

1981

Review of *Die archaischen Metopen von Selinunt*, by Luca Giuliani

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. 1981. Review of *Die archaischen Metopen von Selinunt*, by Luca Giuliani. *American Journal of Archaeology* 85:97-99.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/84

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

The book is a useful and valuable study. Its contribution is twofold: it gathers together a large amount of important details on the capitals and their associated buildings, and it offers an overview that sees the volute capitals as an integral part of Palestinian stone architecture. As Shiloh correctly observes, there is considerable evidence for wooden floral capitals in Syria, Cyprus and many other parts of the eastern Mediterranean. Only rarely, however, do these forms appear in stone. The Palestinian series is unique for the Iron Age because—unlike the later stonework from Tamassos, Cyprus and elsewhere where the stone imitates wooden construction—it uses volute capitals as one aspect of a stoneworking tradition, along with walls built entirely of ashlar blocks.

The book is not so much a review of the current state of the field as a statement of the author's conclusions after a careful study of the evidence. Since this sometimes involves a choice between alternate theories, there are those who might disagree with an occasional point. As the title indicates, Shiloh calls the capitals "Proto-Aeolic" (as opposed to "Proto-Ionic," "Aeolic," or simply "volute capitals"), though he does not claim them as the ancestors of the Greek Aeolic style. He rejects any Egyptian influence in the formation of the Palestinian tradition, preferring the palm tree motifs of Late Bronze Age Syria and elsewhere. Within the Palestinian sequence, he advocates a compact chronological development that begins with the Megiddo capitals in the tenth century B.C. and ends with the ones from Ramat Raḥel. He dates these latter to the ninth century in spite of the excavator's more cautious view that places them within the ninth to seventh century, most likely at the end of this period in Stratum VA, the stratum in which they were found (Y. Aharoni, *Excavations at Ramat Raḥel Season 1961 and 1962*, 119-20). The result is a very early chronology, with the pieces from Jerusalem and Medeibiyeh also dated to the ninth century, well before the capitals from Cyprus, Caria, Aeolis and elsewhere. Shiloh sees the tradition as essentially local. In this he is surely correct, but one would like to see more discussion of the three-dimensional balustrades from Ramat Raḥel, details that may be closer reflections of the stylistic mainstream leading to the monumental columns of Aeolis and elsewhere.

The book is well organized and easy to use as a reference. With a few exceptions (notably pl. 16, no. 1), the plates are of good quality. The line drawings are somewhat uneven, and one regrets yet another reproduction of the incorrectly restored capital from Neandria (fig. 63). As a whole, however, the book is a welcome contribution to the scholarship on this important body of material.

PHILIP BETANCOURT

DEPARTMENT OF ART HISTORY
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19122

DIE ARCHAISCHEN METOPEN VON SELINUNT, by *Luca Giuliani*. Pp. viii + 89, text ills. 11, pls. 24. Philipp von Zabern, Mainz 1979.

Certain topics in archaeology seem to enjoy intermittent popularity: they remain relatively untouched for years but are then investigated simultaneously by several scholars. This is the case of the Selinus metopes which, after the 1873 publication by O. Benndorf, are again receiving monographic treatment not only in the book under review but also in a forthcoming work by Erik Østby. Yet, as Giuliani states in his Preface, many fragments are still unpublished and final presentation of all the material remains an Italian task. In this 1975 Basel dissertation he has therefore concentrated on a stylistic analysis of the well-known pieces, including as many of the new finds as are published so far. Bibliographical updating stopped in 1976 and a page of "Addenda and Corrigenda" contributes relatively little to the main text. Within these limitations the book represents a thoroughly informed treatment of the sculptures with excellent illustrations which include much comparative material.

A lengthy introduction reviews the history of Archaic relief metopes. Giuliani, following a chronological method, concludes that they must be a Corinthian innovation and that Magna Graecia has no tradition of its own, Selinus and Foce del Sele being the exceptions that confirm the rule. This reviewer, using a geographical approach, believes that the tradition of sculptured panels may have originated with the Western Greeks under influence from Asia Minor, and this different interpretation of the evidence colors many of the following comments. It is gratifying, however, to read (p. 9) that the Magna Graecian cities, far from being provincial in any cultural or historical sense, may well have looked upon many aspects of the mother country as "provincial." It is also good to have the Copenhagen metope included, albeit from unknown context; the frontal (rather than dorsal) attachment of the creature's wings may not only be old-fashioned but also part of that Ionic influence that Giuliani recognizes in the head. The motif continues in Etruscan art, perhaps from the same ultimate Oriental source, if not mediated by Magna Graecia.

