

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 *Onatas of Aegina*, by José Dörig

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. 1978. Review of *Onatas of Aegina*, by José Dörig. *American Journal of Archaeology* 82:260-261.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/63

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

more than the height of a vase. One must deplore the apparent poor state of the earlier excavation records as seen in the entries for **E 37** and **Pr 9** in particular.

Production mistakes are very few and easily corrected by the reader. Pl. 7,7, however, does show **100** (not indicated in the catalogue or caption) and **118** (not indicated in the caption). Pl. 73,2 is printed upside down. Fig. 5, cross section N-N', does not show **40** (HW 111) as it should according to Plan 1 and the description. Enclosure 1, cross section R-R', has **114** (HW 200) drawn in but not numbered. It is above HW 198. **407** (HW 7) cuts **391** (HW 6) and is not cut by it, as stated on p. 167.

A great deal of effort went into the excavations and the preparation of this report. It is unfortunate that the additional effort needed for the report was not made. On the omissions, such as the relation of this part of the Kerameikos to the rest of the cemetery and other nearby burials, one hopes that they may be taken up in future volumes. Certainly a summary interpretation similar to *Agora XIV* by Thompson and Wycherley is desired.

MICHAEL M. EISMAN

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19122

ONATAS OF AEGINA, by José Dörig. (*Monumenta Graeca et Romana* vol. 1, edited by H.F. Mussche.) Pp. x + 32, ills. 65. E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1977. Gld 48.

"There is no more dangerous obstacle to knowledge than an unquestioned adherence to received opinions, which have come to be accepted as documented facts through force of habit." With this statement (p. 6) Dörig reopens the entire question of Onatas's *oeuvre* and begins a painstaking process to formulate his own attributions. I find myself totally in agreement with the initial statement, but I am not entirely convinced by the results.

Dörig starts by collecting the literary sources on Onatas (from which however Paus. 6.12.1 and *Anth. Palat.* 9.238 are omitted), and then discusses previous scholarship and attributions, such as the bronze god from Artemision and the Aegina sphinx, none of which he finds tenable. Even among the monuments mentioned by Pausanias some, like the horse-headed Demeter Melaina, may now be irretrievable. Dörig therefore concentrates on the few pieces for which he believes that a reasonable certainty exists. His starting point is the Herakles dedicated at Olympia by the Thasians, which he recognizes in colossal Roman copies at Cherchel, Alexandria and London. His second identification is the Hermes Kriophoros, also at Olympia, which is represented by a bronze statuette (8.6 cm. high) in the Cabinet des Médailles, and perhaps by a marble head from the Athenian Akropolis, though the

latter could reflect another work by the same master. Finally, three male figures are attributed to the group of Greek Heroes dedicated by the Achaeans at Olympia, which portrayed nine warriors waiting for Nestor to draw lots. These marble copies, selected because of their heroic size and Severe style, are the torso Torlonia 401, the "Poseidon" Borghese and the "Ares" Somzée in its recently restored form (for which see also J. Marcadé and G. Donnay, *Cahiers de Marie-mont* 4 [1973] 47-57). The book closes with a note by A.E. Raubitschek on an inscribed pillar found at Olympia in 1963, on which Onatas's name can plausibly be restored as the sculptor's signature. Each monument is illustrated with excellent photographs, in many views.

Of all these identifications, that of the Hermes Kriophoros is perhaps the most convincing, because the bronze statuette in Paris, despite its diminutive size, corresponds in all details to Pausanias's description of the original and the general style seems Severe. The connection between the head of the figurine and the marble head from the Akropolis seems to rest more on general typology than on true similarity; certainly the arrangement of the hair is entirely different and to restore a cap or a helmet on the marble seems somewhat arbitrary.

Since a draped figure of minute size cannot be used to determine a sculptor's treatment of male anatomy, the Herakles represents an important premise for all further attributions. Here the identification with Onatas's work is based on the "Severe style" of the Roman replicas and on the attributes held by the statues. However, the pronounced and fractioned musculature of the replicas in Cherchel and Alexandria seems hardly in keeping with an original created shortly after 470 (p. 14) and indeed the type had been previously dated to the advanced fifth century B.C. Were the anatomical rendering to be imputed to the copyist, it is still difficult to dismiss the hint of a chiasmus in the pose itself. Of the heads, one is excessively emotional and highly modelled, the other too cold and smooth. To attempt a reconstruction of the original from these two extremes, and to reach a date on its evidence, seems risky. Finally, the attributes are not as definite as suggested. The club held in the right hand is a fact, but the left hand is missing and the strut below the left hip is insufficient to postulate a lowered arm holding a bow. Even the works mentioned as possible reflections of the type hold the Apples of the Hesperides, an attribute which had in fact been proposed for the Cherchel replica.

