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ABSTRACT

Archaeological evidence for early Greek cult images is very scarce. Literary sources constitute the only means through which we learn about them. The antiquarian and iconoclastic tradition ascribes crude beginnings to such images positing that representational sculpture evolved from aniconic prototypes. This is an art- and religious-historical fallacy on the part of ancient authors and modern scholarship that subscribed to it. Aniconism always existed side by side with the iconic impulse in the ancient world.

From the Neolithic period onward, holy images in the eastern Mediterranean reflect two different types of female figure. The first is a patterned or modeled type whereas the second is a simpler rendition. Orientalizing Greek sculpture in stone displays these two types through the Daedalic and early Archaic styles respectively. The former is a translation into stone of small-scale statuary fashioned in wood and precious materials. The latter reflects semi-iconic predilections.

Daedalic images of Levantine pedigree probably depicted divinities and influenced early Greek cult images. However, early korai belong to a different tradition that may have partaken of aniconic tendencies. The votive significance of korai and the offerings they bear render implausible the idea that they represent divinities. Whereas small-scale images in wood and costly materials may have attempted to reproduce the substance of
the divinity, larger images in stone may have been thought to act as temporary vessels for it.

There are important stylistic differences between eastern and Mainland korai. The latter are more ornate than their eastern sisters and reflect Daedalicizing facial features. As opposed to the Daedalic image which came to Greece from the Orient via Cyprus and Crete, the kore emerged in East Greece under the influence of Anatolian and Mesopotamian models. As well, the Levant may have been a source of influence for this type, for it had close contacts with the Neo-Hittite world and a tradition of litholatric aniconism. In this regard, as far as early Greek sculpture is concerned, one can talk about two different forms of Orientalizing style that stemmed from about the same geographic area.
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INTRODUCTION

This essay is a preliminary study of the standing female image of pre-Classical Greece in its formal, stylistic and religious aspects. Although my principal focus is the kore, earlier examples of female figures from various localities in the eastern Mediterranean area will also be dealt with in order to put in context the developments in the Archaic maiden type. The seminal role played by foreign, more specifically, Near Eastern sources in the formation of Greek art is attracting more and more students today. In examining the kore type, I emphasize two important facets of the so-called Orientalizing period which in fact have significant overlaps: one, the Cretan contribution whose primary source is the Levant, and two, the Ionian component which has a distinct western Anatolian flavor although its ultimate origins may be sought further in the East as well.

As far as freestanding statuary is concerned the Cretan contribution manifests itself through what has been designated as the Daedalic style, examples of which are thought to epitomize Orientalizing sculpture in the Greek world. However, the Archaic style too should be considered as an Orientalizing phenomenon though it yielded its first examples somewhat later. Archaic sculpture did not develop from the Daedalic and the two styles reflect different traits and probably drew upon different sources. These differences in
form, style and origin will be stressed time and again in the first, second and fourth chapters.

The problem of beginning in both Greek monumental sculpture and architecture in stone has been a perennial question. Although I will not attempt to resolve this difficult issue, another controversial matter has much to do with it, and that is, to what extent early Greek sculpture in stone imitated cult images said in the literary sources to have been carved in the archaios fashion. Interestingly enough, it is in the kore type rather than the kouros that this discussion finds its most fertile ground. Such korai as Nikandre, the dedication of Cheramyes on Samos now in the Louvre, and the Peplos kore have been explained on account of their semi-iconicity as translations into stone of former cult images, or at least as reflecting some of their formal characteristics owing to religious conservatism. On the other hand, the nude kouros type is unanimously thought of as the medium through which the Greek sculptor perfected anatomical rendering. Thus the kore type has further connotations than such clichés as the Greek ideal or a surrogate lovely girl in the service of the host sanctuary. In short, the female figure offers the student of Archaic sculpture a richer opportunity to explore issues in anthropomorphic representation and religious content.

My goal in this essay is twofold, first, to trace the religious connections of the mode of anthropomorphic representation presented by the kore, and second, to locate this type in an “Orientalizing” context with respect to Daedalic sculpture in stone and its small-scale parallels in costly materials. The first chapter will mostly serve to set the foundation for the first objective. It will deal with the question of aniconism in reference
to literary sources, art and religious historical dogmas, and archaeological evidence. The second chapter, on the other hand, will delineate the formal and religious aspects of non-monumental images in materials other than stone, emphasizing the Cretan component in Orientalizing sculpture. The question whether or not the kore type drew upon former cult images also gives rise to another perennial issue, whether or not the kore represents a goddess. Since the primary function of this type was votive, a whole chapter, the third one, is devoted to the study of the sacrificial and dedicatory significance of the kore. This chapter will attempt to synthesize in depth the identity of the female subject represented by the maiden type. Finally the fourth chapter will pinpoint the stylistic differences between eastern and mainland korai leading to a Conclusion where the probable origins of the kore type are discussed.

The Persian wars changed the entire ancient Greek world view, and the kore as a favorite Acropolis dedication became extinct with this crucial turning point. Most korai were buried and remained under the earth until they were excavated by archaeologists in the nineteenth century. Since the Greeks “revised their attitude toward the Orient”1 as a result of the Persian wars, the decline of the kore on the Athenian acropolis should be seen as part of the nascent “orientalism” that was fostered throughout the Classical and Hellenistic periods. The increase in the production of female images in the Greek world in the seventh-century was one of the consequences of the Orientalizing influx. This essay intends to examine the kore within this framework, and it is my objective to stress the

---

representational and religious ramifications embodied by this type. I am hoping that this approach will shed light on some of the less studied or neglected aspects of Archaic korai.
CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM OF ANICONISM IN THE GRAECO-ROMAN WORLD

The question of anthropomorphism forms the basis of the two diametrically opposite conceptions of godhead in the ancient Mediterranean world, Greek polytheism and Jewish monotheism.1 Greek cult is often said to have originally centered around the altar and the ritual of sacrifice.2 Nevertheless, from the eighth century onwards Greek worship was essentially the veneration of anthropomorphic images.3 In Homer and Hesiod the divine realm is always conceived of in terms of the human being and his social context.4 As far as Greek worship is concerned, the appearance of the divinity and its epiphany are striven for as a fortunate experience whereas according to the Old Testament the sight of Yahweh is normally a taboo.5

---


3 Stewart, Greek Sculpture. 44. Whitney Davis uses André Malraux’s phrase “Greece’s tireless cult of man” in pointing to the difference between Greek and all other sculpture. “Egypt, Samos and the Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture,” Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, 67 (1981): 61.

4 Stewart, Greek Sculpture. 44.

Image prohibition in the Old Testament follows on two lines. One, the protest against pagan idolatry and two, the impropriety of worshipping the true God, Yahweh, through images. There are two general grounds of objection to image carving in this respect. The first one is the falsity of supposing that an inanimate thing is alive, the second, the irreverence committed toward God by representing him through a visible simulation. The second commandment clearly discourages all endeavor to arrive at a precise depiction of the deity. An approximately analogous understanding exists in the Muslim doctrine as well. It is wrong, according to the Islamic belief, to make the image of a fish because one cannot make a live fish.

In the Greek realm too, attacks on idolatry came as early as ca. 500 BC with the remark of Heracleitos that the Greeks talked to their statues as if one were to converse with houses, in ignorance of both gods and heroes. Similarly Democritos talks about “idols, conspicuous for their dress and ornament, empty of heart.”

The ethical aspects of image carving and idolatry have been a religious historical problem since time immemorial. The practice of venerating non-representational divine

---


7 Ibid., 64.


images is commonly referred to as aniconism. According to this understanding manmade anthropomorphic images were especially abominable.\textsuperscript{12} This kind of approach may explain the special regard paid in the ancient Greek world to stone images which were believed to have fallen from heaven, also referred to as diopetēs (fallen from Zeus).\textsuperscript{13} As well, the aniconic image, be it an object or some kind of natural formation, was not itself considered as the divinity.\textsuperscript{14} The image was regarded as the temporary abode of the godhead which would have to be summoned through ritual or prayer to enter into the substance of the image for a consecrated moment or duration of time.\textsuperscript{15} The Greeks themselves seem to have acknowledged this kind of divine experience as Porphyry speaks of theiadamoī anagkai.\textsuperscript{16}

The consecration and veneration of simple unworked stones was a very old Levantine tradition.\textsuperscript{17} The usual ethnographic view is that the Semitic notion of the divine

\textsuperscript{12} Bevan, \textit{Holy Images}, 78.

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid. Among such images were the stone of Aphrodite at Paphos, the pounder of Ephesus (Fig. 13) and the black stone of Cybele at Pessinus.

\textsuperscript{14} Metzler, “Anikonische Darstellungen,” 8.

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid. See also Arthur J. Evans, “Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult and its Mediterranean Relations,” \textit{Journal of Hellenic Studies}, 21 (1901): 99 - 204. “Of course it is not the Black stone itself which is worshipped in Mecca but there can be no doubt of the existence of lithographic practices in pre-Islamic Arabia and of beliefs that invest stones with divine and supernatutral powers.” David Freedberg, \textit{The Power of Images: Studies in History and Theory of Response} (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1989), 68.

\textsuperscript{16} Porphyry, \textit{De Philos. Ex. Orac.} P. 154 quoted in Metzler, “Anikonische Darstellungen,” 97. According to Arthur J. Evans a ritual of such sort is depicted on a gold signet ring from Knossos. Evans, “Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult,” 170, fig. 48. According to Evans such depictions are artists’ “attempts to express the spiritual being duly brought down by ritual incantation, so as temporarily to possess its stony resting-place.” Ibid., 124.

status of stones from the skies passed on to Greece via Crete. The word *baitylos* which designates an animated stone (*lithos empsychos*) derives from the Semitic word *beth-el* meaning the house of god. Jacob’s pillar from the book of *Genesis* (28: 10-22 and 35: 14) is a well-known example. The prophetic Hebrew religion did not shrink from the idea of a supernatural virtue attaching to a material object so long as it was not a similitude. It did, however, regard as sinful the worship of the *Asherim* which means poles or pillars erected to represent a goddess, a deity other than Yahweh. All in all, it may be argued that image prohibition particularly, though not exclusively, referred to representational and most of all, to anthropomorphic images.

Throughout the early history of art, man had always felt more comfortable and seems to have been more proficient in depicting animals than the human form. Cave

---


22 “Trees and pillars of Canaanitish gods were overthrown, but others were planted and set up in honor of the Lord. It was only ‘graven images’ that were condemned by the conservative precepts of early Israelite cult.” Evans, “Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult”, 132.

paintings of the Paleolithic period invariably represent animals with incredible realism. An Archaic Greek work, the Moschophoros (Fig. 1) is interesting in that “compared with the rigid figure of the bearer, the calf seems far more a creature of flesh and blood.”\textsuperscript{24} Apparently, some kind of religious conservatism attached to the human depiction in the ancient times which also influenced early Greek art.

According to the Stoic view, God does not have a human body but man’s soul is of the same nature as God.\textsuperscript{25} In this regard, the best symbol of God could be considered as an image in human form since “the human form is among all visible things on earth the vehicle and index of the soul.”\textsuperscript{26} Similarly in the Jewish realm, the Biblical account presupposes that man was created according to or in imitation of the image of God. However, given the Biblical taboo of the sight of Yahweh’s countenance, this constitutes a good enough reason for the prohibition of images, especially anthropomorphic ones. It is likely that the idea underlying image prohibition in general is the undesired act of equating the anthropomorphic or representational image of lifeless material to God or any living being. In sum, one can talk about three different conceptions of divine representation. One, the image as symbol, as in the Stoic view, two, the image as a means for the epiphany of the deity which is apparently the case with aniconism, and finally three, the image as similitude which runs the danger of being equated with the imaged.\textsuperscript{27} That the idol was merely a symbol bringing home to the senses the idea of an


\textsuperscript{25} Bevan, \textit{Holy Images}, 73.

\textsuperscript{26} Ibid.
invisible and remote divinity is the more philosophical view of the image and was probably never the original view. As far as the other two conceptions of images are concerned, it may be argued that one is on safer grounds as far as aniconic objects are concerned since they are not actual simulacra. Thus, the objection raised to images in the Old Testament is grounded on the condemnation of idolatry because it makes a similitude of God rather than the charge that it falsely supposes a block of inanimate material to be animated.

Be this as it may, according to some doctrines, the purest state of worship is the one which does away with material images altogether. Many Greek philosophers such as Plato, Heracleitos and Xenophon are unanimous on the opinion that "anything made from a terrestrial substance or worked by human hands is simply unworthy of the gods." This

---

27 "A figure in a religious context is not simply intended to evoke the sacred power to which it refers, which in certain cases it 'represents,' as in the case of an anthropomorphic statue." Jean-Pierre Vernant, Mortals and Immortals. Collected Essays (Princeton: University Press, 1991), 153.


29 When one considers once again the two biblical objections brought against image worship, neither the first nor the second has any application to the worship of aniconic objects. The golden calf is denounced in the Scripture (Psalm 106:20 and Hosea 13:2) because one, Yahweh is not like a calf and two, the image of the calf is not alive. Ibid., 40.

30 Ibid., 39. Also, according to the late Greek apologists of images such as Plotinus, the purpose of the image is to enable the worshiper to come into real contact with the World Soul which is attracted by particular material things through some kind of sympathy. In this way, "a man can come into communion with the Higher Soul and with the Nous to which the Higher Soul is always directed." Ibid., 76.

31 For instance, the worship of sacred stones was deemed idolatrous by Moses who ordered their destruction. Hence, Leviticus 26:1 reads: "You shall not make idols for yourselves, or set up for yourselves carved images or pillars, or place figured stones in your land to worship upon, for I the Lord am your God."

32 Freedberg, The Power of Images. 61. According to Dio Chrysostom, a Christian apologist of images, there is one thing which all worship of God in his sublime transcendence lacks and that is the sense of intimate nearness, the satisfaction of the human craving to touch. Dio Chrysostom, Oration 7, De Dei Cognitione. Bevan, Holy Images, 72.
is also the view which is presupposed by the Christian apologists such as Clement of Alexandria. Clement was a converted Christian and his views reflect the Christian attitude toward the Greek practice of idolatry. He condemns not only anthropomorphic but also aniconic images: “It is now, therefore, self-evident that out of stones and blocks of wood, and in one word out of matter, men fashioned agalmata resembling the human form, to which you offer a semblance of piety, calumniating the truth.”

As well, Clement has thoughts and suggestions concerning the general chronology of ancient images: “Before, then, they perfected the fashion of agalmata, the ancients setting up columns, worshipped them as aphidrumata” and “that (the agalma) of Hera, as Aëthlius says, was at first a sanis but afterwards, when Procles was ruler, it became andriantoeides.” These statements take it for granted that columns preceded agalmata as venerable objects in the religious history of the ancients. According to Clement, the worship of non-figural objects is a developmental stage in idolatry and suggests a continuous evolution from such objects into representational images. Similarly, antiquarian authors such as Callimachus, Plutarch and Pausanias believe in the existence

33 Irene Bald Romano, Early Greek Cult Images (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1980), 15.

34 The meaning of the word agalma in this context is simply divine image; the significance of this term will be discussed in the next chapter.


36 Clement of Alexandria, Stromateis, i. 164. 1.


38 Ibid., 4. 41 P. quoted in A. A. Donohue, Xoana, 202.
of a technologically less sophisticated and austere past when images were carved in accordance with the *archaios* fashion.\textsuperscript{39} Pausanias, for instance, remarks that in remoter antiquity the Greeks worshipped unhewn stones instead of *agalmata* which were made with *techne*.\textsuperscript{40} Callimachus mentions the plank-like and unworked representation of the Samian Hera indicating that the art of carving *agalmata* had not yet been advanced then.\textsuperscript{41}

Hence, the iconoclastic view as exemplified by Clement's statements defamed the veneration of both aniconic objects and "*agalmata.*" On the other hand, the account of the antiquarian authors did not refer to the ethical aspects of image worship. These authors adhered to the assumption that early images were crude and belonged to "an age before art" and spoke of the developments in the technique of fashioning images.\textsuperscript{42} However, they did consider the old image of crude formation to be an indication as to the high antiquity of the cult centered around it.\textsuperscript{43}

The commonly accepted opinion in today's scholarship is that the belief in a more superior aniconic past is an "historiographical invention that arises from the need to claim for a culture a superior spirituality."\textsuperscript{44} However, neither of the two views explained above, iconoclastic and antiquarian, claims that aniconism was a spiritually superior stage

\textsuperscript{39} Ibid., 195 - 6. Pausanias remarks that in the past the Greeks worshipped not *agalmata*, but unworked stones (7. 22. 4). He also says that the seven pillars near Sparta are the *agalmata* of the planets conforming to an *archaios* fashion.

\textsuperscript{40} Pausanias, 9. 3. 2., quoted in ibid., 195.

\textsuperscript{41} Diegesis to Callimachus, *Aetia IV* fr. 100, quoted in ibid.

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., 196.

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 3.

\textsuperscript{44} Freedberg, *The Power of Images*, 60.
of worship. One wonders whether it was mainly through the Biblical account which has been discussed above and the old Israelite tradition of setting up pillars to honor the deity that the non representational images came to be regarded as superior to the veneration of representational or anthropomorphic images in the ancient Mediterranean world. Nevertheless, it was this historiographical tradition based on iconoclastic and antiquarian testimonia that has suppressed the possibility of iconicity at the beginnings of the Graeco-Roman culture. Early modern theories about the origin and early development of Greek sculpture depend on ancient testimonia in postulating a primitive stage in Greek art. Winckelmann, like the writers on pagan antiquity who preceded him, accepted ancient literary accounts at face value and took it for granted that aniconic idolatry evolved into representational statues. “For Winckelmann there was no question of founding a history of ancient art on purely empirical observation of the monuments alone.”

One can cite other scholars of our era who subscribed to evolutionary theories. Arthur J. Evans, for example, presupposes all through his article “Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult” that there was a transition from the aniconic to the anthropomorphic shape: “Elsewhere we see the figure of a Goddess seated beside or even upon her rustic shrine or

45 Ibid., 65. According to Metzler, the question of aniconism was not without its political aspects. In the case of the Mosaic version of monotheism and the aniconic Yahweh religion, the prohibition of images also served for monopolizing the cult of Yahweh in the temple at Jerusalem. “Anikonische Darstellungen,” 99.

46 Ibid.

47 Ibid., 186. “For Winckelmann there was no question of founding a history of ancient art on purely empirical observation of the monuments alone. Ibid., 188.

48 Ibid., 188.
beneath her sacred tree, and tended by her hand-maidens. In other cases, as in the Lion’s Gate scheme, we see the pillar image between its guardian monsters. The coexistence of this more realistic imagery side by side with the material objects of primitive cult certainly betrays elements of transition.”