The text proper begins with the Temple C series. The developments of the Selinuntine akropolis and temenos are discussed for chronological evidence, and construction of the temple is thus placed in the second quarter of the 6th c. Recent urbanistic studies by R. Martin and J.M. de la Genière suggest instead that this date be lowered to ca. 550 and give a convincing new reading of traffic patterns on the citadel. Sculptural analysis starts with the metope of Perseus and the Gorgon; Giuliani finds it in keeping with the architectural evidence and believes that Perseus' chitoniskos has been recut and modernized, which I find technically unlikely. The peculiar combination of flat and plastic renderings that is stressed as a Sicilian sculptural trait (p. 22) seems to me a deliberate way

to differentiate between the mask-like Gorgon (whose face is treated as a potential Gorgoneion) and the "human" figures. It should have been mentioned that Athena's and Perseus' heads have been deliberately tilted forward to be fully visible from below. That this frontality is neither primitive nor required by the myth but perhaps "Ionic" may be argued on the basis of the Delphi ivory frieze with the Boreads chasing the Harpies, where the frontality serves to emphasize the main characters in the scene. Inspection of a cast makes me wonder whether the Selinus Athena is veiled—another possible East Greek trait; but the metope is so poorly preserved that certainty is impossible.

The panel with Herakles and the Kerkopes leads to a lengthy discussion of relief types in which "deep" is distinguished from "high." The Foce del Sele metope with a similar subject is dated somewhat later than the Sicilian and both are considered typical monumentalizations of Greek prototypes in the minor arts. The two metopes with frontal chariots, taken together, are interpreted as Apollo and Artemis respectively, surrounded by greeting figures; however, a *lectio difficilior* is cautiously advanced for the better preserved relief. Noting that the alignment of the chariot axle suggests the imminent loss of a wheel, Giuliani wonders whether the charioteer may be Oinomaos; the beardless head at present restored within this metope could well belong with the fragments of the second and thus be Pelops. But would the (victory?) crown proffered by the flanking woman on the left be appropriate for the scene, or should this fragment too be transferred to the adjacent panel? The description should mention that the flanking figures probably faced inward, as suggested by the uneven arrangement of their tresses—a rendering occurring also on the Y metopes. Fragments from Temple C include the frontal heads of a warrior and a woman and two more in seemingly more advanced style, one of them in profile. As a whole, this series is considered autochthonous, albeit within the Greek tradition and using mainland Greek elements. Ionic influence and Etruscan traits are occasionally mentioned but never pursued (e.g., n. 172). Provenience of all fragments from the East side exclusively is correctly stressed: it is in keeping with Magna Graecian emphasis on temple fronts.

The discussion of the so-called Y metopes begins, controversially, with the 1968 find featuring a frontal chariot with rampant trace horses. Giuliani, accepting it within the series, dates it earlier than the C metopes within the second quarter of the 6th c.; the other panels, differing in style and format after interruption in construction, would be roughly contemporary, ca. 550. The earlier dating is confirmed by the architectural members attributed to Temple Y, which stylistically seem to precede Temple C. The Y panels, beside the Chariot of Demeter and Kore, comprise a Sphinx, Herakles struggling with the Cretan Bull in the pres-

ence of Minos, Europa and the Bull (these two reliefs being a local allusion to the myths and name of Herakleia Minoa), the Apolline Triad, a female head in profile (Y 6), and the panel with Three Goddesses also found in 1968. Stressing the similarity of all three, Giuliani would identify them as the Moirai, if the "flowers" in their hands are indeed distaffs.

The Temple Y series reflects the same eclectic tendencies typical of Sicilian art. Differences from the Temple C reliefs, which make the Y workshop seem more progressive "by mainland standards," are probably stylistic rather than chronological. Ionic influence, doubted in the quadriga scene, appears in the others, probably because the import of Rhodian statuettes had begun by mid-century. Contacts with Attica, on the basis of pottery trade, are deemed unlikely before the turn of the century, so that comparison with Attic works is downplayed. I would like to compare the "Polyxena" of the Olive Tree Pediment—and other figures from the Akropolis poros sculptures—not only with the Y but also with the C metopes: they share the squat proportions, large heads with virtually no necks, big eyes and other features which are a consequence not of the medium but, to my mind, of East Greek influences, at work both on the Athenian material and at Selinus. The varied appearance of the Y and C metopes may be partly due to the size of the relative buildings and thus the distance of the panels from the viewer. The Y reliefs, on a much smaller structure, could successfully employ a lower, more calligraphic rendering than the monumental C metopes.

The section on "New Tendencies" discusses two fragments attributed to Temple C: the upper torso of a draped figure being seized by the neck, and the central portion of a naked male in a lively pose. Giuliani reconstructs the scene as Orestes and Klytaimnestra, the latter seated and wearing chiton and peplos. Could this rather be a himation worn in male fashion? The face, corroded, might have been bearded, thus explaining the size, larger than the opponent's. Giuliani dates the relief to the last decade of the 6th c., perhaps a replacement at the time when modernization took place.