The three male figures assigned to the Achaean monument find good parallels among the pedimental sculptures of the Temple of Zeus, although the latter are said to be by a different master. The Borghese "Poseidon" wears its mantle like Oinomaos, and Dörig suggests that he may have been the Agamemnon in Onatas's group, since he is not armed. The other two figures, though naked, were probably character-

ized as warriors through their weapons. The Somzée statue has been vastly improved by the removal of an extraneous piece from its hair, the shortening of its neck and the consequent alteration in the turn of the head. I am somewhat puzzled by the long hair of a Severe warrior, since shorter coiffures were preferred for both men and gods. Could the Somzée head have originally belonged to an Athena? The helmet, with its hinged cheek-pieces, could be Attic (or pseudo-Chalkidian), and the Roman predilection for switching heads of statues regardless of sex is well known. The Torlonia torso is itself crowned by a Roman portrait and is introduced by Dörig "with all due reservations." All in all, the group is interesting but the attribution to Onatas is not compelling, especially in view of the influence the Olympia pediments must have exercised on later works.

No further information can be derived from the inscribed pillar. It carried a small object (perhaps a bird) and the recipient of the dedication is not mentioned. Raubitschek would date the letter forms in the sixth century, "were it not for the artist's name" (p. 30). Dörig refers to the pillar as the Kephalos stele (pp. ix, 32, captions to figs. 58-65) but is that not the patronymic of Pythion? Onatas's signature on the Akropolis accompanied another statuette, not a major work.

Dörig's method "proceeds from the conviction that neither avarice nor neglect have the power wholly to obliterate the masterpieces of the past, and that we ourselves are to blame for not perceiving them through the forms in which they still continue to exist among us" (p. ix). Yet Onatas does not seem to have been too famous in Roman times, since only Pausanias mentions him in his writings, and not even the works attributed by Dörig survive in a substantial number of replicas. The author's arguments may be correct, but more definite evidence is needed for them to achieve widespread acceptance.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE
BRYN MAWR, PENNSYLVANIA 19010

THE MARINE THIASOS IN GREEK SCULPTURE, by *Steven Lattimore*. (The University of California, Los Angeles, Monumenta Archaeologica 3.) Pp. ix + 81, pls. 31. The Institute of Archaeology, The University of California, Los Angeles, 1976.

Thematic studies are in vogue at present. As testimony to the inventiveness and variety of ancient art and its place in an increasingly more complex culture, their value is obvious. Yet not all subjects are equally promising: some are too slight or too short-lived, others rich and diverse—yet with one vital component irre-

trievably lost, the enquiry is frustrated at every turn. This, sadly, is the case with the Marine Thiasos in sculpture. Over the centuries it acquired a significance transcending the purely decorative: religious, political, and funerary. Yet the *pièce de résistance*, Skopas's group later in the Circus Flaminius at Rome, seems lost beyond recall, and its influence thereby incalculable. It is upon this rather intractable problem that L. brings his not inconsiderable critical powers to bear, supplementing the older studies of Nereids and sea-monsters by Gang (1907) and Shepard (1940).

This approach has two rather unfortunate consequences. The "non-Skopaic" Ahenobarbus-Ara, for instance (the sole-surviving near-complete thiasos in Greek monumental sculpture), merits only a 3-page "excursus" (on location and date alone) in a book of some 80 pages; yet whenever the central question of Skopas's influence upon later sculpture is raised, "might-have-beens" are uncomfortably prominent. In fact, here the only conclusion as such is that the double-tailed Triton was probably Skopas's creation (p. 61). So, whereas an appraisal of Skopas's contribution alone might have made a good article, or a widening of L.'s perspective (to include, e.g., the sarcophagi) an important and comprehensive book, as it stands, the present monograph, though generally convincing, occasionally illuminating, and certainly useful, falls rather between the two stools.

To turn to points of detail.¹ Ch. 1 neatly summarizes the career and style of Skopas. The implication on p. 2 n. 12 that Ashmole attributes BM 1013-15 to Skopas is, however, false (cf. *SP* 95-7); Tegea and Sparta were enemies from 371 (3 n. 27) and anyway, the Tegea temple was surely begun by 360 (*SP* 66-9); Benson's head (4 n. 49), now NM 183, is actually a poor copy of the Apollo Lykeios (*SP* 161 n. 1).

Ch. 2 cogently reviews the evidence for Skopas's thiasos, refusing to swallow Mingazzini's four Skopases—a true Thyestean feast! P. 13: to transform Poseidon from the arms episode (known in painting) to a hypothetical and unparalleled voyage to the Isles of the Blessed raises a methodological problem. Compare the apparent uniqueness, iconographically, of the Tegean West pediment (*SP* 54): was Skopas again perhaps making a special point (for at Troy, Poseidon's sympathies were anti-Greek) and if so, how do we tell? P. 14: concerning the Domitius-Ara (whose "essential stylistic unity" [16 n. 53] escapes me), here both L. and myself (*SP* 170 n. 56) have been overtaken by events: in *Greece and Rome* 21 (1974) 160 T.P. Wiseman identifies its dedicator and in *BSR* 42 (1974) 12 shows that its findspot lies well outside the Circus Flaminius, and in a forthcoming monograph Raimund Wünsche will demonstrate that the Munich slabs were carved in Asia ca. 140, then trimmed slightly

¹ For brevity, I may perhaps be excused for including references to my own *Skopas of Paros* (Park Ridge 1977) in place of extended comment on some points.