Farnell states that “the new evidence” leads one to the conclusion that the “free statue was a native Greek development and that it slowly evolved from the earlier aniconic object.” He mentions the thesis developed by Bötticher in *Umriss des Hellenischen Baumcultus* that the later anthropomorphic image of the divinity is gradually developed from the tree. He also notes Overbeck’s opposition to this theory. According to Overbeck, “there is no development necessary to suppose of iconic from aniconic: the impulse towards the iconic object breaks away altogether from the tradition of the past.” Farnell rejects this counter-argument on the basis of “certain ancient records,” which have been referred to above as iconoclastic and antiquarian testimonia, and much “a priori” argument. As for early Greek sculptural images, Farnell posits that “the primitive *agalmatapoios* did not exclude from his mind, when he began his idol, the form of the sacred pillar but rather took the latter as his *point d’appui*.” At some point he goes so

---

49 Evans, “Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult,” 124.


51 Ibid., 168.

52 Overbeck, *Berichte der Sächsischen Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften*, 1864, p. 15 etc. quoted in ibid.

53 Ibid.

54 Ibid., 169.
far as stating that the evolution from the pillar to the articulated statue is analogous to the development of the human organism from the inorganic germ.\footnote{Ibid., 171.}

Donohue, in her book \textit{Xoana} and the Origins of Greek Sculpture, reviews the three theories about the origins of Greek sculpture which constituted the basis of modern scholarship we have examined above:\footnote{Ibid., 174. Finally one can cite Charles Michel whose thoughts were along the same lines with the evolutionary theories. Michel asserts that the anthropomorphism which was so characteristic of Greek religion was the primary factor that gradually transformed stones and columns to statues. \textit{"Les Survivances du Fétichisme dans les Cultes Populaires de la Grèce Ancienne," Revue de l'Histoire des Religions} 60 (1909), 146.} one, “there existed a primitive stage of sculpture in which figural representation was imperfectly achieved,” two, “wooden statues of inherently primitive character preceded images carved in stone,” and three, “aniconic monuments preceded figural representations and influenced their form.” She deems all of these assumptions to be untenable owing to the fact that “the archaeological evidence does not offer confirmation of a primitive stage of sculpture, of the inherentcrudeness of wooden production, or of the aniconic stage of worship and representations of the gods.”\footnote{Donohue, \textit{Xoana}, 206 - 31.} As a result, she posits that Greek aniconic worship may not necessarily have been ancestral to the making of figural images.\footnote{Ibid., 231.}

Likewise, Ridgway asserts that such terms as development and evolution “imply a sort of organic growth that moves from imperfect or incomplete beginning to later fruition and fulfillment, and thus involve an element of judgment.”\footnote{Ibid.} Furthermore, like Donohue,
she indicates that evolutionary theories mainly derive from ancient Roman sources.\textsuperscript{61} According to Ridgway, the idea that the Archaic style was striving toward naturalism is also dangerous.\textsuperscript{62} She is inclined to name the developments in early Greek sculpture as “changes” rather than “evolution.”\textsuperscript{63}

The most important evidence against the evolutionary theories is the existence of archaeologically demonstrable anthropomorphic statues side by side with the recorded examples of unworked cult objects and simple sculptural images that approach being aniconic. Most contemporary scholars point to this reality in arguing that evolutionary theories are not based on an objective and empirical observation of the available archaeological material. David Freedberg states that anthropomorphic images such as the Cycladic idols (Fig. 2) of the third and second millennia BC predate many of the recorded examples of unworked cult objects.\textsuperscript{64} Likewise Hetty Goldman points out that although the Greeks certainly venerated their gods under the form of stones, pillars, and pyramids, these “rude” monuments existed side by side with the fully developed anthropomorphic statue until a late date.\textsuperscript{65} Edwyn Bevan, too, postulates that aniconic fetishism and a cult


\textsuperscript{62} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{63} Ibid., 5. Even an early modern author such as Dénoua does not approve of evolutionary theories. W. Waldemar Dénoua, \textit{Dédaile ou la statue de la Grèce Archaique. Origine et Évolution de la statue archaique. Problèmes techniques et esthétiques} (Paris: E. Boccard, 1930), 52 - 3. He does, however, state that for a statue to be successful, all remnants of aniconism should be eliminated. Ibid., 53.

\textsuperscript{64} Freedberg, \textit{Power of Images}, 66.
of iconic objects coexisted even in Paleolithic times. As a final remark, one can quote Donohue: “Both the coexistence of more or less naturalistic types and the development of figural types away from naturalism and toward abstraction disprove the theory that figural representation must have evolved from imperfect beginnings.” Her account on Mycenaean art is also noteworthy: “What is known of Mycenaean art suggests not primitive beginnings, but instead what appears to be the wholesale adoption of sophisticated Cretan figural traditions by a mainland culture whose own lack of interest in representational art seems due not to any incompetence, but rather to a demonstrable aesthetic preference for abstraction.”

I have selected pairs of examples in order to concretize the discussion above. My focus will be the representational figure rather than the aniconic object. Therefore, I will concentrate on the fully anthropomorphic type and a simpler representational type which has aniconic predilections. I will examine the figures from a totally formalistic point of view so as to prepare a basis for later discussion.

---


67 Donohue, *Xoana*, 207.

68 Ibid. One can also quote R. L. Gordon on this problem: “The classical Greeks believed that in the old days it was usual in Greece to pay the divine honors later paid to statues of gods to unshaped stones. Whatever the historians of religion make of this belief, I shall remark here simply that, as far as the belief is concerned, it is ‘pseudohistory’ not ‘history’. The serialization of the relationship unshaped stones / anthropomorphic statues offers an explanation of the coexistence of two (apparently) different representations of divinity in the Archaic and Classical periods - and indeed beyond, down to the very end of the Roman empire.” “The Real and the Imaginary: Production and Religion in the Graeco-Roman World,” *Art History* 2 (March 1979): 5 - 34, 12.
The first pair consists of two Neolithic female figurines from Catal Höyük, Asia Minor, dating to the first half of the sixth millennium BC. The first one is a Mother-Goddess figurine of baked clay seated on a leopard throne (Fig. 3). The parts of the body associated with fertility are exaggeratedly rendered: heavy buttocks, massive thighs and arms, pendulous breasts and a sagging belly.\textsuperscript{69} Interestingly enough, the second figurine (Fig. 4) is referred to as a stylized goddess.\textsuperscript{70} She is of black limestone and her breasts, arms, hips and legs are indicated by incised lines. Her slightly conical, almost phallic shape is in sheer contrast with the elaborately plastic treatment of the first figurine. Both are from the same locale and date to the same general period, although from different levels.\textsuperscript{71} However, they display diametrically opposite approaches to image making.

A number of mother goddess figurines dating to the late Neolithic period were unearthed in Höyükçê Höyük, located a little south of Hacilar in Asia Minor. These figurines, referred to as insert-head idols (sokmabas idol) are a combination of the two diametrically opposed types introduced above. The idol comprises a more or less anthropomorphic body which contains a round cavity located between the shoulders for the insertion of a long cylindrical object made of wood, clay or bone (Fig. 5). This unmodeled item served as the head and examples have faces incised on them.\textsuperscript{72}

\textsuperscript{69} Belma Kulaçoğlu, Gods and Goddesses, Museum of Anatolian Civilizations (Istanbul: Ana Basim, 1992), 172.

\textsuperscript{70} Ibid., 168.

\textsuperscript{71} The first figurine is from level II and the second from level VI. Thus, the second one is considerably earlier than the first one. However, one can see baked clay figurines with exaggerated hips and breasts among the finds of level VI as well.
The so-called Lady of Auxerre (Fig. 6) and Naxian Nikandre’s dedication on Delos (Fig. 7) constitute the second pair. Both date to the second half of the seventh century BC. The former is probably from Crete and the latter exemplifies the nascent monumental sculpture of the Cyclades. Although both are frontal and rigid, there are striking differences between them. For one thing, the Lady of Auxerre is holding her right hand between her breasts whereas the dedication of Nikandre’s arms are tightly pressed against the sides. The Auxerre statuette’s gesture is reminiscent of those of the least Hellenized plaques from Gortyn drawing upon the Astarte prototype, “where the woman is quite naked and grasps her genitals with one hand.” In addition, the statuette’s breasts are more modeled than those of Nikandre. Her waist is also narrower than Nikandre’s emphasizing the breasts and upper hips. Moreover, her skirt is decorated with incised concentric squares which were originally painted. Nikandre’s dedication lacks this kind of patterned and modeled treatment although it is impossible to know how or whether her clothing was painted. Overall, this comparison shows the Cretan tradition of plastic representation in contrast to the developments in the Cyclades.


73 Lauren Adams, Orientalizing Sculpture in Soft Limestone from Crete and Mainland Greece (Oxford: British Archaeological Reports, 1978), 32. The positioning of the hand between the breasts in this way may also be a gesture of adoration. John Griffiths Pedley, Greek Art and Archaeology (Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall, 1993), 141.

74 Pedley, Greek Art, 139.

75 Adams, Orientalizing Sculpture, 34.
Our third pair consists of two well-known sculptural representations from Samos. The first one is presumably a depiction of the goddess Hera\textsuperscript{76} (Fig. 8) and dates from about the second half of the seventh century BC. One can see similarities between this wooden figure and the Lady of Auxerre (Fig. 6) which has been discussed above. Both figures wear capes and their skirts are decorated with incised designs. The wooden figure is very ornate and is wearing a\textit{ polos} which is also patterned.\textsuperscript{77} Its arms were probably extended forward. The common opinion about this small wooden image is that it imitates an earlier monumental cult image also in wood.\textsuperscript{78} The second example is the\textit{kore} dedicated by Cheramyes to the goddess Hera (Fig. 9). When contrasted with the wooden figure, this statue reflects a more austere and cylindrical disposition with its linear but unpattered surface treatment and column-like appearance. Especially, the lower part of the body is no different than a column complete with its base and flutes.\textsuperscript{79}

\textsuperscript{76} "The statuette represents a woman in a tight skirt wearing a most elaborate dress, which marks her unquestionably as a divinity." Ridgway, \textit{Archaic Style}, 28.

\textsuperscript{77} According to Ridgway, the tall headdress is a\textit{ mitra} rather than a\textit{ polos}, since it is open at the back. It suggests a removable ornament in perishable or precious material. Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway, "Birds, ‘Meniskoi,’ and Head Attributes in Archaic Greece," \textit{American Journal of Archaeology} 94 (1990): 583-612.


\textsuperscript{79} We can take a look at a similar comparative case in the realm of the seated female figure as well. Figure 10 shows a limestone statuette said to be from Chalkis dating to the first half of the sixth century. It depicts "a heroic female figure seated upon a cubic throne in the oriental manner." Adams, \textit{Orientalizing Sculpture}, 124. The most striking features of the statuette are its Egyptianizing headdress and incised surface decoration consisting of rosettes inscribed in squares. The uppermost rosettes are bigger than the ones on the skirt and clearly accentuate the breasts which are slightly modeled. The second member of the pair is a seated statue in limestone from Haghiageoritika in the Peloponnese dating to the first quarter of the sixth century (Fig. 11). In contrast to the fully rounded shoulders, modeled breasts and the ornate surface treatment of the Chalkis statuette, this figure has massive square shoulders, a broad but flat chest and waist, and simpler though apparently unfinished surface treatment.
One can deduce from these pairs of examples that there existed roughly two modes of plastic representation from the Neolithic period onwards: The modeled and/or patterned type, for which the first counterpart of the pairs above constitute examples, as opposed to a simpler and column or planklike type with no or very economical surface treatment. The first type can be planklike too, such as the small wooden image of Hera (Fig. 8), but is invariably characterized by elaborate surface treatment and touches of modeling especially in the breasts. Although both types are thoroughly anthropomorphic, the second one comes closer to the designation “abstract” and “schematized.” Even the Cycladic figurines (Fig. 2) which have been referred to in discussing the evolutionary theories can be thought to fall into this classification since they are highly stylized and devoid of modeling and patterned surface treatment.

It has often been thought that such statues as Nikandre (Fig. 7) and the dedication of Cheramytes (Fig. 9), because of their log or planklike morphology, are translation into stone of some early wooden images. As a matter of fact, very few wooden statues are preserved in Greece. Egypt, due to its exceptionally dry climate is the only region in the Mediterranean where the study of wooden sculptures can be based on archaeological finds. Elsewhere one has to refer to literary evidence for such a study. As far as ancient

Moreover, she is wearing a mantle slung obliquely across the chest, the manner in which some of the Archaic korai wear their mantles.

80 “The kore (Nikandre) thus has all the corporeality of a wooden plank, and in fact statues hewn from wooden beams were probably her prototypes.” Hurwitt, The Art and Culture of Early Greece, 188. Ridgway suggests that the columnlike treatment of the statue may have been the sculptor’s way of imitating an earlier cult statue presumably of wood. Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway, The Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture (Princeton: University Press, 1977), 95, footnote 11.

Greece is concerned the most fruitful source is Description of Greece written by Pausanias during the reign of Marcus Aurelius. Pausanias uses the word xoana to refer to very old wooden statues representing divinities. Although there is great controversy in modern scholarship concerning the imprecise use of this term as well as some other designations used for statues in ancient sources, its widely accepted archaeological definition is an image that looks early, primitive and crude in appearance and that approaches being aniconic.

According to Donohue, the examination of the term xoanon as it occurs in ancient testimonia reveals that the word does not presuppose a tradition of primitive cult statues. On the contrary, it is reasonable to believe that early wooden images, be they small or monumental in scale, were richly decorated rather than left plain and unworked and were probably artistically refined. Pausanias oftentimes mentions xoana that were enriched by the use of metal and precious stones. The wooden figurine of Hera from Samos examined above is one of the very few extant examples demonstrating the ornate surface treatment of wooden statues. In this respect, the thesis that Nikandre and Cheramyes’

---

82 Ibid., 301.
83 Donohue, Xoana, 1.
84 Ibid.
86 Hermann, 636. “If by the time of Homer deities were imagined as anthropomorphic beings and by the eighth century xoana of Samian Hera and probably Athena Polias were made in human form, there is no reason to believe that xoana originated in Iron-Age Greece as crude tree stumps.” Roman, Early Greek Cult Images, 358.
kore were meant to copy wooden prototypes seems to be untenable. One would expect an example which is a translation into stone of wooden images to look rather like the Lady of Auxerre (Fig. 6).

According to Jenkins Nikandre must be older than the Auxerre statuette since it looks cruder.\textsuperscript{88} As well, Adams regards the statuette as an intermediary stage between the "crude" Nikandre (Fig. 7) and a whole series of korai ushered in by the examples of the Cheramyes group (Fig. 9).\textsuperscript{89} It is more reasonable to argue that the two statues are examples of two different trends coexisting at about the same period when monumental Greek sculpture was in embryo. The Auxerre goddess can be defined as "the enlarged petrified version of the 'Daedalic' types"\textsuperscript{90} whereas the Nikandre epitomizes the nascent kore type.

Another example for what a stone version of an older wooden statue would have looked like is represented by the Roman copies of the cult image of the Ephesian Artemis (Fig. 12). Ridgway posits that this type goes back to the late "Daedalic" and Archaic predecessors rather than Hellenistic ones.\textsuperscript{91} It is likely that there existed a very old wooden cult statue of this type in the sanctuary at Ephesus. Nigel Spivey suggests that it "was a simple wooden xoanon, festooned with amber globules that gave her the


\textsuperscript{89} Adams, *Orientalizing Sculpture*, 33.


\textsuperscript{91} Ridgway, *Archaic Style*, 49, footnote 2.25.
appearance of being super-fertile and ultra-matronly.” It is impossible to know when this kind of a statue was first carved to represent the Ephesian Artemis. However, a Neolithic object from this locale (Fig. 13) stands in sheer contrast to a possible wooden anthropomorphic image of the goddess along these lines. It is a pounder of green stone defined as “a primitive eidola comparable with the bottle-shaped goddesses depicted on coins of Asia Minor.” This image, together with the stone of Cybele from Pessinus was believed to have fallen from the sky and was highly venerated as an emanation from the gods above. One may visualize this totally aniconic image existing side by side with some kind of an ornate wooden image of Artemis at Ephesus.

When one considers as “anthropomorphic” the “stylized” Neolithic goddess figurine (Fig. 4) examined above, it becomes clear how simple a process it is to convert an aniconic object to a representational image through several incisions on the surface. “The boundary line between the aniconic object and ‘idol’ is hard to fix precisely, and a slight cut in the surface of the stone or a stroke of color converts the former into the latter.” Therefore a distinction should be made between actual aniconic objects such as

92 Spivey, Understanding Greek Sculpture, 78. The breasts have also been interpreted as the actual scrota of sacrificial bulls, but the point about fertility remains. Ibid. Stewart, Greek Sculpture, 216.


95 It is more appropriate to use this term to refer to non-representational holy stones, posts and pillars. However, small scale stylized idols of stone which are so typical of Neolithic Asia Minor are also non-representational and without incisions. Therefore they may also be designated as aniconic.
poles and pillars, and representational images that have aniconic predilections. The term “semi-iconic” can be a proper designation for this type. In this regard, the two monumental examples in stone that have been examined, Nikandre (Fig. 7) and Cheramyes’ dedication (Fig. 9) can be referred to as semi-iconic.

As far as early statuary in marble is concerned, Farnell thinks that the pillar is the starting point. Furthermore, he suggests that a parallel development of the wooden idol from the aniconic wooden object is extremely likely although we have little evidence for this since the earliest wooden idols have not been preserved. He also believes that these images were carved under the influence of wooden Phoenician idols. However, he indicates that there is no reason why one should not “resort to the same a priori evidence” for these Oriental statues “in favor of the same development that was put forward as regards the development of stone agalmata.”

Farnell’s views are troubling insofar as they are along the same lines with evolutionary theories. It is hard to suggest that such statues as Nikandre and the dedication of Cheramyes artistically derive from the stone pillar in a period when one can encounter high-quality representational art in full maturity. One can argue that at this early stage of Greek sculpture artists were not proficient enough in working with stone. However, not only does the Lady of Auxerre (Fig. 6) prove that representational types

---

96 Farnell, “Origins,” 171. Farnell here uses the word “idol” to mean iconic representation. However the term is often times used for small scale holy objects rendered in a highly abstract and schematized fashion (Fig. 14).


98 Ibid., 174 - 5.

99 Ibid.
produced in other materials could be successfully translated into stone, but also the *kore* dedicated by Cheramyes on Samos by no means reflects any deficiency on the part of the sculptor to handle marble. Finally, as has been mentioned above, it is quite unlikely that the Nikandre and Cheramyes’ dedication imitate old wooden cult statues since they lack patterned surface ornament. In addition to the testimony provided by the small wooden image of Hera from Samos, one can see a statue of Athena held by Cassandra on a red-figure cup by Onesimos (Fig. 15). The statue as represented on the cup displays ornate patterning on its clothing in contrast to the relatively plain surfaces of the figures around it. The designs on the skirt and the scale treatment of the aegis may give one an idea as to the appearance of a holy image of this sort in remoter antiquity.