A final section deals with 5th c. material. The metopes of Temple F are assigned to the early years, the two *frieze* plaques with Amazonomachy to the middle, although one is stylistically considerably earlier than the other. Both are assigned to the so-called Temple M, near the Malophoros sanctuary, which although virtually unpublished seems too early for a 450 date and has at least one corner triglyph. The metope with Eos and Kephalos (an Attic theme), from an unknown temple, is judged slightly later than the F panels. Temple E's metopes, confronting male and female, may reflect Pythagorean dualism; they are by a workshop mixing Attic, Ionic and local traits, which may have employed the master of the marble Agrigento Warrior in Severe style. This theory is all the

more likely since the practice of inserting marble parts into limestone bodies may recur on the Olympieion pediments.

Perhaps the most problematic aspect of the topic is the peculiar chronological gap apparent in all series. In Temple C one entire metope is considerably later and details are modernized in the original panels; the opposite applies to Temple Y, where only one metope seems contemporary with the architecture, all the others being later. Given the small size of the structure, a lengthy interruption or extensive repairs seem unlikely. Even the Amazonomachy frieze has two undoubtedly disparate compositions and, although not extensively discussed, the E metopes show such "chronological" differences. Because of the range in time of these examples, we cannot think in terms of one major catastrophe requiring massive reworking at the site (both on the akropolis and in the plain). Giuliani is properly cautious in assessing the nature of the differences, although he seems to equate frontality with early date. Perhaps the sequence of panels on the buildings would have shown that movement led inwards from both sides, so that only the central metopes stressed immediate eye-contact with the viewer. But the present state of our knowledge is too imperfect for further speculation.

Giuliani's book fills a long-felt need, and does it with the scholarship and sensitivity one expects from one of Scheffold's pupils. That the results are still debatable is due to the nature of the evidence rather than to any fault of the author, and we look forward to Østby's work for a different viewpoint on this challenging and multifaceted material.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

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

ANTIKE KUNSTWERKE AUS DER SAMMLUNG LUDWIG, I. FRÜHE TONSARKOPHAGE UND VASEN, edited by *Ernst Berger* and *Reinhard Lullies*. (Veröffentlichungen des Antikenmuseums Basel, Band 4/1). Pp. 251, figs. 201 (9 in color). Archäologischer Verlag Basel. Philipp von Zabern, Mainz, 1979. DM 90.

An earlier catalogue of the antiquities in the Ludwig collection, published in 1968, was reviewed in *AJA* 73 (1969) 481. The present volume is almost twice as large, and is the first of two, the second of which will contain sculpture. Many of the pieces have been lent to the museum in Basel, others to museums in Germany.

The following entries deal with objects which, while familiar from one context or another, did not appear

in the 1968 catalogue: nos. 1 (a Minoan sarcophagus, described by I. Pini), 13 (Corinthian column-krater), 18 (Attic lip cup), 21 (Attic black-figured amphora), 39 and 41 (dinos and lekythos by the Berlin Painter), 46 (skyphos by the Splachnopt Painter), 57 (amphora with twisted handles, related to the Kleophon Painter), 58 (mug), 60 and 61 (white-ground lekythoi), 66 (black-figured eye-cup), 67-69 (Etruscan), 70-72 (south Italian), 74-79 (Phrygian).

The 1968 catalogue was attractive; the 1979 volume is even more elegant, with handsomely printed pages and a more convenient layout. It is written in connected prose, not in the compressed, somewhat staccato style of its forerunner. Since the material is already fairly well-known, the reader's attention will be drawn chiefly to the *Einzeldarstellungen* (pp. 201-48), by Emily Vermeule (on no. 2: "A Painted Mycenaean Coffin"), John Boardman (no. 9: "A Protocorinthian Dinos and Stand"), Reinhard Lullies (no. 39: "Der Dinos des Berliner Malers"), Erika Simon and Günter Neumann (nos. 60-61: "Zwei weissgrundige Lekythen"), and Margot Schmidt (no. 70: "Eine unteritalische Vasendarstellung des Laokoon-Mythos"). These essays contain original and provocative points of view, and give the book an interest and importance much beyond that of a conventional catalogue.

CEDRIC G. BOULTER

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI
CINCINNATI, OHIO 45221

ANTIKE NUMISMATIK, by *Maria R. Alföldi*. (Kulturgeschichte der Antiken Welt, Bd. 2-3). TEIL I, THEORIE UND PRAXIS. Pp. xlvi + 218, figs. 23, pls. 25, maps 7. TEIL II, BIBLIOGRAPHIE. Pp. xxx + 114, pls. 20. Philipp von Zabern, Mainz, 1978.

This introductory history of ancient numismatics grew out of the author's own research and teaching and is intended for the student and layman. The examination stretches from the earliest forerunners of coins to the eighth century A.C. and from Lydia to Byzantium. Coin material is never presented for its own sake and not every issue of every state is treated, since the author's purpose is to demonstrate the unique value of numismatic evidence to students of the classical and early medieval world. Such a purpose precludes specific narrow criticism and requires a judgment based entirely upon the value and usefulness of the work to the non-specialist, and about the value of Alföldi's work there is no doubt.

Volume I contains a description of what the study of numismatics entails, its particular contribution to studies of the ancient world, and an interesting brief history of the subject beginning with ancient references to the use of numismatic evidence and extending