concepts usually do not possess telltale attributes or physical characteristics, and are normally identified by means of their inscribed names. The sex of the visual personification generally follows the gender of the Greek noun; thus, female figures predominate. Shapiro limits his survey to four groups of pure abstractions: "physical conditions," "social goods," "ethical and moral qualities," and "metaphysical ideas." Although personifications appear in Homer's *Iliad*, no examples are known in art until the early sixth century B.C., beginning with those described by Pausanias (5.17.5–5.19.10) on the lost Chest of Kypselos at Olympia. As the Chest underlies many of Shapiro's arguments a fresh reconstruction drawing would have been welcome. Most extant examples dating between ca. 580 and 400 B.C. are found in Attic vase painting, which is Shapiro's central focus. During this time personifications came to be grouped together in pictorial compositions, but they were rarely unified into complex allegories. (Shapiro examines that subject at greater length in *Boreas* 9 [1986] 4–23.)

For the scholarly reader one weakness is in the presentation of the important epigraphical evidence. The inscribed names of personifications listed in the catalogue entries are transliterated into the Roman alphabet rather than given in the original Greek letter forms. Moreover, these figures' names are rarely legible in the text illustrations, particularly in the case of matte-red inscriptions on red-figure vases. (A solution might have been a regular coupling of photographs with inscribed line drawings.) Translations of the nouns personified are not provided consistently in the iconography section despite its reference format.

Shapiro offers a historically sensitive interpretation of Athenian pictorial iconography. Although his primary reliance on literary sources is a traditional approach, the author carefully points out associations of personified figures with Athenian life during the fifth century B.C., offering valuable evidence for the influence of dramatic performances, such as the first appearance of Lyssa (Madness), for the cults of personified deities, such as Nemesis (Retribution), and for the political use of personifications, such as Eumonia (Good Order). The rare male personifications, such as Geras (Old Age), tend to be more distinctive in appearance than the female ones. Hypnos (Sleep) and Thanatos (Death) can serve to exemplify the sort of changes traced by Shapiro. On the Chest of Kypselos (Paus. 5.18.1) they appeared as children held by their nurse Nyx (Night). Representations recalling the *Iliad* (16.454–683), where the twins transport the body of Sarpedon from the battlefield, are first preserved on Attic red-figure vases by Euphronios. Here they are armed bearded warriors, who are also given wings. Finally, on Classical white-ground lekythoi these winged personifications, Hypnos, now a dark youth, and Thanatos, an older