Thus there is enough reason to argue that the two early marble statues that have been examined bear a deliberate reference to the aniconic image without being examples of a transitional stage or derivatives of pillars. In other words, they reflect the merging of an aniconic attitude prevalent in their period with the fully anthropomorphic plastic representation. Eliminating all kinds of incised geometric designs that were usual on small scale holy images of wood or some other materials in the “Orientalizing” period, they emphasize their columnar or planklike morphology. Why this sort of sculptural disposition manifests itself in the early period of Greek sculpture is a question hard to answer. Müller refers to the small scale counterparts of this type (Fig. 16) as *Blockstil* and argues that it is of non-Greek origin.100

100 Valentin Müller, *Frühe Plastik in Griechenland und Kleinasien* (Augsburg: Dr. Benno Filser Verlag, 1929), 87. According to Farnell, it was also through the Orient that the Greeks borrowed the iconic impulse. Farnell, “Origins,” 175.
Important late twentieth-century scholars agree that the anthropomorphic cult image was communicated to Greece from foreign sources as well. Andrew Stewart talks about the fact that the idea of the cult image may have reached Greece from the Near East as a result of commercial and cultural contact.\textsuperscript{101} He goes on to say that there was a sudden emergence in the eighth century of freestanding temples and their images which were often made of Levantine timbers and described by Pausanias.\textsuperscript{102} He also draws attention to the fact that these statues apparently looked like those of Neo-Hittite Phrygia, North Syria, Urartu and Assyria.\textsuperscript{103} Walter Burkert indicates that early Greek worship was without cult statues.\textsuperscript{104} He posits that the Indo-Europeans originally did not use images of the gods, unlike the Egyptians and Mesopotamians who had as center of their worship the temple housing the cult statue.\textsuperscript{105} He asserts that this tradition was borrowed by the Hittites and, with the exception of Israel, by the western Semitic peoples.\textsuperscript{106} Finally, Sarah Morris stresses the fact that the coastal Levant was the pivot point of contact between the Aegean and Egypt.\textsuperscript{107} She draws attention to the simultaneous appearance of Levantine “cult practices and objects such as animal sacrifice, platforms or

\textsuperscript{101} Stewart, \textit{Greek Sculpture}, 104.

\textsuperscript{102} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{103} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{105} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{106} Ibid.

benches, and idols in the Aegean in the late Bronze age." According to Morris, "aspects of Semitic cult practices survive into Archaic Cyprus, where they lie intermediate, in period and locale, to the Levant and Greece."  

The Semitic West is also thought to have been an important source of inspiration for the Hellenic world as far as aniconic image worship is concerned. A turn-of-the-century religious historian, Robert Brown, argues that a Hellenic god of non-Aryan or Semitic origin can be identified through the lack of the derivatives of its names and myths in the other branches of Aryan religious mythology and its "more or less unanthropomorphaic" form. As has been mentioned, early pillar worship was very widespread in the Levant and may have influenced Bronze Age Crete as well. Sarah Morris, underlining the Semitic heritage of Crete, posits that archaeology and anthropology suggest activity on the island more Levantine than Greek. Similarly, Martin Bernal thinks that by 1700 BC the languages of the ruling classes in the towns of the southern Aegean were West Semitic and Egyptian. He also states that it was in this period that "the amalgam of local Indo-European with Egyptian and Levantine influences that we call Greek civilization was first and lastingly formed."  

---

108 Ibid., 108.

109 Ibid., 128.


111 Morris, Daidalos and the Origins of Greek Art, 169.


113 Ibid., 494.
Evans, on the other hand, “the Semitized guise” of the Southern Aegean “may itself be largely due to the former existence on the more eastern Mediterranean shores of indigenous ethnic elements akin to those of prehistoric Greece.”\textsuperscript{114} Whether or not aniconism penetrated the Hellenic religious realm from the Levant, owing to the greater age and sophistication of Levantine and Egyptian cultures, it seems highly likely that the predominant cultural flow was from the eastern Mediterranean to the Aegean world rather than the other way round.\textsuperscript{115}

According to Donohue, aniconism should not be regarded as a universal stage in primitive worship.\textsuperscript{116} She argues that aniconic monuments are features of particular cults and therefore should be examined on a cult-by-cult basis.\textsuperscript{117} However, the known occurrences of a generic kind of pillar and holy stone veneration in the Levant, on Cyprus and Crete makes it overwhelmingly likely that this kind of worship was widespread enough to go beyond exclusive individual cults. In short, although it cannot be considered as a chronological phase in the religious history of the ancient world, aniconism was in and of itself a generally acceptable mode of image worship in the old eastern Mediterranean realm. Furthermore, the fact that many of the principal Hellenic divinities such as Aphrodite, Apollo, Artemis, Dionysos, Hera and Zeus had aniconic

\textsuperscript{114} Evans, “Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult,” 135.

\textsuperscript{115} Bernal, \textit{Black Athena}, vol. 2., 494.

\textsuperscript{116} Donohue, \textit{Yoana}, 226.

\textsuperscript{117} Ibid.
representations\textsuperscript{118} is an indication of the permeability of individual cults to this particular mode of idolatry.

It is reasonable to assume that the semi-iconic sculptural representations examined above partake in the significance of aniconic depiction. In this respect one can safely talk about a blending of non-anthropomorphic shapes that belonged to the original realm of aniconic worship with representational images that constituted the other branch of object-dependent religion. The driving source and significance of early Greek semi-iconic female figures in stone, as exemplified by Nikandre and Cheramyes' dedication, are very difficult to explain. However, given the dynamic cross-cultural milieu of the eastern Mediterranean from the late Bronze age to the Archaic period, it will be profitable to examine early sculptural representation in Greece in its "Orientalizing" context.

\textsuperscript{118} Farnell asserts that all Hellenic divinities in the pre-Homeric age were likely to be worshipped with "aniconic emblems." \textit{Celts of Greece}, vol. 4 (New York: 1977), 307. For instance, the "emblem" or \textit{agalma} of the worship of Apollo was almost invariably aniconic, the most common being the conical pillar. Similarly, very primitive elements can be traced in the worship of Artemis. In her earlier monuments one can find the very ancient type of the religious element; the stone without any human semblance (p. 518). As for the representation of Aphrodite at Paphos, it was simply a conical stone shaped like a Greek meta or goal-post (p. 670).
CHAPTER 2

ORIENTALIZING SCULPTURE:
MATERIALS, TECHNIQUE AND FUNCTION

The words xoanon and agalma are the two most common terms used to designate holy images in ancient testimonia. Although there is controversy regarding the definitive meaning of the word xoanon, it signified, as early as the fifth century BC, a sacred image of wood usually representing a divinity. Pausanias' use of the word is clear and consistent.1 “For him the basic distinction of the xoanon is that it is made of wood.”2 He uses the word only for statues of divinities, male or female, and not of mortal men.3 As for the word agalma, it literally means “delight.” In the Archaic period the word became the standard usage for “votive.”4 In this respect the term denotes “a gift that pleases the gods.”5 However, “by the fourth century BC, agalma is used for any statue of a god,

---


2 Ibid.


regardless of its ostensible function.” The word finally came to refer to any image without any necessary association with the gods. The word *xóanón*, too, at first restricted to images of wood, grew at length to have a denotation referring to any image depicting a deity which is an *eikon* or some kind of a likeness.

One can argue that originally these two terms referred to two specific types of images different from each other in rendering and significance. However, one can hardly get a clue as to their pristine connotations from ancient testimonia. The only hint in this regard could be the literal meanings of these terms. The word *xóanón* derives from the infinitive *xeeín* which means to give a proper finish to a crude surface with chisel or knife. *Agalleín* is a Greek verb meaning to adorn or to honor and is most probably the verb from which *agalma* is derived. A good indication of the probable difference between the two terms comes from Françoise Frontisi-Ducroux. She proposes that the

---

5 Meiggs, “Trees and Timber,” 301.

6 Stewart, *Greek Sculpture*, 45.


word *agalma*, unlike *xoanon*, did not embody a technological significance.\(^{12}\) It simply meant a statue to honor the divinity without necessarily being a representation of it.\(^{13}\)

As far as *xoana* are concerned, it is almost certain that they were fully anthropomorphic and richly rendered ancient cult statues.\(^{14}\) It has been suggested in the first chapter that the wooden statuette of Hera could be a reflection of what this kind of a cult image would have looked like. Some of the most famous *xoana* of antiquity were the Samian Hera, probably from the beginning of the eighth century, Athena Polias at Athens from the eighth century, the Zeus of Labranda, and the Ephesian Artemis, both probably


\(^{13}\) Ibid. There were other terms the Greeks used to refer to their statues: *Andrias* means man-like image and it was used from the sixth century onward to designate divine images human in form. Brunaide Sismondo Ridgway, *The Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture* (Chicago: Ares Publishers, 1993), Stewart, *Greek Sculpture*, 44. *Bretas* is a word of non Indo-European origin, together with *xoanon*, was used for portable wooden idols. Stewart, 44. Both of these terms denoted figured objects. Another word of non-Indo-European origin is the word *kolossos*. This term, together with *bretas*, is one of the words used for describing cult statues in the Classical period. Ridgway, *Archaic Style*, 22. Philologists postulate that the word may have come from Asia Minor. Ibid., 35. Stewart, *Greek Sculpture*, 44. The present-day meaning of this term was a later development, perhaps prompted by giant *kolossoi* such as Apollo at Amyklai and the famous *kolossos* of Rhodes, one of the seven wonders of the world. According to Philo of Byzantium, the *kolossos* of Rhodes was a giant representation of the Sun god Helios who was identifiable only through his attributes. Philo of Byzantium, *De Septum Miraculis Mundi* p. 14 (Overbeck, 1547) cited in Georges Roux, "Qu’est-ce qu’un *kolossos*?" *Revue des Études Anciennes* 62 (1960), 13. Roux posits that this literary evidence along with some others suggests that the *kolossos* of Rhodes had the appearance more or less of a giant pillar, probably of bronze. In Nicetas one can read about the equation of the term with a column or pillar in bronze (Overbeck, 1551). Furthermore, Pausanias, refers to the giant image of Apollo at Amyklai as "an archaic work, executed without art, whose body, with the exception of his face and the extremities such as the feet and hands, was rendered like a bronze column or pillar." Pausanias 3.19.2. Thus in all likelihood, the term *kolossos* designates something erected, built and mostly applied to images which are columnlike. In this regard, the term is equivalent to the Latin *statua*. Roux, "Qu’est-ce qu’un *kolossos*?" 6.

\(^{14}\) "The *xoana* were made of wood - did that make their shape columnar or plank-like? That would depend on whether it was a tree trunk or a prepared plank that was carved. And why should we assume that wooden sculpture means less articulated human forms? Egyptian wood sculpture from 2500 BC onwards made dextrous use of tenon joints to produce extended limbs for wooden figures, and the lime-wood sculptures of Gothic Europe achieved dramatic folds and gestures with figures taken from a single block." Nigel Spivey, *Understanding Greek Sculpture. Ancient Meanings. Modern Readings* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1996), 60.
from the seventh century BC. Wooden xoana could be gilded and be given robes as kosmesis. Moreover, as has been pointed out in the previous chapter, Pausanias mentions the precious metals that used to cover such idols. Thus, ancient images portraying divinities must have been made in precious or perishable materials which did not survive.

It is reasonable to assume that the earliest iconic images were representations of divinities. As far as the ancient Greeks are concerned the cult image was regarded as the "divine earthly surrogate" substituting the deity at such cultic functions as the sacrifice and sacred processions. Two such instances that involve the participation of the sacred image in cultic ceremonies are the ritual washing of the image of the goddess Hera on Samos and the Panathenaic festival which culminated in providing the olive-wood statuette of Athena Polias with a peplos. In Athens, there was also the Plynteria, the washing festival which took place in the last month of the year. In this festival virgins and women cleaned the ancient wooden image of Athena, removed her ornaments and veiled her. This day was regarded as a day of ill omen and therefore no important business was started.

15 Romano, Early Greek Cult Images, 358.

16 Ibid., 361. Stewart, Greek Sculpture, 44.

17 Frontisi-Ducroux, Dédale, 97.

18 Ridgway, The Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture, 21.


20 Romano, Early Greek Cult Images, 2.
In some texts cult statues were referred to as divinities themselves.\textsuperscript{22} As a matter of fact, the Greeks sometimes did not distinguish between the image and the thing represented.\textsuperscript{23} Such idolatry as the identification of the image and the imaged was quite normal among the Greeks and “down to the end of antiquity their descendants continued to speak of cult images as if the gods themselves were standing before them.”\textsuperscript{24} Thus, at the heart of Greek anthropomorphism was the faith in animated images, the belief that statues in cult contexts were more than representations, they could act and respond. In brief, they had a life their own.\textsuperscript{25}

Sacred xoana were also connected with mysterious and unusual actions and rites. It was not only the requirements of cult and the anthropomorphic tendency of the Greeks that favored and encouraged the production of representational statuary, but also the belief in sacred images' being imbued with life.\textsuperscript{26} According to Faraone, in some ancient texts, the name of the god used to refer to its image is sometimes misread by modern scholars, “so that the anecdote that straightforwardly refers to acts done by a particular statue are accorded instead to the god represented by the statue.”\textsuperscript{27} In the case of

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{24} Stewart, \textit{Greek Sculpture}, 44.
\textsuperscript{25} Spivey, \textit{Understanding Greek Sculpture}, 48.
\textsuperscript{27} Faraone, \textit{Talismans and Trojan Horses}, 10
"talismanic" statues which had the power to give off miraculous signs, their power is expressed in myth and legend either through some biological phenomena the statue performs such as movement, sweat, tears and voices, or some equally supernatural omens such as glowing or shooting fire. 28 Both of these suggest that the statue was conceived of as being alive or capable of displaying supernatural signs.

A xoanon was oftent believed to be on the point of escaping or deserting. 29 There are also instances in which such images were bound and imprisoned. According to Faraone, Greek legends and rituals concerning bound and imprisoned statues express the desire to control directly the potentially dangerous activities of powerful deities of an arbitrary and often malicious disposition. 30 The myths and legends involving the images of the legendary craftsman Daedalus reflect similar cases of animation. A capacity for movement earned Daedalus the reputation for carving statues that would run away if they were not tied down. 31

Although in modern art historical scholarship Daedalus is associated with a particular style in the seventh-century Greek sculpture which can be exemplified by the Lady of Auxerre, the ancient Greek tradition had a tendency to personify almost all early

———

28 Ibid., 4. Nigel Spivey mentions certain mechanical devices with which a bust of Epicurus now in Copenhagen, can be made to speak by a concealed ventriloquist. “This is an example from later antiquity but such tricks must have gone on earlier. Cult statues moving, sweating, bleeding or weeping are numerous documented, and could easily have been engineered in similar ways - tubes, perforations, and so on - to the Epicurus bust.” Understanding Greek Sculpture, 48.


30 Faraone, Talismans and Trojan Horses, 137.

sculptural innovations and techniques in the figure of Daedalus. In fifth-century Athens, a literary tradition of "living art" which derived from poetic conventions was kept alive for comic and philosophical purposes. Socrates says in one of his dialogues (Meno 97d) that philosophical opinions are like the statues of Daedalus: "if they are not fastened up, they play truant and run away." This is explained by a commentator: "Daidalos, the greatest maker of statues, was the first to open their eyelids, so that they appear to see, and to separate the feet, so that they appear to walk. And because of this he bound them, in order that they might not run away, as if they were living and breathing." Similarly, another quotation from Plato reads: "Daidalos the Athenian was foremost among the sculptors of that time. He was also the first to design a statue with legs apart, the images before that time having their limbs worked together. From that time derives the account current among many, of statues moving and walking around."

Perhaps the most celebrated account on Daedalus comes from a Hellenistic author, Diodorus Siculus:

In natural ability he far surpassed all other men, both in the art of building and in the manufacture of statues and in stoneworking. And having become the inventor (euretes) of many techniques in art, he made wondrous works (erga thaumazomena) in all parts of the inhabited world. In the making of statues he so far surpassed all others that later generations told tales about him, that his statues resembled living men: For they see and walk and on the whole maintain such a disposition in their whole body, that the artificial creature seems to be a living creature (empyphon zoon). As the first to give them eyes and make them move their limbs, it is

32 Ibid., 191.
34 Spivey, Understanding Greek Sculpture, 58.
35 Quoted in ibid., 241.
36 Plato, Euthyphro, 11c quoted in ibid., 142.
reasonable that he was admired among men. For the artists before his time used to make statues with closed eyes, and with arms at rest and close to their sides.  

Curiously enough, the attribution to Daedalus of moving statues with extended arms and legs would not agree with the majority of the specific works that are ascribed to the sculptor in ancient testimonia. The description of statues before Daedalus seems to refer to the pillar shaped images that have been designated as “semi-iconic” in the first chapter. However, in the Roman period, the statues by Daedalus were usually described as unworked column or planklike images. “In other words, Roman conceptions of the works of Daedalos correspond to those that Classical and Hellenistic writers attributed to his predecessors.” Pausanias sometimes equates such “unworked images” with daidala. His comment on the style of Daedalos’ statues is also worth noting: “As many statues as Daedalos made, they were somewhat odd in appearance, but something divine stands out in them.” One can infer from this quote that according to Pausanias these statues were too outdated to be considered as revolutionary, yet venerable still owing to their antiquity.

The changing aspects of Daedalos through antiquity and the relevance of the ancient testimonia concerning his works and deeds to the discourse on the origins of Greek sculpture are complex matters which go beyond the scope of this essay. Nevertheless, the important point to be emphasized for our discussion is that Daedalos

---


38 Ibid., 242.

39 Ibid., 243.

40 Pausanias 2.4.5 quoted in ibid., 248.
was a legendary figure who possessed some sort of "craftiness" along with a technical command in craftsmanship. In other words, the miraculous deeds of the legendary sculptor clearly betray magical overtones.

Frontisi-Ducroux states that all statues fashioned by Daedalos depicted divinities while all of them which are cited by Pausanias were ancient xoana of wood. It has been asserted above that xoana, being portrayals of divinities, notwithstanding the definitions based on the antiquarian tradition, could have been highly sophisticated and ornate images. Even though they were "odd" in morphology, they were probably enriched by precious metals and stones. In fact, the attribution of very old wooden statues to Daedalos may have masked his significance as a craftsman working with metal as well. According to Sarah Morris, Daedalos was the translation into Hellenic culture of the Near Eastern craftsman god Kothar. Kothar was probably adopted first in Crete as Daidalos in the Late Bronze Age. This was also the period in which the so-called Canaanite diaspora took place and some other Levantine traditions penetrated into the Hellenic world. The rise of the Neo-Assyrian empire caused war and thus enhanced commerce in the eastern Mediterranean, supporting Phoenician expeditions for metal and timber.

