



FRONING, HEIDE AND ZIMMERMANN-ELSEIFY, NINA

Die Terrakotten der antiken Stadt Elis.

Philippika. Marburger altertumskundliche Abhandlungen 32.

Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010. 148 pages. 32 plates. ISBN: 9783447061506. € 54.00.

Reviewed by Joannis Mylonopoulos (jm3193@columbia.edu)

With the notable exception of Corinth, the cities and settlements that “controlled” the four panhellenic sanctuaries have shared a similar fate in terms of archaeological exploration and/or the publication of their excavations. Despite several decades of Greek ¹ or as individual articles.² No

historical perspective³ or in association with, and in the shadow of, Olympia.⁴ All the more welcome is the present book, a col-
-
tions.⁵

The richly illustrated and well-edited volume consists of a very brief introduction signed by both authors, two chapters by Froning

molds. Thirty-two plates with grey-scale photographs of all 149 objects – several objects are shown from multiple perspectives – complement the text.

In the introduction, after brief references to the history of the excavations within the area of the ancient city, the authors address

to be based on stylistic observations, because the immediate archaeological context could not be precisely dated. The general state of preservation of the terracottas is fair, with a few examples preserving traces of color. The rather soft, almost powdery, clay re-

remain unclear. Direct imports are rare; there is one probably from Boeotia, another from Corinth, and yet a third from Argos. Nonetheless, the authors do address stylistic similarities between locally-produced works and those from Corinth, Boeotia, Athens, and Magna Graecia.

nated at sanctuaries in the vicinity. With the exception of P 23, the protomes are made of soft clay and seem to be products of old, nearly worn-out molds. P 23 from the late-5th century is made of harder, gray clay. Froning argues that it is nevertheless a

and the mid-4th century. P 21 and P 22 seem

times confusing.⁷ Only after a careful reading of the catalogue and a close looking at the images does the reader begin to understand her typological and formal categories. These do make absolutely good sense, but the author does the reader no favor by being extremely laconic. After discussing the interpretive possibilities of protomes in general, she concludes that with the exception of P

brevity that dims the clarity of the analytical part of this chapter becomes an asset in the catalogue, in which Froning presents all necessary information about each piece in a lucid and well-organized fashion in detailed, but not wordy, descriptions and with helpful bibliographical references.

buildings. S 2, the upper part of an Amazon’s body from the early 4th

perhaps an acroterion. S 10, probably belonging to a late-4th

functioned as architectural sculpture (S 3, 4, 9, 11, and 12), while others (S 5, 7, 8, 10, and 13) probably were free standing vo-

th and late 4th century.

associated with sculpture, rather than with the contemporaneous, serialized, mold-based, coroplastic products. In two brief sub-

and Kore.⁸ As with the catalogue of the protomes, the entries on the individual objects are clear. Due to the importance of the material, the stylistic analyses here are longer and more detailed than in the case of the protomes. S 3, 4, 6-8, and 13 are published

sh... been locally produced. Among the 112 objects... only one (T 14) is probably from the Argolid and one

... such as attributes, garment parts, hair locks or strands... even arms or legs were often handmade and then attached to the

especially in the 5th century, was the female divinity seated on a throne. Towards the end of the 5th century, local artists started

Importe und regionale Bezüge	12-13
Protomen (H. Froning)	15-35
Terminologie	15
Fundumstände	16
Ton und Produktion	16-17
Datierung	17-18
Form	18
mit anatomisch geformten Körperabschnitt	19-20
Interpretation	23-25
Katalog P 1 – P 24	26-35
Handgeformte Tonplastik (H. Froning)	37-65
Fundorte	37-38
Funktion	39
Werkstattfragen und Technik	39-41
Chronologie	41-42
Die nacharchaische handgeformte Tonplastik in anderen Regionen Griechenlands	42-44
Stilistische und technische Bezüge	44-45
Das Verhältnis der elischen zur korinthischen Tonplastik	45-47
Katalog S 1 – S 13	48-65
„	
Die Funktion der Terrakotten	80-85
Der regionale Kontext	86-92
Katalog T 1 – T 112	93-148
Tafeln	

NOTES

¹ In the *Praktika* or the *Archaiologikon Deltion* (Greek excavations) and in the *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts* (Austrian excavations).

²

Agora,” *ÖJh* 70, 2001, 81-116.

³ S. Zoumbaki, *Prosopographie der Eleer bis zum 1. Jh. v. Chr.*, Athens 2005.

⁴ N. Yalouris, *Ancient Elis. Cradle of the Olympic Games*, Athens 1996.

⁵

⁶ According to Froning, a protome should be understood as an anthropomorphic bust in relief but without background. Here, Froning is citing F. Croissant, *Les protomés féminines archaïques. Recherches sur les représentations du visage dans la plastique grecque de 550 a 480 av. J.-C* pinax” (p. 19 f.).

⁷ Froning discusses the typology in a paragraph on p. 22. The constant switching from “Form” to “Grundtypus” to “Typus” to “Variation” within a few pages does not make Froning’s categorization clearer.

⁸ N. Bookidis, *The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore. The Terracotta Sculpture*, Corinth 18.5, Princeton 2010.