---


42 Frontisi-Ducroux, *Dédale*, 97.

43 Ibid., 115. In Homer, who has little to say about Daedaius, the god associated with metal working is Hephaistos. The poet liked to imagine the smith-god making dogs and lions from gold, silver and bronze, and giving them life (psyche entheis) so that they could serve as effective guardians, for the palace of King Alcinous for instance (*Odyssey* vii.91-2). Spivey, *Understanding Greek Sculpture*, 49.

44 Morris, *Daidalos*, 115.

45 Ibid., 125.
systematic contact between the Greeks and North Syria began in the eighth century BC and a trading colony was founded at Al Mina around 800 BC. Levantine craftsmen driven out by the Assyrian conquest came to Cyprus and Crete. With these craftsmen there arrived in the Hellenic world not only new wood carving traditions but also the practice of protecting xoana with thin bronze sheets. Bronze was an acceptable and common material for cult images and was used for this purpose from the Geometric period down to the sixth century BC.

The sphyrelaton technique, that is, forming statues through hammering bronze sheets around a wooden core, was also dependent on Near Eastern technology. It is on Crete that we see the first examples of this technique from the Greek world. A large statuette group consisting of a god and two goddesses, presumably Apollo, Leto and Artemis, were found in a temple of the second half of the eighth century BC at Dreros (Fig. 17). These statues presumably served as cult images and can be referred to as "some of the earliest known Greek sculpture of an 'orientalizing' character." The female

46 Stewart, Greek Sculpture, 37.

47 Romano, Early Greek Cult Images, 364. Later on, in the Classical period, manufacture of bronze statuary became the monumental art in which Athens excelled. Interestingly enough, it was in this time that Daedalos was associated with this medium. Morris, Daidalos, 215.

48 Hurwitt, The Art and Culture of Early Greece, 131. It used to be supposed that a carved wooden core-figure was essential to such figures (sphyrelaton), arising from the religious practice of embellishing or enriching wooden cult statues with bronze exteriors, but in fact a freestand technique is more plausible, allowing sculptors to work on bronze plates both from the inside out (repoussé) and from the outside in (chasing). Spivey, Understanding Greek Sculpture, 72.


50 Ibid.
statuettes that may have stood for Leto and Artemis are different from the male one in that they are draped. They are also wearing polloi which indicate their divine nature. Although the lower parts of their bodies are columnlike, their breasts are somewhat modeled. Moreover, there are vertical bands of designs running along the center of their robes on the front. They are also wearing capes similar to the ones worn by the Lady of Auxerre and the wooden Hera from Samos. In spite of the fact that they are not as lavishly fashioned as the Samian statuette (Fig. 8), they can still be considered as examples for the patterned type which has been outlined in the first chapter.

The ivory figurine from the Dipylon cemetery (Fig. 18) is another piece of plastic art which can be referred to as “Orientalizing” as well. Whether an actual Oriental craftsman or a Greek artist under Near Eastern influence carved it, the raw material for the statuette, the way her eyes are carved, her nudity and her polos, though not its meander band, obviously came from the East.\footnote{Hurwitt, \textit{The Art and Culture of Early Greece}, 27.} Again, the polos and the nudity reveal that the statuette depicts a goddess. Furthermore, the fact that the figurine is of ivory harmonizes well with the ancient belief that along with wood, precious materials were deemed suitable for representations of deities. One can also cite another “Orientalizing” statuette, the ivory figurine of a god, presumably of Apollo, with a lion from Delphi (Fig. 19).

Besides certain kinds of wood, many precious and semi-precious materials were meant to substitute for the “flesh of the gods” in the Oriental world from the late second
millennium onward as is attested by the Erat epic. As far as ivory is concerned, in early times it was felt to be the substance in nature which most closely resembled human flesh. Most of the tales concerning this material came from the East. For example, Pygmalion, King of Cyprus, a Phoenician, fashioned an ivory statue of a woman. He was a bachelor and believed that no living woman was good enough for him. So he made the statue of the most beautiful woman he could imagine and adorned it with jewelry and fine clothes. Meanwhile he prayed to Aphrodite to make his creation come alive. The goddess granted his prayer and the ivory turned to flesh as Pygmalion touched it.

The myth of Pelops, whether or not of eastern origin, involves a comparable case. The gods came to visit Tantalos for a festive meal. Tantalos, for whatever reason, turned the divine banquet into cannibalism slaughtering his own son Pelops and offering him to the gods as food. Demeter, unaware owing to her intense mourning for Persephone, ate his shoulder. The justice of Zeus, however, soon followed and Pelops' limbs were put back together. Thus he was brought back to life, but the missing shoulder had to be replaced by a piece of ivory. It was believed that there was something mysterious about


54 Ovid, Metamorphoses X, 243-97 quoted in ibid. “According to Clement of Alexandria, the statue was of Aphrodite herself (Protrepticus 17, 31). Pygmalion's love story reflects a form of Phoenician cult. Ibid., footnote 6.

55 Spivey, Understanding Greek Sculpture, 52-53.

ivory, and objects made from it were highly valued gifts to the gods.\footnote{Ibid.} Plato states that a modest person should not make offerings of ivory to the gods since it comes from a body that has given up the ghost (apoleloipotos psychēn somatos).\footnote{Plato, \textit{Laws} (956a) quoted in ibid. The same fact also applies to wood since the tree is an organic living being before it is cut down and given shape.}

Another material which had associations with life-like qualities was bronze. We read in the Greek Anthology about a bronze heifer made by Myron, of Discobolos fame:

I am Myron’s little heifer, set up on a base. Goad me herdsman, and drive me off to the herd. A calf died beside thy heifer, Myron, thinking that the bronze had milk inside. In vain, bull, thou rushest up to this heifer, for it is lifeless. The sculptor of cows, Myron, deceived thee. The lead and stone hold me fast, but otherwise, thanks to thee, sculptor Myron, I would be nibbling lotus and rushes.\footnote{Dioskorides, \textit{Anthologia Graeca} 9.734 quoted in Spivey, \textit{Understanding Greek Sculpture}, 51.}

Bronze sculpture offered to the exponents of Greek anthropomorphism more excitingly life-like possibilities than marble, limestone or any other stone. It is also noteworthy that it was the most preferred material for freestanding statuary in the post-Archaic period (Fig. 20). The chryselephantine technique which is generally regarded as something peculiarly Hellenic and associated with the great masters of Greek sculpture such as Pheidias seems to have taken over in the Classical period the practice of fashioning ornate xoana out of wood, metals, and precious materials.\footnote{Florence M. Bennett, “Primitive Wooden Statues which Pausanias Saw in Greece,” \textit{Classical Weekly} X, 85.} The tradition practiced by early sculptors of xoana, as Pausanias mentions,\footnote{Pausanias, 6.25.3, 8.22.7 cited in ibid.} of gilding large portions of the image and
fashioning the head, hands, and feet of other materials may have given rise in later times to combine gold and ivory. Curiously enough, even after chryselephantine statues replaced more ancient wooden ones, the latter were still kept and venerated as the most sacred divine images. In Athens, the olive-wood Athena housed in the northern sanctuary of the Acropolis, the Erechtheion, was still the center of the cult even after Pheidias formed the great chryselephantine Athena Parthenos. It was also this type of holy image which was used in processions owing to its portability and was subject to such sympathetic rituals as feeding, washing, and dressing.

The use of metals and costly materials, gold, silver, and ivory, for statues of gods suggests an attempt to extend the range of invoking the deity beyond actually representing it iconically. This attitude clearly embodies an endeavor to reproduce divine substance through using certain types of materials, possibly for theurgical purposes. The belief in statues' being alive and performing miracles and the myths related with Daedalos and his images are also along the same lines with this kind of magical animism. Since most of the images that become alive in mythical cases and the ones depicted iconically in wood, metals, ivory and other precious materials represent divinities, one can presume that it is the association with the cult of a god that generates the life-giving source for a statue. However, one can equally think that it is art,

---

62 Ibid.


64 R. L. Gordon, "The Real and the Imaginary: Production and Religion in the Graeco-Roman World," *Art History* 2 (March 1979): 5-34. Choice of material of this kind can also be connected with "gleaming" or "brightness" which is a very distinct feature of Greek conceptions of divinity. Ibid.
especially art carried out in certain special techniques and materials, that imbues statues with life.\textsuperscript{66} Thus, it is possible to argue that iconicity, modeling, and pattern and ornament are factors that enhance this kind of animism. Particular material things were thought to have a quality which attracted divine power by a kind of sympathy and the image’s being a likeness or “in some way an imitation” is a further step in this regard.\textsuperscript{67} Thus one could affect a supernatural being of whom one had only an imaginative conception through an object made to resemble it.\textsuperscript{68} Plato’s reservation concerning ivory, and many other sources that denounce image making, may have referred to the uncanny effects of this sort of craftiness. If image making had magical connections, this must have dated in origin to much remoter antiquity since instances of this sort are myths and legends. Its essential esoteric knowledge lost, the execution of such idolatry may have been regarded by certain learned men as well as the Scripture as liable to yield undesired consequences.

As mentioned earlier, such mythical instances and iconic carving practices, involving wood, metal and ivory working technologies, came to the Aegean world from the East. A peculiarly Hellenic style of the seventh century BC commonly known as Daedalic also derives from Oriental prototypes. “Daedalic covers a variety of media and dimensions, ranging from small anthropomorphic pots to large pieces of architectural

\textsuperscript{65} Freedberg, \textit{The Power of Images}, 37.

\textsuperscript{66} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{67} Edwyn Bevan, \textit{Holy Images, An Inquiry into Idolatry and Image-Worship in Ancient Paganism and in Christianity} (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1940), 76.

\textsuperscript{68} Ibid., 14.
sculpture.\textsuperscript{69} The Lady of Auxerre (Fig. 6) reflects the characteristics of this style in freestanding format. Other examples in stone include the Astritsi statue (Fig. 21) and the Eleutherna statuette (Fig. 22), both from Heraklion, Crete. Crete had no freestanding monumental type in stone of her own creation and the examples cited above are the embodiment of the influence of the islands and East Greece on Crete in the seventh century.\textsuperscript{70}

Daedalic style was probably brought to Greece and Crete from the Orient, after 700 BC, together with relevant techniques and tools, and was disseminated by means of terracotta molds and figurines.\textsuperscript{71} The first terracotta examples were actually inspired by the mold-made “Astarte” figurines of Syria.\textsuperscript{72} These oriental works must have been enthusiastically received on Crete by a populace accustomed to nude goddesses.\textsuperscript{73} Two groups of terracotta plaques depicting standing female figures are here illustrated (Figs. 23 and 24). The first group (Fig. 23) consists of relief representations of women who are all naked and clasping their breasts. Most of them are wearing head gears and this can again be taken to mean that they are goddesses. Some of them are also wearing belts and necklaces. In some, the pubic area is accentuated. This type can be interpreted as a

\textsuperscript{69} Spivey, \textit{Understanding Greek Sculpture}, 62.

\textsuperscript{70} Adams, \textit{Orientalizing Sculpture}, 143.

\textsuperscript{71} Ridgway, \textit{Archaic Style}, 26.

\textsuperscript{72} Adams, \textit{Orientalizing Sculpture}. R. M. Cook, “Origins of Greek Sculpture,” \textit{Journal of Hellenic Studies} 87 (1967), 29. Small terracotta tablets with the frontal relief figure of a woman, usually naked, have been found in most parts of the Near East, where they are known to scholars by the conventional name of “Astarte plaques.” P. J. Riis, “The Syrian Astarte Plaques and Their Western Connections,” \textit{Berytus} 9 (1948-49), 10.

\textsuperscript{73} Stewart, \textit{Greek Sculpture}, 106.
derivative of the Syrian Bronze Age figurine in the round.\textsuperscript{74} “The gesture, which is a commonplace feature of primeval plastic art in many civilizations seems to mean that the breasts are pressed for milk, and thus it characterizes the woman as a motherly being.”\textsuperscript{75} The second group (Fig. 24) consists of draped female figures standing in a similar posture. Some of them such as nos. 1 and 2 are again clasping their breasts. However, there are some who simply hold flowers such as nos. 4 and 7. Although these examples most probably represent supernatural beings as well, their being draped and especially the fact that some of them are holding flowers instead of clasping their breasts point to a different conception of the female divinity depicted on these plaques. Moreover, it is in this group that one can see the standing female figure with her arms tightly placed on her sides such as nos. 3, 4 and 7. In fact this is also the pose of the female cult figurines from Dreros (Fig. 17) and the Dipylon ivory goddess (Fig. 18).\textsuperscript{76}

Similar types can be observed in the realm of Daedalic sculpture in stone. In the Lady of Auxerre (Fig. 6), who places her hand between her breasts, one can see a diluted version of the goddess clasping her breasts, in spite of the fact that she is draped.\textsuperscript{77} On a triad frieze from Gortyn dating to the second half of the seventh century BC, there are three female figures standing side by side (Fig. 25). They are totally naked except for their poloi. It is again highly likely that both instances depict divinities, the Lady of Auxerre

\textsuperscript{74} Riis, “The Syrian Astarte Plaques,” 81.

\textsuperscript{75} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{76} The pose with the arms and hands pressed to the body as well as the overall attitude of early Greek sculpture reflect Syrian originals. Akurgal, The Art of Greece, 176.

\textsuperscript{77} Adams, Orientalizing Sculpture, 32.
being highly modeled and patterned and the Gortyn figures being naked and with head
dresses. It is thus safe to assume that all statues or figurines fashioned in Daedalic style
were meant to represent divinities. 78

Let us now take a look at some other Orientalizing images from Crete. Figure 26
shows “the lower half of a flat and crudely made statuette of a standing figure in a
triangular skirt reaching to the ankles.” 79 Adams indicates that this statuette from Gortyn
is similar to the limestone votaries dedicated in Cypriot and Rhodian shrines in the second
half of the seventh century. 80 Since all the early votaries were male, this figure must have
been no exception. 81 In its original state, the arms were probably bent at the elbows in
order to hold some object. 82 A second example is a fully draped, columnlike figure also
from Gortyn (Fig. 27). It is again a votary with one hand pressed down along the flank
and the other raised to hold a cup close against the breast. His feet are “nearly flat,
toeless, slightly separated, each one the quadrant of an oval protruding halfway from
under the garment, which meets the base all around but describes a low arc over the
feet.” 83 This is the same technique used for Nikandre (Fig. 7) and the dedication of
Cheramytes on Samos (Fig. 9). 84 Although these examples reflect technical connections

78 Ridgway, Archaic Style, 26.
79 Adams, Orientalizing Sculpture, 19.
80 Ibid.
81 Ibid., 20.
82 Ibid.
83 Ibid.
84 Ibid.
with Cyprus and Rhodes, their iconography may have drawn upon North Syrian prototypes such as orthostat blocks from Carchemish showing female figures in relief holding chalices or conical objects out before the right breast.\textsuperscript{85} Adams posits that the Gortyn figures find no iconographical parallel in Greek art.\textsuperscript{86} However, draped korai holding fruits or sometimes animals and the ivory figurines from the Ephesian Artemision are comparable examples.

Another semi-iconic statue that we can here examine comes from the Ptoan sanctuary in Boeotia (Fig. 28). It is an over life-size limestone kore from the second half of the seventh century which reflects a great similarity to the dedication of Nikandre. She wears a belted peplos and shoes. Her feet protrude at the bottom of the garment beneath an archiike opening.\textsuperscript{87} Her Daedalic hair is arranged in horizontally divided masses descending on each side.\textsuperscript{88} One can understand from the inscription that she is a dedication to Apollo Ptoios. In striking contrast to the nearly contemporary Auxerre statuette, the borders of the lower mantle and the dedicatory inscription are the only incised elements on the statue.\textsuperscript{89} According to Adams, “the statue cannot be strictly called orientalizing as it owes nothing directly to orientalizing minor arts or to oriental

\textsuperscript{85} Ekrem Akurgal, \textit{The Birth of Greek Art} (London: Methuen, 1968), 82, pl. 22b quoted in ibid., 21.

\textsuperscript{86} Ibid., 20.


\textsuperscript{88} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{89} Adams, \textit{Orientalizing Sculpture}, 111.
sculpture, even to the extent that the Auxerre and Eleutherna statues do.\textsuperscript{90} However, the human body carved as a column, plank or cylinder is a rather unusual conception in Greek art and thus is not quite at home in the Hellenic realm either.\textsuperscript{91} What was the source for this kind of semi-iconic depiction which became an acceptable mode of sculptural representation, especially in the case of monumental stone examples, in the second half of the seventh and the first half of the sixth century in Greece?

Columnlike rendering must have been a deliberate stylistic preference. In this respect, Ridgway’s arguments for considering Archaic statues as stemming from a different tradition than do Daedalic is persuasive.\textsuperscript{92} Egypt, no doubt, played an important role in stone working technologies both in sculpture and architecture. Moreover, it contributed to the developments in Greek sculpture with its canon of proportions which can be observed in kouroi and even in Nikandre (Fig. 7).\textsuperscript{93} It was also suggested that an Assyrian influence may be observed in early Greek sculpture since the dedication of Nikandre reflects similarities with the free-standing statue of Ashurnasirpal now in the British Museum (Fig. 29).\textsuperscript{94} It is also noteworthy that Egypt was under Assyrian

\textsuperscript{90} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{91} Barnett, “Early Greek and Oriental Ivories,” 20.

\textsuperscript{92} Ridgway, \textit{Archaic Style}, 4 cited Donohue, \textit{Koena}, 234.


\textsuperscript{94} Frederick R. Grace, “Observations on 7th Century Sculpture,” \textit{American Journal of Archaeology} 46 (1942), 343. “Assyrian influence in early Greek sculpture is, of course, not surprising; for we hear of contacts between Greeks and Mesopotamians as early as the reign of Sennacherib (705-
domination in the seventh century and Ionian and Carian mercenaries were imported by King Psammetichus I (664 - 610 BC) to help free Egypt from the Assyrians and to reunite the country. Thus, between 650 and 590 BC, Naucratis in the northwest of the Delta was founded as a factory and entrepot by Miletos and other Greek cities.

Barnett posits that the columnlike treatment of the human body in Greek sculpture is basically eastern Anatolian in origin. The human figure carved in the round from Palanga near Malatya can be cited as an example for the semi-iconic trend in Asia Minor (Fig. 30). “This statue appears to show the origin of the zigzag folds, usual later on Archaic Ionian drapery.”

Another case from Asia Minor, the group of figurines from the Ephesian foundation deposit dating to the early sixth century, not only points to the Anatolian connections of rendering the human body in columnar form but also prefigures the kore type. They include electrum statuettes of women in the sphyrelaton technique which are commonly said to represent Artemis. We shall here concentrate on the ivory figurines which can be considered as creations of the Ionian area influenced by the Near East. Our first examples are two so-called “hawk-priestesses.” Figure 31 shows the first one


95 Anthes, “Affinity and Difference,” 61.


97 Ibid.

98 Paul Jacobstahl, “The Date of the Ephesian Foundation Deposit,” *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 71 (1951), 90.

with two hawks in her hands. She is stiff and without feet. Although the hawk was the sacred animal of Artemis, it is unlikely that the statuette is a representation of the goddess. A contrast with the many-breasted cult image of Artemis from the Hellenistic and Roman times (Fig. 12) would reveal the difference in form and conception between these two representations. The ivory statuette reflects a simple, unpatterned surface treatment and does not wear a polos. Is this a representation of a neokoros, a novice entrusted with the care of the sacred hawks?\textsuperscript{100} Whoever the figurine depicts, it is not comparable to the Orientalizing wood, ivory or metal images of divinities that have been considered previously.

The second hawk-priestess is a much more refined and decorated image (Fig. 32). There are bands of designs along her sleeves and collar. Also, her breasts are smoothly modeled through her garment. She is wearing a chiton and two girdle overfolds (kolpoi) fall softly on her hips. Her hair is gracefully articulated with vertical and spiral grooves. In contrast to the hawk-priestess examined above, this statuette is much more “Orientalizing” in rendition. However, her modest disposition makes it unlikely that she is a goddess. She is not wearing a headdress and is holding in one hand a bowl with ringlets around it and in the other an oinochoe. According to Jacobstahl, no marble statue expresses the East Greek ideal of a kore more lucidly than this ivory figurine.\textsuperscript{101} He goes so far as stating that the maidens dear to Sappho may have looked like her. There is today agreement that this work dates to the second quarter of the sixth century.

\textsuperscript{100} Ibid., 91.

\textsuperscript{101} Ibid., 92.
The next two examples from the Ephesian Artemision are two highly Orientalizing statuettes. The first is the representation of a spinner which is virtually indistinguishable from Oriental work (Fig. 33). The second is the "Megabyzos" (Fig. 34), the eunuch priest of Artemis. Although both are cylindrical in form with little modeling, the designs on their garments and their facial types betray their Oriental pedigree. They are also wearing ornate head dresses which is another Orientalizing trait. In fact, it is more than likely that these two ivories were carved by Oriental artists who came in the second half of the seventh century and made votive offerings for the Ephesians.\textsuperscript{102} In this regard, the second hawk-priestess (Fig. 32) may have been the work of a gifted Greek apprentice or of an Oriental craftsman adopting some sort of a Greek style. The fact that both local and foreign craftsmen were active in Ephesus can be further supported by the ivory statuette shown in Figure 35. Here, it is the planklike form of the whole figure rather than an eastern ingredient that dominates. This statuette is a perfect indication of the prevalent mode of depicting the standing female figure in East Greece in the Orientalizing period. Its carver was probably a local artist.

Where did the plank or columnlike form in early Greek sculpture come from? Was it part of the Orientalizing trends that permeated the Hellenic world in the seventh century or was it a native Greek trait? As has already been mentioned, scholars such as Muller and Barnett believe that it is of non-Greek origin. Material evidence such as the early korai from Samos (Fig. 9), the dedication of Nikandre (Fig. 7), the Palanga statue (Fig. 30) and the Ephesian figurines show that this kind of semi-iconism is more at home in the

\textsuperscript{102} Ibid., 93.
islands and Asia Minor. Ridgway believes that these early korai are in essence quite non-Greek: "To my eyes, the Samian statues do not look particularly Greek in conception or form. Granted that terracottas may show the incipient stages of fold formation, the specific combination of surface patterns made of thin, engraved lines and the smooth veil tucked in at the waist seem to me too Oriental to be ignored."103

Since very early Greek worship was without images and mostly centered on the altar and the ritual of sacrifice, it is likely that both types of representation that have been the focus of our essay from the beginning, the fully iconic patterned type and the semi-iconic type, came to Greece from foreign sources. The former type has commonly been referred to as "Orientalizing," the term mostly referring to the Levant. As far as the semi-iconic type is concerned, its examples such as Nikandre (Fig. 7) and the early korai from Samos (Fig. 9) have generally been regarded as the products of a nascent monumental tradition in stone with a seminal influence from Egypt. However, Egyptian sculpture, both from the formal and conceptual standpoint, seems to belong to a totally different realm.104 The semi-iconic rendering of the human and especially the female body in East Greece in the Orientalizing period probably drew upon some Neo-Hittite and ultimately Mesopotamian models105 as well as embodying a direct allusion to the aniconic image.

103 Ridgway, *Archaic Style*, 150.

104 For instance, as far as the nude male is concerned, "the Egyptian statue is far more naturalistic, its anatomy is far more rounded and accurate than the Greek statue, whose anatomy is a highly articulated assemblage of equally sharp ridges and equally shallow grooves" (Fig. 36). Burwitt, *The Art and Culture of Early Greece*, 194. Plato preferred Egyptian sculpture owing to its timeless, unchanging and ideal qualities. *Laws* 2, 656E quoted in Stewart, *Greek Sculpture*, 20.

105 As far as ancient Mesopotamia is concerned, one can again talk about a duality in holy images. Mesopotamian temples were invariably cult-statue oriented shrines. "The cult statue, the figure
Given the influx of the Syrian and Levantine mercenaries and craftsmen into the Aegean region in the seventh century, the western Semitic world seems to be a probable source of influence for this trend as well.

The occurrences of semi-iconism as testified by the statuettes of votaries from Gortyn (Figs. 26-27), Rhodes and Cyprus show that this trend was not confined to Asia Minor alone, though it was more popular there. This may point to the probability that both paths of the Orientalizing influx, the one that passed through Asia Minor over Phrygia reaching the East Greek world and the one that reached Crete and eventually mainland Greece via Cyprus, were effective in the dissemination of this trend. The Orientalizing eastern Mediterranean was an extremely cross-cultural milieu defying all kinds of stylistic categorization with respect to localities and workshops. As has been mentioned, the homeland for the Daedalic style was clearly North Syria and Phoenicia “whose Aramaeans and Neo-Hittite kingdoms, together with the independent cities of Tyre and Sidon, had been conquered by Assyria in the late eighth century.”

It is a crucial fact that these western Semitic centers “produced and were conduits for art objects in a wide variety of styles, ranging from a blocky and somewhat brutalistic Hittite revival in

---

of the deity which was placed on the altar before the niche at the narrow end of the shrine, was alive with a vitality of higher order, for the god himself was immanent in the figure. But very few cult statues have come down to us, since they were mostly made of precious materials or decked with gold and other valuables.” On the other hand, the extant corpus of monumental Mesopotamian sculpture in the round reflects a cylindrical, semi-iconic morphology with the subjects being mostly devotees rather than divinities. Henri Frankfort, The Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1970), 46.

---

106 Stewart, Greek Sculpture. 106. It is also noteworthy that the Assyrians were in touch with the Phrygian kingdom in the eighth century and later with Lydia as well. R. M. Cook, “Ionia and Greece in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries BC,” Journal of Hellenic Studies 66 (1964): 24 - 32.
stone sculpture, through soft and delicately stylized work in ivory, to elaborately formal Assyrian and Assyrianizing creations in bronze or precious metal.\textsuperscript{107}

In sum, it is possible to suggest that both the patterned iconic and the simpler semi-iconic impulse penetrated into the Hellenic world from the Near East, especially from Syria and the Levant. Greek merchants at Al Mina and elsewhere must have come across with them directly whereas the Greek communities in the Aegean were acquainted with them through imported trade and luxuries.\textsuperscript{108} This flow resulted in different attitudes in early Greek representational art. What could have been the different functions and meanings attached to these two types in the Greek realm? We have already discussed the connotations of the first type stressing its significance in terms of divine representation and magic. As far as the second type is concerned, it should be no coincidence that all of the semi-iconic female figures in stone that have been examined, Nikandre (Fig. 7), Cheramyes’ dedication (Fig. 9), and the kore from the Ptoan sanctuary (Fig. 28) are dedicatory offerings. So are almost all of the korai that followed them. Their votive function seems to have some kind of affinity with their form. Moreover, even the material they are carved of appears to have a particular significance. “With the exception of aniconic idols, cult images made of marble or of any other type of stone are rare in the early Archaic period. There are no explicit literary references to Archaic cult images made of stone.”\textsuperscript{109} Another difference of these statues from cult images, a trait which they

\textsuperscript{107} Stewart, Greek Sculpture, 106.

\textsuperscript{108} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{109} Romano, Early Greek Cult Images, 370.
actually share with aniconic objects, is the fact that they did not demand shelter such as cellas or temples but stood in the open air.\textsuperscript{110}

I believe that the practice of binding statues which has been referred to above is very useful in pinpointing the differences in significance between our types. One cannot help thinking about the bound divine images reported in myths and legends concerning statues when one looks at cult images of the Ephesian Artemis type. The registers on the Pamphylian Artemis (Fig. 37), for instance, appears to draw upon the goddess’ ancient image which was decorated with metal bands.\textsuperscript{111} These metal bands may well have been an allusion to the binding of important divine images that were inclined to escape. This kind of treatment of the cult image acknowledges the fact that the idol represents divine action by miming it for the duration of a rite, or even in the absence of a rite, just by its own free will, far more than it does in its capacity as a figure that locates or fixes this action in space.\textsuperscript{112}

The xoanon with its small size and portability is a very handy religious object. It can be carried around, washed, dressed and fed. It manifests the divine being independent of any fixed locality. On the other hand, the semi-iconic trend apparently drawing upon aniconic representation may be thought to possess the opposite pretension, that is, of capturing and locating divine power. It certainly embodies a different mode of religious commitment on the part of the worshiper than does the one attached to the

\textsuperscript{110} Ibid., 5.

\textsuperscript{111} Louis Richard Farnell. \textit{The Cults of the Greek States}, 3 vols., 2: 520.

\textsuperscript{112} Vernant, \textit{Mortals and Immortals}, 55.
ornate *xoanon* type and its derivatives. A study of the votive connotations of monumental semi-iconic representation in stone and the significance of the term *agalma* will be illuminating within this framework.
CHAPTER 3

THE KORE AS OFFERING AND OFFERING-BEAERER

To thee I dedicated a very beautiful image of thy form Cypris, since I have nothing better than thy form.¹

The exchange of gifts is a process in ancient societies that maintains and reinforces personal and pious bonds through giving and receiving. Among the ancient Greeks, dedicatory practices were a means by which relations of superiority and subordination between individuals and their gods found expression. Being the “Stronger Ones” as well as the “Givers of Good,” the gods had a legitimate claim to gifts.² In order to create and sustain a good relationship with their gods, the ancient Greeks resorted to three media which are closely connected: prayer, sacrifice and votive offering.³ This chapter will focus on the last of these means and its sacrificial connections within the framework of the


monumental offering par excellence of the Archaic period, the kore. An examination that emphasizes the votive aspects of this sculptural type is crucial for understanding its religious significance. The first step is to analyze the votive offering as a general phenomenon in the Greek world and the pervasive role of the anthropomorphic sculptural dedication in this context.

The most common votive offerings were artifacts set up in temples as gifts to the gods. Such offerings are frequently mentioned in ancient sources, both literary and epigraphical. They were either gifts of great value such as objects of gold and silver, or simple gifts such as terra-cotta figurines and small bronzes. The beginnings of this sort of memorial dedication in ancient Greece may be placed in the ninth or tenth century BC. Its noblest and fullest expression can be observed in the sixth and fifth centuries. The earliest Dark Age votives were sacrificial implements such as tripod caldrons and vases. From the ninth century onward, small bronze and terra-cotta oxen became popular. In time, the variety of objects offered increased making the actual ritual content by no means obligatory. For instance, an ancient Greek sanctuary consecrated to a goddess would

---


include as offerings objects closely linked with feminine and domestic life such as fibulae and pins besides animal or anthropomorphic terra-cotta figurines.\(^8\)

The verb *anatithēmi*, "to set up," in passive sense *anakeimai*, and its derivative *anathēma* are universal vocabulary for both sacrifice and the votive offering in the Greek world.\(^9\) In both cases something is offered to the gods. However, in sacrifice the object offered is intended for consumption, human or divine, whereas in the case of the votive offering the object dedicated is durable and meant to stay in the sanctuary\(^10\), or wherever it is placed, at least for a certain amount of time.\(^11\) The reconstruction of sacrificed animals' bones and skins on altars or practices of this kind underscore "the desire to retain a tangible memento of the sacrifice."\(^12\) This brings us automatically to the votive offerings that remained in the sanctuary, perceptible and tangible, after their presentation.\(^13\) The *anathēma* is thus "a lasting, visible gift: a witness to the worshiper’s relationship to the


\(^9\) Rouse, *Greek Votive Offerings*, 323. van Straten, “Gifts for the Gods,” 66. The votive offering is also often called *doron* meaning gift. Ibid.

\(^10\) "Figurines have been found on benches, around and on altars, in sacrificial debris, and they may have been placed on benches and in niches, as well as in other places." Alroth, “The Positioning of Greek Votive Figurines,” 203.


\(^12\) Ibid., 69. There are instances in which some figurines damaged by fire were found in the vicinity of the altars such as the ones from the Ptoion sanctuary. There are also figurines that were simply found in ash layers. Whether the figurines were actually burned on the altar or were put there after the actual sacrifice was enacted, this practice betrays a symbolic sacrificial act and reflects the sacrificial associations embodied by votive figurines. Alroth, “The Positioning of Greek Votive Figurines,” 203. Another testimony for this connection is the animal figurines offered as votives which were apparently substitutes for sacrifice. Ibid.

deity, the principal form of expression for private devotion and the most representative document of official piety."\(^{14}\) Whereas sacrifice is mostly a religious act that pertains to the collective piety of the community, "the votive offering sheds light on the personal religiosity of the Greeks."\(^{15}\)

The votive offering has commonly been explained as a more or less commercial transaction between the worshiper and the god.\(^{16}\) In this sense, it is a gift made to the god in consequence of a vow or for him to fulfill an expectation in return.\(^{17}\) "Whatever the object was, germane to the act of its dedication is a reciprocal religious mentality. Benefits between deity and devotee are traded on a strictly mutual basis."\(^{18}\) This \emph{do-ut-des} attitude on the part of the worshiper can be observed in the dedicatory inscription of the "Mantiklos" bronze from Thebes (Fig. 38) dedicated to Apollo in the first quarter of the seventh century: "Mantiklos dedicated me to the Far-shooter with the Silver Bow from his tithe; grant, Apollo, something good in return."\(^{19}\)

Another mode of offering, which, as we shall see, is relevant to the discussion of \emph{korai} as dedications is the so-called first fruit or grain offering. It is an elementary form of gift consisting of the surrender to the god of firstlings of food whether won by hunting,

\(^{14}\) Burkert, \emph{Greek Religion}, 93.

\(^{15}\) van Straten, "Gifts for the Gods," 63.

\(^{16}\) Ibid., 72.

\(^{17}\) Burkert, \emph{Greek Religion}, 68.

\(^{18}\) Nigel Spivey, \emph{Understanding Greek Sculpture: Ancient Meanings, Modern Readings} (London: Thames and Hudson, 1996), 84.

fishing, gathering, or agriculture. Taking place in the vintage or harvest time, it can be regarded as an expression of gratitude for favors already granted and also for those to come. Any deity might be rewarded for ensuring a good harvest, or invoked to do so in the future through the dedication of this kind of a share in the produce. The Greeks called it *ap archai*, that is, beginnings taken from the whole, since the god came first. Although the concept of *ap archai* does embody the wish to secure the fruitfulness and abundance of the earth, in contrast to a specific personal favor asked of the divinity by an individual or a vow that is fulfilled, it reflects a more natural transaction between men and the gods. The essence of the votive offering is free will. It may be customary, as the first fruits or of fixed proportion as the tithe, but it must not be compulsory, otherwise it becomes a tax. In summary, the grain or first fruit offering was the acknowledgment of the bounty of mother earth and a contribution on the part of the pious individual and the community for its sustenance. This can also be thought to have a sacramental character, the god and his worshipers being conceived of as partaking of the same food.

---

20 Spivey, *Understanding Greek Sculpture*, 84.

21 Ibid., 66.

22 The practice of animal sacrifice stresses the similarity between sacrificial animals and cultivated plants by incorporating barley and wine into the ritual killing and burning of the sacrificial animal. Jean-Pierre Vernant, *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*, 198.

The act of dedicating images at holy shrines is a very ancient custom. That the tithes and first fruits were offered by the people of agrarian societies to their most ancient gods is also well attested and it is very likely that the latter is as old as the former.\(^26\) The fruit or offering which is sometimes seen in the hands or upon the knees of votive statuettes, and particularly some korai, may represent the first fruit or the tithe.\(^27\) More about these so-called “hand attributes” later. Let us, for the time being, focus on the nature of the kore as dedication. The primary source of information for this issue is the dedicatory inscriptions on the statues themselves or their bases. Few of the extant inscriptions reflect a do-ut-des type of disposition. For instance, the inscription on “Antenor’s kore” (Fig. 39) from the Athenian Acropolis emphasizes the idea of tithe: “Nearchos the potter dedicated me as a tithe of his works to Athena. Antenor the son of Eumares made the agalma.”\(^28\) Again from the Athenian Acropolis, a dedicatory

---

\(^{24}\) The grain offering was common in the ancient Jews as well. The term minhah designates grain offerings in the priestly texts. The word ultimately derives from the political and administrative vocabulary where it has the meaning of “tribute, gift.” Priestly and other writers appropriated the term to designate certain types of offerings that were presented in the manner of gifts. A term meaning “tribute, gift” is, after all, highly appropriate for expressing the relationship between the individual worshiper and God and between the Israelite community and the God of Israel. It highlights the themes of sovereignty and subservience, of covenant and mutual obligations, and of loyalty and devotion. Baruch A. Levine, *The JPS Torah Commentary: Leviticus* (The Jewish Publication Society: 1989), xxiii.

\(^{25}\) Rouse, *Greek Votive Offerings*, 41.

\(^{26}\) Ibid., 348.

\(^{27}\) Ibid., 67. Ammernan indicates that the terracotta models of animals and fruit recovered at the site of Santa Venere near Paestum would conventionally be seen to stand for either first fruits that were offered to the deity, or else for animals and other foods sacrificed in her honor. Interestingly enough, the most common model is that of a bird, possibly a dove. “The Naked Standing Goddess: A Group of Archaic Terracotta Figurines from Paestum,” *American Journal of Archaeology* 95 (April 1991), 228.

inscription on a base reads: “Naulochos dedicated this kore as a tithe of the catch which the sea-ruling one with the golden trident gave to him.”

There are even simpler statements such as those of the two extant dedications of Cheramyes on the island of Samos: “Cheramyes dedicated me to Hera as an agalma” (Fig. 9), and “Cheramyes dedicated me to the goddess, a perikalles agalma” (Fig. 40). Although these statements do not reflect a reciprocal transaction between the divinity and the devotee, one can assume that their speakers were fashioned as the fulfillment of earlier vows that are not reflected through dedicatory inscriptions.

The word agalma mentioned in the inscriptions cited above is the principal designation for korai as dedications. The word kore has come to be an art-historical term for the “maiden” type although it occurs in inscriptions from the Athenian Acropolis where it refers to the goddess Athena as the kore of Zeus, the recipient of the offering. The word also occurs in the dedicatory inscription of Phrasikleia. The Erechtheion Caryatids were also referred to as korai. Although the word agalma is used extensively in ancient sources to designate a holy image or even a cult statue, its use in these inscriptions is closer to its literal meaning, delight or gift that pleases the gods.

---

29 Ibid.


31 The two instances in which the object dedicated is referred to as a kore are the inscription on a base from the Athenian Acropolis mentioned above, supra 29 and the inscription of the Phrasikleia kore, infra 39.

32 Infra 39.
the *agalma* does not necessarily represent a divinity,\(^{34}\) it is commonly taken to be the statue of a god set up as a dedication to him.\(^{35}\) For instance, according to Rouse, “the tithe often took the form of a statue of the friendly deity.”\(^{36}\) From his point of view, the statue inscribed as a “maiden” is the image of Athena herself, otherwise the offering would have no point.\(^{37}\) In fact, as is also clear from our quote at the beginning, the image of the patron deity of a sanctuary was oftentimes deemed to be the most appropriate offering to that divinity.\(^{38}\) Actually, whom the votive statue represents is a perennial question that has attracted the attention of many scholars. It is commonly thought that there are varying cases such as representations of dedicators, priests or priestesses and divinities themselves.\(^{39}\) All in all, as personal gift, the votive is always an integral part both of the dedicator and the deity to whom it is dedicated.

\(^{33}\) In archaic and classical Greek the word is used particularly for dedications. At any rate, by the fourth century it is used for any statue of a god, regardless of its ostensible function. Stewart, *Greek Sculpture*. 45.


\(^{35}\) Gernet, *Anthropology of Ancient Greece*. 77.

\(^{36}\) Rouse, *Greek Votive Offerings*. 89.

\(^{37}\) Ibid., 90.

\(^{38}\) Bruniilde Sismondo Ridgway, “Birds, ‘Meniskoi,’ and Head Attributes in Archaic Greece” in *American Journal of Archaeology* 94 (1990), 611.

\(^{39}\) Déonna divides statues in general into two major categories, those representing divinities and those representing mortals. As far as divine statues are concerned, they may be statues of gods, e.g. cult statues, or dedications depicting divinities. As for the statues representing mortals, they may depict the dedican, usually identified through an inscription that, for instance, says “I am and such and such...” He regards both *kouroi* and *korei* as impersonal mortal images. W. Waldemar Déonna, *Dédales ou la Statue de la Grèce Archaïque. Origine et Évolution de la statue archaïque. Problèmes techniques et esthétiques* (Paris: E. Boccard, 1930), 65.

Similarly, van Straten states that anthropomorphic votive offerings could be of two kinds, one representing the deity to whom they were offered and the other representing the offerers themselves. “Gifts for the Gods,” 81.
Rouse places anthropomorphic votive offerings into his category of “objects dedicated for what they imply” as opposed to “objects given for their intrinsic worth” which he associates with a “crude notion of payment.” He then subdivides the former group into five the first three of which pertain to anthropomorphic votive offerings. The first is “the most obvious offering of a grateful worshiper,” the image of the patron deity. Rouse suggests that this type of image depicts the deity in his traditional form, that is, in the guise of his cult statue in the temple. The second is “the deity represented in his power” which refers to the depiction of the deity with his appropriate attributes, such as Apollo with a bow or Artemis with arms or shooting at the prey. Rouse’s third group consists of dedications depicting “the human activity, the act or process blessed by the god.” I believe that Rouse’s third classification offers a more suitable framework for the discussion of korai as votive images. Items carried by a considerable number of them lead one to view these statues as figures depicted in some kind of ritual or at least pious action.

The best example for korai that depict dedications is the Geneleos group from Samos (Fig. 41). The names Philippe and Orimhe are inscribed on the draperies of two standing female figures belonging to the group. Richter, Korai, nos. 67-8. The base on which they are situated together with one seated and one reclining figure is inscribed “Geneleos made us.” The reclining dedicatee is inscribed “I am...ahe, who has also dedicated to Hera.” Located along the sacred road leading to the temple of Hera, this base bearing the representations of the dedicatees, probably the members of an aristocratic family, seems to be a monument of prestige. More or less contemporary with the Cheramy group (Figs. 39, 40), these statues reflect a slightly different stylistic attitude as the standing figures grasp folds of their draperies. Furthermore, there must have been certain conceptual differences as well since Cheramy’s dedications do not speak in the first person and identify themselves as dedications. This issue will be discussed further in Chapter 4.

Another korai that speaks in the first person is the grave marker of Phrasikleia from Attica (Fig. 42). The deceased is identified through the inscription:

“The tomb of Phrasikleia
Kore I will always be called
Since instead of marriage this is what the gods have allotted me
Aristion of Paros made it.”
Stewart, Greek Sculpture, 22.

Rouse, Greek Votive Offerings, 356-66.
As we shall see in the examples that follow, a large number of dedications have reference to sacrifice, the Greek ritual par excellence.

The conventional definition of the *kore* is “a draped female figure, either with feet together or with one slightly advanced, one arm by the side and the other folded across the breast or extended out with some object, a bird or a piece of fruit, for instance.”

Although one of the most prominent authorities on Archaic sculpture, Gisela Richter, thinks that most of the *korai* do not represent divinities owing to their lack of proper attributes, there are scholars who strongly argue that they do. Rouse’s thought that the Acropolis *korai* are depictions of Athena has already been mentioned. As well, Ridgway believes that both *kouroi* and *korai* are divine images. Although there is no way one can securely know whether the *kore* type represents the goddess or simply a generic devotee, I believe that there are a lot of interesting points one can draw from their dedicatory inscriptions as well as the items they often bear. Several inscriptions have already been mentioned to pinpoint the fact that the images never identify themselves as goddesses. Let us now concentrate on the so-called hand attributes and their sacrificial connections.

---


It may be odd to start this group of examples intended to concentrate on korai with an early Athenian dedication depicting a male subject. However, the work has important characteristics that bring it closer to the kore type in conception rather than the kouros. For one thing, kouroi normally do not bear offerings or hold any items in hand such as fruits or vessels. Moreover, this statue is partially draped, wearing a shepherd's cloak\(^44\) that also covers his head presumably in the form of a hood, very similar in rendering to the epiblema so typical of eastern korai (Fig. 43). Kouroi on the other hand are always depicted naked. Further, unlike most of the kouroi that date around this period, the Moschophoros, notwithstanding his arms and shoulders exquisitely modeled beneath his cloak, reflects a planklike disposition, especially noticeable in his upper thighs and abdomen. The latter is usually rather modeled and bulging in most of the contemporary kouroi. The planklike rendition of the human body was a feature that attached mostly to some korai of the early Archaic period. Finally, one can compare the Moschophoros to the so-called Pomegranate kore (our no. iV, Fig. 44), also from the Athenian acropolis, that will be discussed below. The stylistic similarity between these two statues is incredible, especially in the way the verticals, richer in the kore, are rendered. Also very similar in each case is the manner in which the edges of the clothes ending with tassels are delineated is very similar. In the Moschophoros, the idea of border delineation which is quite foreign to a kouros is even carried to the navel which is

\(^{44}\) Rouse, *Greek Votive Offerings*, 284.
surrounded by a perfect circle that was given a thickness, echoing the treatment of the cloak’s edges.

The crossed arms of the Moschophoros, an Egyptianizing motif, is an excellent touch on the part of the sculptor to suggest an intimate union between the calf and its bearer. The artist thus reminds us of the interdependence of man and beast in an agricultural society and a religion of sacrifice. The statue was dedicated to Athena by a certain Rhonbos. Whether or not the figure depicted the dedicator we do not know. Nevertheless, that a statue suggesting the rite of sacrifice is at the same time a votive points to the sacrificial significance attached to such dedicatory practices.

I have suggested that there were certain features that brought the Moschophoros close to the kore type. In fact, the Moschophoros can be regarded as a type in its own right since there are extant examples in the form of small bronze statuettes depicting the same theme. Besides this image, there is the marble statue of a ram-bearer (the Kriophoros) from Thasos (Fig. 45) which was probably a dedication as well. Thus, the norm for this type was a male devotee bearing the animal on his shoulders, or in the case of the Ram-Bearer in his arms against his breast. In the Moschophoros, one can see a draped masculinity which is nevertheless accentuated through the correspondence of the exposed genitalia of the bearer to the testicles of the calf falling on his shoulder. This is

45 Stewart, Greek Sculpture, 120.
46 Ibid.
47 Spivey, Understanding Greek Sculpture, 94.
another masterful touch that presents to the beholder the offering and its bearer in
sympathetic impartiality.

In summary, given the stylistic features of this statue that draw upon the kore
type, it may be argued that the sculptor tailored an already existing votive genre to a
contemporary, traditionally acknowledged form of votive offering, the kore, which can
at times be taken as an offering-bearer. However, the “hand-attributes” of korai are
more difficult to interpret as actual offerings than such an obvious sacrificial victim as a
calf. In order to approach this problem, let us now take a close look at the selected
examples of korai with items in their hands.

II Ivory Statuette from Ephesos. Fig. 32

Although this ivory statuette is not a kore in the true sense of the word, the idea
behind it is analogous to that embodied by its monumental marble counterparts. The
figurine is among the votive offerings unearthed in the Archaic Artemision built by
Croesus and destroyed around 546 BC by the Persians.

Both arms of the figure are lowered. She holds a small oinochoe in her right hand
and a Phrygian phiale in her left. Perhaps the figure depicts a priestess who is about to

---

49 Both kouroi and korai could serve as grave markers and votives. However, as far as Athens is
concerned, the kouros was almost invariably used in funerary contexts whereas the kore was mostly for
votive purposes. For a discussion of the function of kouroi, see Stewart, Greek Sculpture, 109-10.

50 Richter, Korai no. 81.

51 Ekrem Akurgal, Ancient Civilizations and Ruins of Turkey (Istanbul: Haset Kitabevi, 1985),
make a libation. As well, one may think that she is shown after she has performed some kind of ritual action, which, according to Akurgal, is the pouring of wine from the pitcher into the dish to start the religious ceremonies. Whether or not the figurine depicts a priestess, the ritual content of the representation is almost certain and relevant to the votive function of the statuette.

III Marble Torso of a Kore found at Moschato, Attica. Fig. 46

The left forearm of this kore is laid against the front of her body whereas her right arm was probably lowered. Although the fragment is in very poor condition, it is not difficult to gather from the disposition of the left hand that she once held something. Gisela Richter does not mention any items that may have been held by the kore. Nevertheless, the traces of an oblong, stalklike object are noticeable on the right half of the torso. This putative item is held diagonally against the figure’s breast. It is probable that the kore was holding a flower or sheaf of grain, though one would expect the latter to be a little bit longer. If the kore did indeed hold a vegetal or floral item, this must have embodied connotations pertaining to such phenomena as the harvest and the tithe.

52 Richter, Korai, 54.
53 Ibid., no. 40.
This *kore*, which we have already compared to the Moschophoros, holds a ring-like wreath in her lowered right hand. Her left arm is brought to the front of her body and holds a pomegranate. Rouse states that there are some indications, though by no means conclusive, that models of the wreaths which were worn, or some other objects used in ritual, were possible dedications. Examples of such items were found in the hero-shrine at Amyclae and in Olympia. Rouse indicates that there might have existed a practice of dedicating models of wreaths. Furthermore, he posits that in the case of wreathed figurines, which were not infrequent as votives, the wreath would bear the same relation to the figure as a separate animal would to a figure holding it. Whether our *kore* is holding a real or a model wreath and whether or not the wreath has sacrificial significance, the most sensible explanation for this motif is that it embodies an allusion to ritual action. Garlands, wreaths of flowers and other hair decorations have an important role in literary tradition, such as in Sappho's lyrics, especially insofar as festive rites performed by maidens in sanctuaries are concerned. More about maidens and ritual performance later.

Pomegranates are very frequent hand-attributes for *korai*. Although their significance in this context is not known for certain, one may again talk about some

---

54 Ibid., no. 43.


votive connections. In the Samian Heraion along with a terra-cotta pine-cone were found many clay and ivory models of pomegranates and poppy heads. 58 "The factor common to all these plants is their richness of seeds which obviously symbolized Hera's aspect as a fertility goddess." 59 "Probably real pomegranates and poppies were brought to the sanctuary by simple people." 60 An analysis of the well preserved plant remains from the excavations of this area showed that there were many pomegranate seeds and some poppies among the finds of the seventh century.  61 Pine-cones alternating with pomegranates occur in Assyrian ornaments as well since they played a particular role in Assyrian cult. 62 They are depicted in scenes of ritual purification, such as on reliefs from palaces. An Assyrian text from such a context reads: "The pine-cone shall deliver me, which is full of seeds." 63 One can here see both the meaning of religious purification, which may have been valid for pomegranates as well, and the aspect of fertility. Thus, in

57 Richter, Korai, nos. 42 (the Berlin kore), 59 (or apple), 122 (or apple), 138, 192. It is regrettable that most of the Acropolis korai have lost their hands. Ridgway, "Meniskoi," 611. Most of these lost hands belong to forearms extended forward that held items among which were probably pomegranates.

58 Kyriacopoulou, "Offerings of 'the Common Man' in the Heraion at Samos," 219.

59 Ibid.

60 Ibid.

61 Ibid.

62 J. Börker-Klähn, in Reallexikon der Assyriologie III, 1957-1971, 619, s.v. "Granatapfel" cited in ibid. Pomegranate motifs also occur on Carthaginian stelae (fig. 47). As well, we learn from the Old Testament that the brazen pillars set up by Solomon at the porch of the Temple were provided with capitals adorned with a network of pomegranates and of "lily" shape. 1 Kings 7:15 cited in A. J. Evans, "Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult and its Mediterranean Connections," Journal of Hellenic Studies 21 (1901): 144. Finally, the pomegranate was an attribute of the Athena of Side, side meaning pomegranate in Greek, attesting to the strong Semitic influence in Pamphylia. "Granatapfel," 626.

the Samian Heraion the influence of the Ancient Near East was apparently strong in the seventh century.\textsuperscript{64} Let us now go on with our discussion of hand attributes and take a close look at a kore from Samos.

\textit{V Headless Marble Kore Dedicated by Cheramytes on Samos.}\textsuperscript{65} Fig. 40

It goes without saying that this statue is very similar to the other dedication of Cheramytes (Fig. 9). The right arm of the figure is lowered, with the hand holding a fold of the drapery whereas “the left is bent, with the forearm laid across the chest and the hand holding a hare on the open palm.” The hare suggests that the goddess to whom the offering was made is Aphrodite.\textsuperscript{66} It is known that a new temple on Samos was dedicated to Aphrodite in 560-555 BC and this statue may be contemporary with that event and testify to the presence of the goddess in the sanctuary in the middle years of the century.\textsuperscript{67} Again, the question to pose is whether the statue represents Aphrodite, or the dedicator, or neither.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{64} Ibid. For some other religious aspects of the Near Eastern influence on Samos, see B. M. Frith-Haneson, "Hera’s Wedding on Samos: A Change of Paradigms" in \underline{Early Greek Cult Practice}, 205-213.

\textsuperscript{65} Richter, \underline{Korai}, no. 56.

\textsuperscript{66} Sacrifice of a hare is closely related with the goddess Aphrodite. According to Kadletz, the only reference in Greek to the sacrifice of a hare concerns Aphrodite. E. Kadletz, \underline{Animal Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religion} (Diss. Univ. Of Washington, 1976) cited in, Ammerman, “The Naked Standing Goddess,” 229.

\textsuperscript{67} John Griffiths Pedley, \underline{Greek Sculpture of the Archaic Period: The Island Workshops} (Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1976).}
The *kore* holding a bird is one of the most favored types of Archaic votive sculpture. As in the case of the calf-bearer type, one can see smaller versions of this paradigm in other materials such as terra-cotta and bronze as well. This example from the East depicts a figure with her right hand lowered, adhering to the side, and the left bent, with the forearm laid across the chest holding a bird. Richter suggests that the bird may be a partridge. The birds held by some *korai* have been identified as doves. An example which we shall later compare to this *kore* can here be briefly mentioned. It is the so-called Lyons *kore* (Fig. 49) which comes from the Athenian Acropolis where the lower section was excavated.

The motif of the bird as hand-attribute in *korai* may have sacrificial connotations. “Birds, as plastic objects in themselves, or as dedications on other items, were frequently dedicated to the gods, especially during the Geometric and Archaic periods.” On the other hand, birds and especially doves have been understood as a form of divine epiphany in the Minoan and Mycenaean religion as is made clear through the paintings on the sarcophagus of Hagia Triadha (Fig. 50). Their occurrence in ritual depictions show that

---

68 Richter, *Korai*, no. 57.


they were thought to partake of the sacrifices performed beneath the place where they
have alighted. “The one obvious explanation is that the birds are signs of the presence of
the deity, to whom the sacrifice is made or to speak in terms of the concrete conceptions
of an earlier age, the embodiments of the god.” 71 Interestingly enough, in such Minoan-
Mycenaean contexts, birds are usually depicted perching on top of horns of consecration
and heads of idols 72 but are never held in the hand.

Rouse argues that the doves and other birds held in the hands of votive statues are
to be taken as offerings given or accepted. 73 However, Burkert posits that in Greek ritual
the most common sacrificial animals were the ox, the bull, the sheep, the goat and the
pig whereas the sacrifice of birds other than poultry, such as geese and pigeons, was
rare. 74 Nevertheless, he states that Aphrodite was worshipped with incense altars and
dove sacrifices just like the Semitic Astarte-Ishtar whose identity and cult Aphrodite drew
upon. 75

Dove sacrifice was an acceptable offering in the ancient Jewish cult as well. The
book of Leviticus prescribes the burnt offering (‘olah), the offering that was supposed to
be burned on the altar without being eaten either by priests or donors, as such: “If his


72 “...birds are seen to perch on the double axes at the sacrifice on the Ayia Triada sarcophagus,
on the columns from the Shrine of the Dove Goddess, and on the heads of idols from the Late Minoan
period.” Burkert, Greek Religion, 40. For a drawing of a Mycenaean dove shrine with doves perched on
an altarlike object see Evans, “Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult,” fig. 65.

73 Rouse, Greek Votive Offerings, 297.

74 Burkert, Greek Religion, 55.

75 ibid., 153.
offering is a burnt offering from the herd, he shall make his offering a male without blemish,” (1:3). “If his offering is from the flock, of sheep or goats, he shall make his offering a male without blemish,” (1:10). “If his offering to the Lord is a burnt offering of birds, he shall choose his offerings from turtledoves and pigeons” (1:14). As for the sin offering (hatta‘), doves could be sacrificed if the sacrificer was not able to afford a bull, sheep or goat: “But if his means do not suffice for a sheep, he shall bring to the Lord, as his penalty for that of which he is guilty, two turtledoves or two pigeons, one for a sin offering and the other for a burnt offering” (5:7). It is noteworthy that in both cases birds are the tertiary means that could be resorted to as sacrificial victims. Apparently, the religious prestige attaching to the animals of the flock and the herd was greater.

In ancient Greece, literary evidence concerning the sacrifice of birds is not plentiful, probably because of the modesty of such burnt offerings in comparison with larger animals. However, the presence of their bones in sanctuaries such as Ephesos where the bones of birds were found in the Archaic basis itself, Isthmia and the sanctuaries of Demeter at Cnidus and Cyrene clearly testifies to sacrificial practice. In this respect, one should also talk about decorum in sculpture. We have mentioned the sympathetic association of the calf and its bearer in our discussion of the Moschophoros. Furthermore we have drawn attention to the male element which was underscored in the composition. It is reasonable to suggest that the kore could not be depicted as bearing

76 Elinor Bevan, Representations of Animals, 41.

77 Ibid. Terracotta models and actual remains of birds turned up at the site of Santa Venera near Paestum as well. Ammerman, “The Naked Standing Goddess,” 228.
such a heavy-duty offering as a calf simply because this would be visually improper. More important, however, is the fact that the bird was obviously deemed more appropriate to the religious content of the kore type.

As has been suggested earlier, the nature and meaning of the items held by female votive figurines and marble korai, if known, would tell us a lot about whom the figure depicts. One can here follow a simple reasoning: the figure represents a goddess if the held object is taken as a divine attribute and a worshipper if the hand attribute was meant to be a sacrificial offering. However, I believe that this question has further and more complicated ramifications. In this regard, it may be more sensible not to approach votive images from the standpoint of the two diametrically opposite categories of mortals and immortals. Moreover, the way the votive image was conceived of may differ from locality to locality. For instance, one may even point to conceptual, let alone stylistic, differences between western and eastern korai.

Before we pass on to our final example, let us now take up again the two korai that were examined at the beginning of this section, the kore from Miletos (Fig. 48) and the Lyon kore (Fig. 49). The latter holds the feet of her dove with a rigid forearm. The bird is rendered very conspicuously and is quite dominant with respect to its bearer. Although, following the norm, it is held against the bearer’s breast, it nevertheless retains its full three dimensionality. In the kore from Miletos, however, the bird is firmly pressed against the breast of the maiden and reflects, notwithstanding its considerable size, relief characteristics rather than an element in the round. Here, one can see a
more intimate relationship between the animal and its bearer than in the previous case. In the Lyons kore, on the other hand, a more majestic and distant disposition can be observed. The Milesian kore is reminiscent of the Moschophoros in that sacrificial overtones are communicated through an implicit emotional content evoked by the quality of the physical contact between the human figure and the animal.\textsuperscript{79} If asked which one of these two examples is closer to human experience, one would certainly pick the Milesian kore. It should also be kept in mind that the offering pressed against the breast with a diagonal arm is one of the hallmarks of eastern korai whereas mainland korai tend to hold their hand attributes with the arm extended out from the body.

\textit{VII Marble Relief from the Harpy Tomb, Xanthos.} \textsuperscript{80} Fig. 53

This late Archaic work from Asia Minor depicts korai involved in a seemingly human activity, a ritual procession. They are bringing offerings to a personage who himself or herself is holding a pomegranate. "The attitudes are slightly different in the three figures. The one at the back grasps her chiton with the left hand, and holds up an egg(?) or fruit(?) in her right. The middle one has a flower in her left hand, and a

\textsuperscript{78} One should also note that the Lyons kore is wearing a polos which the Milesian kore probably did not. A similar contrast exists between the Pomegranate kore and the well-known Berlin kore (Richter, Korai, no. 42, Fig. 51) in the way the pomegranates are rendered and held by the figures.

\textsuperscript{79} Another excellent example for this topos comes again from Miletos (Fig. 52). John Griffiths Pedley, \textit{Greek Sculpture of the Archaic Period} (Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1976), Plate 45.

\textsuperscript{80} Richter, Korai, no. 192.
pomegranate in her right. The one in front grasps her chiton with the right hand, and a
fold of her himation with the left."81

Reminiscent of the Apadana reliefs of Persepolis, this work shows korai in their
offering-bearer attitude without disguise. Although considerably later in date than the
freestanding korai we have looked at, for it dates to the beginning of the fifth century,
this relief is informative in that it tells us something about the kore type which the
monumental statues themselves do not explicitly state, the ritual involvement of the
depicted maiden. According to Lambert A. Schneider, the kore type is a reflection of the
publicly exposed characteristics and behavioral patterns in Greek religious life of real
maidens and women, especially those belonging to noble families.82 He regards korai as
images of actual women making dedications in sanctuaries stressing the fact that similar
social and religious functions are attributed to maidens mentioned in Sappho’s poetry.83
From this point of view, the kore establishes some sort of a socially communicative bond
between the dedicator or the client, the producer and the observer. Schneider does not
approve of the “contemporary” idea that these statues projected the human ritual activity
carried out by maidens into depictions of goddesses. According to this “contemporary”

81 Richter no. 193 is a similar relief found in the prytaneion of Thasos depicting three figures in
procession (Fig. 54). Each of the korai is different from the other in attitude, in the offerings held, and
in the garments worn. The middle one holds a wreath in the left hand. The figure at the back holds a
wreath in one hand and a pomegranate in the other. The one in the front holds offerings in both hands as
well. Unlike the maidens of the relief from Xanthos who wear stephanai, those of the Thasian relief wear
epiblemata. “It is interesting to compare these korai with those on the Harpy Tomb. In attitude, action,
and apparel they are strikingly similar, but the style of the Xanthos women is still wholly archaic, that of
the Thasos women heralds the classical period.” Richter, Korai, 105.

82 Schneider, Zur sozialen Bedeutung, 31.

83 Ibid., 33.
view, what one sees in such statues are goddesses engaged in ritual performance in the guise of the women and maidens of aristocratic families. I believe that one should not overlook the valid aspects of the latter approach for the sake of a thoroughly socio-religious treatment of the problem since it takes into account both the human and divine realms insofar as they are brought into contact, especially through the giving and receiving of gifts or dedications.

***

The last example examined above showed maidens in procession with offerings in their hands. Although it is normal to consider such a procession as human ritual action, the art of the ancient Near East is full of instances that depict the divinities of a pantheon in procession. For instance, a late Hittite orthostat relief from the "Long Wall of Sculpture" in Carchemish depicts deities in such a procession (Fig. 55). The weather god, identified through the axe and the thunderbolt marches ahead followed by a goddess with a pomegranate in the right and an ear of grain in the left hand.\textsuperscript{84} Behind her are the war god with his spear and another goddess holding a pomegranate. The first goddess can be identified as Cybele between the gods Tarhunda and Karhuha.\textsuperscript{85} She was the mistress and great queen of Carchemish. The pomegranate and ear of grain were her traditional

\textsuperscript{84} Friederike Naumann, \textit{Die Ikonographie der Cybele in der Phrygischen und der Griechischen Kunst} (Tübingen: Verlag Ernst Wasmuth, 1983), 30.

\textsuperscript{85} Ibid. In fact, both goddesses have been identified as Cybele, the first emphasizing fertility and the second beauty.
attributes as representations from other localities well attest. She is often depicted with these attributes or with priestesses bearing these items as offerings in procession toward her.\footnote{Ibid., 31.}

One can also see Cybele on an orthostat from Birecik (Fig. 56) in Asia Minor as well. In this case she is holding a mirror in the right and a pomegranate in the left hand.\footnote{Ibid.} The mirror is frequently explained as a symbol of beauty and the pomegranate an allusion to fertility. The great mother goddess was associated with both concepts. The most interesting depiction of Cybele, however, comes again from Carchemish and this time with an inscription on it (Fig. 57). It is a foundation orthostat found in the so-called crossroads temple.\footnote{Ibid., 32-33.} Unlike the previous examples, this relief represents the goddess frontally and she is simply holding a mirror but not a pomegranate. The way the lower half of the body is rendered is reminiscent of the vertical flutelike treatment of the lower chiton in most of the eastern korai. Moreover, the bowl-like disposition of the garment above the feet is also a feature peculiar to early korai from the East.

The inscription on the orthostat reads: “until I built the house of the goddess Kubaba on the crossroads...I set up in Carchemish, the city of the mountain, a statue in the antechamber for Kubaba, the great goddess of Carchemish.”\footnote{Ibid.} This relief is clearly a dedication. Whether the work was produced under East Greek influence or the East
Greek kore type drew on a local Anatolian tradition, one can here see the same formal and stylistic characteristics that attach to monumental votive statues of the western coast of Asia Minor.  

Images of the naked standing goddess are frequently found at Greek sites in the eastern Mediterranean (Fig. 23). Most of the figurines are terra-cottas commonly used as votives in sanctuaries. On account of their nudity and the elaborate poloi they wear, these figures can securely be identified as deities. It has been mentioned in the second chapter that this particular image reached the Aegean world from the Near East via Cyprus where the new mold technology was first established by Oriental craftsmen. Curiously enough, the naked female image that depicts the goddess is confined to dedications of modest dimensions in Greek sanctuaries whereas the other type, the draped female image bearing hand-attributes, eventually becomes the monumental votive statue par excellence in the Archaic period. The advent of this second type was, no doubt, encouraged by the artistic and stylistic predilections of Asia Minor. It is this type which is often hard to identify as depicting a mortal or divine subject.

The draped image with hand attributes was not the only type through which Cybele was depicted in Asia Minor. A monumental statue group from the Hittite capital Bogazköy dating to the first half of the sixth century shows the goddess flanked by attendants (Fig. 58). The lower part of her body is draped with folds rendered in a Hellenized fashion whereas the upper part of her body is naked. She is pressing her

---

90 Unlike eastern korai, however, the upper part of the body is extremely ornate with patterned renditions of elaborate necklaces, which is more of an "orientalizing" flavor.
breasts with her hands, a gesture reflecting aspects of fertility. A contemporary relief found in Bahçelievler, Ankara is in contrast with this statue group (Fig. 59). Here, we see a fully draped female image holding an oinochoe in the right, and a bird in the left hand. On account of the naiskos in which the image is inserted and the crescent moon at the apex of the pediment, the figure can confidently be identified as Cybele. It goes without saying that the underscored sexuality of the naked image connotes fertility. Then what does the draped image with hand attributes signify? If vessels and animals held in hand are offerings or ritual paraphernalia, why would the goddess hold them?91

As opposed to the cult image or the naked figure of the goddess which have straightforward messages, the kore type creates an ambiguity around it through mimicking human pious action rendered in conservative, semi- iconic formal characteristics. Within this framework one should also keep in mind that in the ancient Near Eastern world some lesser gods were thought to approach supreme gods on the worshiper or king’s behalf.92 "Gudea, ruler of Lagash, erected a statue which was called 'It offers prayers.' Another was entitled 'To my king (the city god Ningirsu) whose temple I have built; let life be my reward."93 If the Greeks were familiar with this

91 There are other Cybele reliefs depicting the goddess with deep or shallow vessels. Divinities holding vessels occur in Greek depictions of gods from the fifth century onward. This motif indicates that the god is granting blessing or doing a libation, and is thus a sign for the renewal of divine power through the offering. Ibid., 70. For gods making offerings and their depictions on fifth-century Athenian vase paintings, see Erika Simon, Opfernde Götter (Berlin: Verlag Gebr. Mann, 1953).


understanding at all, one might wonder if korai were depictions of intermediaries that somehow made intercession between the goddess and the devotee. Interestingly enough the word kore is used by Plato to mean dedication to the Nymphs. 94 All of these may point to a daemonic significance embodied by the kore which goes along well with its semi-iconic nature. A fixed, durable dedication would certainly be more effective in ensuring divine attraction and consequently favors and benefits for the individual.

A perpetuation of the mutual pact between the worshiper and the divinity, this type of sculptural dedication is not without its similarities to the pillars of "covenant" mentioned in the Old Testament. 95 The account in Genesis concerning the pillar of Jacob mentioned in the first chapter has an important parallelism with the issues we have been discussing such as the votive offering and tithe: "So Jacob rose in the morning, and he took the stone that he had put under his head and set it up for a pillar and poured oil on top of it. He called that place Bethel; but the name of the city was Lutz at the first. Then Jacob made a vow, saying, 'If God will be with me, and will keep me in this way that I go, and will give me bread to eat and clothing to wear, so that I come again to my father's house in peace, then the Lord shall be my God, and this stone, which I have set

---

94 Phaedon 230B cited in Rouse, Greek Votive Offerings, 90, footnote 10.

95 From the formal standpoint, there is an affinity between the semi-iconic kore type and the votive or grave stele in its incipient phase which reflects a non-representational object situated in the open air and at times had incised depictions on it. The grave stele from a necropolis on Thasos (Fig. 52) clearly draws upon the aniconic pillar or menhir. Gerhard Neumann, Probleme des Griechischen Weihrfels (Tübingen: Verlag Ernst Wasmuth, 1979). 5. Moreover, there exist column dedications on the Athenian Acropolis, some supporting korai, which also testify to the analogy mentioned above. For the column dedications of the Athenian Acropolis see Raubitschek, Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis.
up for a pillar, shall be God’s house; and all that you give me I will surely give one tenth to you."96

*Korat* are too generic to be considered as representations of specific goddesses. However, although they were occasionally dedicated to male deities such as Apollo or as we have seen, Poseidon, they were mostly deemed suitable for a certain range of female divinities such as Athena, Artemis, Hera and Aphrodite.97 In fact, there are a lot of overlaps among these goddesses, especially in the seventh and sixth centuries. The Near Eastern origins of Aphrodite98 and the Oriental influences on the Heraion Samos in the seventh century have been mentioned. The Ephesian Artemis took over as the site of her temple an archaic shrine consecrated to Cybele. Finally, given the Ionian cultural impact on the Athenian Acropolis in the Archaic period, one could not expect Athena not to have partaken of the characteristics of this Great Goddess. Most of the hand attributes we

---

96 Genesis 28: 18-22.

97 There was an increase in the number and variety of female sculptural representations in Greece in the Orientalizing period. In fact, the best Greek Geometric and Subgeometric figurines are almost all male and there existed no stock formula for the female.

98 The goddess of love and procreation in the Hellenic pantheon, Aphrodite, was of Semitic birth and her cult was introduced to Cyprus and Cythera from Ascalon in Palestine. Herodotos (1, 105.2-3) cited in Thomas James Dunbabin, *The Greeks and their Eastern Neighbours* (London: Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, 1957), 52. “Behind the figure of Aphrodite there clearly stands the ancient Semitic goddess of love, Ishtar-Astarte, divine consort of the king, queen of heaven, and *hetaira* in one. This Semitic or more precisely Phoenician origin is already asserted by Herodotos. The decisive evidence, however, comes from those correspondences in cult and iconography which go beyond mere sexuality: this deity is androgynous - there is an Ishtar with a beard and a male Ashtar beside Astarte just as there is a bearded Aphrodite and a male Aphroditos beside Aphrodite; Astarte is called Queen of Heaven just as Aphrodite is called the Heavenly, Urania; Astarte is worshipped with incense altars and dove sacrifices as is Aphrodite and Aphrodite alone.” Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 152.
looked at such as the stalk of wheat, the pomegranate and the dove are universal symbols for a goddess of fertility.\textsuperscript{99}

Whatever suggestions can be made concerning the meaning of the kore, Rouse’s statement that the type reflects “the simplest possible conception of an anthropomorphic goddess” without specialized attributes should be taken as an acceptable compromise. Themselves dedications, the items they hold should be understood on the one hand as sacrificial offerings, and on the other as emblems of the female essence of divine power. In summary, the statues’ and their hand attributes’ frequent occurrence in the Archaic Greek world can be explained through three major phenomena: one, the emergence in Greece of a draped female sculptural type with semi-iconic aspects and its appropriateness for votive purposes, two, the predominance in the Mediterranean of a ubiquitous Great Goddess\textsuperscript{100} who has her pedigree in the Orient, and three, the practice of individualized dedication such as the tithe, the first fruit offering or simply a “gift to please and honor” that established a one-to-one religious bond between the worshiper and the deity while making a public statement.


\textsuperscript{100} Given the associations of semi-iconic form with the Goddess, why semi-iconic representation finds its most fertile grounds of discussion in the realm of the standing female figure can be better understood. There certainly existed aniconic and semi-iconic images depicting male subjects such as herms. However, as Farnell aptly indicates “the \textit{schéma tetragónon} was retained longer for the female figure, for as soon as the male figure had to be represented nude, this scheme must soon have been abandoned for it.” Louis Richard Farnell, “The Origins and Early Developments of Greek Sculpture,” \textit{Archaeological Review} 2 (1889), 78.
CHAPTER 4

THE "IONICIZING" KORAI OF THE ATHENIAN ACROPOLIS

What we now call East Greece must have presented a brilliant picture in the late 7th and early 6th century. The destruction of much of her literature and art is one of the irreparable losses of mankind.

Gisela M. A. Richter

Some korai of the Athenian Acropolis reflect important eastern Greek characteristics. Since "the kore found its most congenial home in Asia Minor and the islands," its development in Attica and elsewhere owes much to the sculptural tradition that emerged and flourished in these regions. In this chapter, the stylistic similarities and differences between eastern and mainland, especially Athenian, korai will be pinpointed and examples from both areas will be analyzed in their respective Orientalizing contexts. However, before a discussion of comparative examples, let us once again take a look at the kore in its incipient phase.

---

1 Archaic Greek Art against its Historical Background (New York: Oxford University Press, 1949), 36.

The centers of origin for the type seem to have been both Naxos and Samos, with each following an independent tradition.\footnote{Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway, *The Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture* (Princeton: University Press, 1993), 128.} Actually, one of the earliest extant korai, though in fragmentary form, comes from Samos (Fig. 61).\footnote{Gisela M. A. Richter, *Korai, Archaic Greek Maidens. A study of the development of the Kore type in Greek sculpture* (New York: Hacker Art Books, 1988), no. 21.} The pieces suggest that it was very similar in every respect to Nikandre (Fig. 7). The fragments consist of the upper part of a torso with ends of tresses falling on the shoulders and the bottom part of a peplos with feet protruding from an archlike opening. It is mounted on a plinth with a tenon for insertion in a base\footnote{This feature is thought to be more appropriate for wooden statues and to reflect survival in stone of earlier practices. Nikandre has such a tenon as well. Ridgway, *Archaic Style*, 125.}, all worked in one piece.\footnote{Richter, *Korai*, 33. To these fragments may belong a piece of the upper left thigh of the figure, inscribed...ethēken. Ibid.} Although the figure is flat and planklike, “it has considerable depth in profile view and is therefore an example of that massiveness of body which characterizes all later Samian korai.”\footnote{Ridgway, *Archaic Style*, 126.}

There exists a chronological gap between this fragmentary kore and the earliest relatively intact korai from Samos, the two dedications of Cheramythes (Figs. 9, 40), which have been dealt with extensively in our previous chapters. Their cylindrical morphology is very different from the planklike Nikandre, the kore from the Ptoan sanctuary (Fig. 28) and the kore from Samos itself mentioned above (Fig. 61). According to Ridgway, despite the fact that Samos was one of the birthplaces of the kore type, it underwent some kind of an eclipse while examples from Attica, Chios and the Cyclades...
came next. In her opinion, this gap in the Samian series went on until “a new veiled type” emerged which Cheramy's dedications exemplify.

Richter places early non-Samian korai in her second group named “The Olympia Hera-Berlin Kore-Akropolis 593 Group” which she dates between ca. 600-570, whereas she places the first cylindrical korai from Samos in her third group, “The Cheramy-Genelios Group,” and dates them to the second quarter of the sixth century. I believe that there are certain problems with this chronological separation which are misleading for the study of the development of early korai. A stylistic examination of some of these early works would make clearer the shortcomings of this chronology.

I Cheramy's Dedication from Samos, now in the Louvre. Figure 9

The head and most of the left arm of this korai are missing. “She is wearing a chiton girt at the waist, and over it a short Ionic himation, draped from the right shoulder to below the left armpit.” She is also wearing an epiblema “which hangs down her back and along the sides, and one edge of which is grasped by the right hand, another is tucked into the belt.” The folds of the chiton are rendered by delicate ridges whereas the himation has deeper, more widely spaced grooves, going in different directions. The epiblema is foldless and wraps the body at the back. Its plain surface treatment contrasts

---

8 Ibid., 128.
9 Ibid.
10 Richter, Korai, no. 55.
with the folds of the chiton and the himation. Nevertheless, it is delineated on its hems with pleats.

This *kore*, together with her sister in Berlin, reflects the "simplified volumes and shallow surface modeling" typical of the Samian workshop. Although there is extensive surface treatment in the form of flutelike folds, there is no incised patterning. This shallow surface articulation is counterbalanced by the plainness of the *epiblema*. In spite of the fact that one can see all the basic components of the Ionic costume, the chiton, himation and epiblema, on this *kore*, they do not seem to have been combined in a logical and coherent sense. When one contrasts this depiction with the ivory maiden from Ephesos (Fig. 32), one can observe the unrealistic way the *kore* carries her garments. As opposed to the lightweight appearance of the single-piece chiton the ivory statuette is wearing, the Samian *kore* is wrapped with several layers of clothes like a mummy. Moreover, even the *epiblema* is not just one layer. The first piece covers the right shoulder, probably passes beneath the himation and is tucked into the belt whereas a

---


12 "If a horizontal section were cut from a Samian statue, its core would be compact, and only the outer 'skin' would be affected by the rendering of the folds. Yet each fold is used sparingly; even on a chiton, they often alternate with blank areas, and veils inevitably create smooth surfaces next to the 'permanent press' appearance of chiton and himation." Ridgway, *Archaic Style*, 134.

13 "It is, in fact, quite true that sculptural renderings of clothing are not always consistent. Some of the Acropolis korai display tips of garments that cannot be accounted for in terms of what they are wearing, but should be seen purely as balancing elements for a rich composition." Ibid., 132.

second layer is covering the back over the himation. Perhaps this second piece was covering the head as well.

The sculptor of this kore apparently tried to impart, to a certain extent, some naturalism to his work, especially on the upper part of the body where breasts are slightly modeled beneath the himation which is also rather logically rendered with its diagonal folds. However, as far as the plain texture of the epiblema and the way it envelops the whole volume are concerned, he seems to have adopted a more abstract stylistic manner.\(^{15}\)

II The Berlin Kore from Attica. Figure 5I\(^{16}\)

The so-called Berlin kore displays eastern features which are executed in an amateur fashion. She wears a peplos which has vertical folds rendered by wide ridges. "The garment has two arched openings at the bottom from which the feet protrude." Over the peplos she wears a shawl-like mantle according to Ridgway,\(^{17}\) an epiblema according to Richter,\(^{18}\) which covers the back of the figure and hangs down in front on both sides. "Its folds are indicated by prominent ridges, arched at the back, vertical in

\(^{15}\) Ridgway states that the "new veiled type" of Samos received some influence from Anatolia. *Archaic Style*, 128.

\(^{16}\) Richter, *Korai*, no. 42. This is one of the six Attic korai found outside the Athenian Acropolis. *Archaic Style*, 141-142.

\(^{17}\) Ridgway, *Archaic Style*, 142.

front, with the stacking indicated at the bottom by zigzags. Tassels are added at the four corners."

The artist who carved this *kore* must have had some Ionic models in mind since the desire to render the whole figure with vertical and diagonal drapery folds must be Ionian in origin. However, the folds of this Attic *kore* lack the elegance and subtlety that articulate the surface of Cheramy's dedication. Moreover, the figure's left hand which is across her chest is stiffly holding her mantle and this feature may be a diluted, misunderstood version of the same motif that the "Hera" of Samos displays (Fig. 9). The abrupt double arched opening at the bottom of the peplos from which the feet protrude also seems to be an unsuccessful imitation of the way the Samian *kore* 's feet are rendered.

Although the Berlin *kore* belongs to Richter's second group (600-570 BC), I believe that the sculptor received considerable influence from the Samian sculptural tradition that produced Cheramy's dedications. Since influences were like:ier to go from the East to the West rather than vice versa, the overall bulkiness and crude details, such as the way the spans between the arms and torso are bridged, do not necessarily suggest an earlier date. In this respect, this *kore* may well date later than the Samian statues we

---

19 As have been mentioned and illustrated in our second chapter, some "Syrian Astarte plaques" display this sort of vertical folds as well (Fig. 24).


21 Another unusual characteristic of the statue is that the figure holds her hand attribute, the pomegranate, very low against her body. Ridgway indicates that she knows of no other *kore* who holds her "offering" this low. Ibid. "The Samian *korai* keep their arms and hands close to the body. When an offering is added, it is pressed against the breasts (usually below them), most often with the fully opened left hand." Ibid., 135.
have been examining. To me, the Berlin *kore* appears to have been carved by a native sculptor only superficially acquainted with Samian statuary.

Apart from its Samianizing traits, the *kore* reflects native mainland or Attic features such as the *polos* with the meander and lotus band around it. It is noteworthy that this patterned treatment is also extended to the peplos, the upper edge of which is decorated in a similar fashion. “She also wears sandals, a necklace with pendants, and a spiral bracelet on her left arm,” *kosmēseis* which eastern *korai* hardly ever display. As for the facial features, she somehow preserves the physiognomy of such Orientalizing images as the wooden Hera from Samos (Fig. 8), the Dipylon ivory figurine (Fig. 18) and the Lady of Auxerre (Fig. 6), all possessing patterned clothes. As has been indicated in the previous chapter, although most of the eastern *korai* are headless, one can get an idea as to what their heads may have looked like by looking at several extant heads from Asia Minor. In general, “cheeks and chins are prominent, noses short and merging with the high-swinging curves of the eyebrows. Eyes are usually long and narrow” (Fig. 62).\(^{22}\)

Overall, facial features of eastern and western *korai* display important differences which are also another indication of the differences in sculptural tradition between the two areas.

\(^{22}\) *Ibid.*, 137.
This kore, which we have examined in our previous chapter with regards to her hand attributes, belongs to Richter’s second group along with the Berlin kore. We have also mentioned in the last chapter its stylistic similarity to the Moschophoros (Fig. 1). “She wears three garments: a chiton, now visible only along the upper right arm where it is fastened with three buttons, but probably once also indicated at the missing part of the statue; a peplos with overfold, and a belt which has hanging, tasseled ends; and a shawl-like epiblema, hanging down the back, over the left arm, and down the right side.” On the front, the epiblema forms vertical folds with zigzag edges which also have tassels at the corners.

It is surprising that according to Gisela Richter this kore, which she refers to as “Ionicizing,” is not so impressive a work as the Berlin kore (Fig. 51) which she believes is contemporary with it. Moreover, she posits that there is a stylistic affinity between the Berlin kore and the Moschophoros. These statements reflect some important shortcomings in her analysis and dating of korai with respect to a highly relative chronology. It is misleading to treat the examples of the two types of korai, the

---

23 Richter, Korai, no. 42.

24 Richter, Archaic Greek Art, 64.

25 Also, Richter suggests that the Naxian sphinx (Fig. 63) at Delphi has similar features to the Moschophoros (Fig. 1). Korai, 44. To me, the differences are more apparent than the similarities. The carved surface ornament of the sphinx is in contrast with the linear, plain surface treatment of the Calf-bearer which shares important stylistic traits with the Pomegranate kore.
mainland works executed in the native fashion which still partake somewhat of the Daedalic tradition, and the eastern or in some instances, atypical mainland works such as the Pomegranate kore, as the developmental products of a homogeneous kore tradition in the Archaic Aegean.27

In referring to the Pomegranate kore as “Ionicizing,” Richter puts her finger on an excellent point which she does not further elaborate. Although the overall form of the kore is flat, it is not as planklike as Nikandre (Fig. 7). The fact that she is wearing a chiton underneath an epiblema brings the statue closer to Cheramyens’ dedication (Fig. 9) in massing and surface rendering. The big difference, however, is the dominance of plain surfaces in the Pomegranate kore. We have seen in Cheramyens’ dedication an attempt to establish a balance between the folded surfaces of her chiton and the plain epiblema that covers it. In the case of the Athenian kore, the folds of the chiton are visible only minimally as if to remind the beholder of the figure’s Ionian pedigree. As well, the fact

---

26 The main reference points for her relative chronology are the heads on Corinthian pyxides, representations of maidens on Orientalizing pottery and the stylistic characteristics of more or less contemporary korai, all very different media or types. As far as the heads are concerned, we have mentioned that few of the korai have their heads preserved. Furthermore, the Daedalic heads of most of those Corinthian vessels (Fig. 64) are entirely different from the extant heads of eastern korai (Fig. 62) and thus cannot be a safe criterion for dating them. As for the representations of women on Orientalizing pottery, Richter’s main point is that the figures are usually comparable to contemporary korai with regards to their planklike stances and drapery. I cannot see in the examples she is giving any depiction wearing anything similar to the Ionic costume (Fig. 65). Besides, since eastern Greece did not have a prominent pottery tradition of its own, representations on proto-Corinthian vases, themselves occasionally Daedalic quotations, which mostly depict stiff peplophoroi, can only be a valid dating criterion for mainland work.

27 It is equally misleading to suggest a relative chronology for the examples of these two different trends by comparing and contrasting them with each other since they may well have existed side by side throughout the Orientalizing period. An example for such a pitfall has been mentioned in our second chapter concerning the dates of the Nikandre and the Auxerre goddess. Like Jenkins and Adams, Richter also thinks that the Auxerre goddess is more advanced than Nikandre especially inasmuch as the facial features of the former are much more evolved. In this regard, whereas she dates the Nikandre to the third quarter of the seventh century, she assigns the Auxerre goddess to the last quarter of that century. Richter, Korai, 23.
that the *kore* wears three major garments on top of each other rendered in an unintelligible fashion\(^{28}\) further points to the affinity between this work and the Samian statue. There are other aspects that reinforce this suggestion. For instance when one looks at the side views of both of the statues (Fig. 66), one can see that the curved transition from the back of the figure to her buttocks is similar in each case. Further, the way the right arm is modeled underneath the *epiblema* and the way layers of garments overlap on the lower part of the body are comparable as well. Nevertheless, the *kore* is not without her non-eastern aspects such as the tresses falling over her shoulders and her necklace with pendants of the same form as those in the Berlin *kore*.

In sum, this example is closer to the western Anatolian understanding of the *kore* as exemplified by early Samian statues than it is to the Berlin *kore* which may be referred to as naïve Attic. Perhaps it does owe something to the earliest *korai*, such as Nikandre, with its morphology, elliptical in cross-section, but there is no mainland example which prefigures the layering of garments that constitutes the whole point in this kind of plastic endeavor. There must have been some eastern models which the sculptor looked at or one may even suggest that the artist himself was an Ionian who simply responded to the

\(^{28}\) "The interrelation of the folds of these various garments is not consistently carried out."

Richter, *Korai*, 40. Especially, the peplos and the epiblema are indistinguishable on the torso. The unrealistic treatment of garments on *korai* may have been the result of a conceptual as opposed to a naturalistic understanding of representation on the part of the sculptors. It is unlikely that the artists failed to render the garments logically since even the Berlin *kore*, which is artistically inferior to the Pomegranate *kore*, does not reflect any ambiguity in the way she carries her garments. Further, as has been mentioned above, the ivory statuette from the base of the Ephesian Artemision (Fig. 29) is a masterpiece of naturalism in the way her dress and hair are treated. The idealistic representational disposition of the Pomegranate *kore* also manifests itself through the supinated right lower arm, which is reminiscent of the Egyptian representational tradition that favors a conflation of profile and frontal views in the depiction of the human body.
demands of his Athenian clients and apparently adopted some aspects of the local custom. From this standpoint, early Samian korai stand ahead of the Pomegranate kore and could have constituted models for her just as they may have for the Berlin kore.\textsuperscript{29} Therefore, to place these Samian korai in a slightly later period would be to deny their influence on the first mainland korai. To my opinion, they should be taken as contemporary with the Berlin and Pomegranate korai.\textsuperscript{30}

\textit{IV The Kulu\l u and Palanga fragments from Asia Minor. Figures 67 and 30}

The Palanga statue (Fig. 30) has been mentioned in our second chapter with regards to a possible native Anatolian tradition of statuary in stone that prefigures Archaic rendering insofar as layers of garment and the so-called zigzag folds are concerned. A similar find (Fig. 67) comes from a nearby region, Kululu, also in eastern central Asia Minor, effacing doubts as to the existence of such a tradition in that area.\textsuperscript{31} It is an

\textsuperscript{29} It has already been suggested that the response to this influence was different in each case. The Berlin kore thoroughly subscribes to the folded garment tradition with several misunderstandings, whereas the Pomegranate kore takes the element of the epiblema to the extreme, keeping the chiton folds at a minimum without totally discarding them.

\textsuperscript{30} “I am strongly in favor of considering Samos one of the birthplaces of Archaic sculpture, independent of Naxos, and I would hesitate to attribute very high dates to the early korai since their similarity to wooden images proportionately increase their appearance of great antiquity.” Ridgway, \textit{Archaic Style}, 126. “To my eyes, the Samian statues do not look particularly Greek in conception or form. Granted that terracottas may show the incipient stages of fold formation, the specific combination of surface patterns made of thin, engraved lines and the smooth veil tucked in at the waist seem to me too Oriental to be ignored.” Ibid., 150.

\textsuperscript{31} Tahsin Özgüç, \textit{Demir Devrinde Kültüpe ve Çıvıları} (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi, 1971), 47. Interestingly enough, no relief or inscribed orthostat has turned up in Kululu. Representational finds mostly consist of freestanding statuary, stelai, and sphinxes. Ibid., 45.
Assyrianizing standing figure, three meters high, rectangular in section with arms held tight below the breast. He is wearing a short-sleeved chiton with a strip of folds visible on the right side.\textsuperscript{32} Over this, he is wearing a shorter and heavier mantle which forms zigzag folds on the right side. The edges of the mantle are generously decorated and the corners have tassels.

Some German and Turkish scholars deny any indebtedness of Greek sculpture to Anatolian sources, and favor influences from eastern Greece as giving new impetus to non-Greek Anatolian works of the early sixth century.\textsuperscript{33} Such is Ekrem Akurgal's view concerning Phrygian art, as exemplified by the Cybele figures, some of which we have examined in our previous chapter (Figs. 58, 59).\textsuperscript{34} These Phrygian works look very Hellenized to my eyes as well, especially as far as their drapery treatment is concerned. However, the Kululu and Palanga statues clearly display a more archaic disposition compared to the korai which they most probably influenced. Ridgway strongly argues that the evidence provided by the Kululu and Palanga fragments seems sufficient to hypothesize the existence of a close link between eastern Greece and the Neo-Hittite legacy of Asia Minor.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{32} One wonders if these folds belong to a further inner garment showing through a slit since a single column of folds looks odd on an otherwise plain dress. The Palanga statue too has the same feature. However, it may well be a decorative textured band added on the chiton.

\textsuperscript{33} Ridgway, \textit{Archaic Style}, 111.

\textsuperscript{34} Ekrem Akurgal, \textit{Die Kunst Anatoliens von Homer bis Alexander} (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Co, 1961), 97. Akurgal dates Phrygian goddess images, including the freestanding group from Bogazköy, to the second half of the sixth century. He argues that Phrygian art had lost its originality by then, as can be proven by its pottery which had been a branch of contemporary Greek art. Thus he posits that the models for the Phrygian Cybele images were such Ionian korai as Cheramyes' dedications.
According to Tahsin Ö zgü ç , these works may date to the first years of Sennacherib’s reign (704-681), that is, shortly after Sargon II’s campaign to Asia Minor around 700 BC. Ö zgü ç posits that the figures should be considered as separate from the contemporary developments in the pottery of Asia Minor which, unlike sculpture, reflects Greek influence running from the West to the East. Thus it is reasonable to argue that the type of drapery rendering on these examples is peculiar to Asia Minor. Although it is not easy to account for the stylistic and chronological gap between the East and West in this respect, our Samian korai seem to have been the first extant examples that were influenced by this Anatolian trend. They in turn must have influenced some mainland examples such as the Pomegranate kore (Fig. 44). In fact, the latter even possesses zigzag folds with tassels at the corners. Most probably an eastern artist was at work here.

35 Ridgway, Archaic Style, 150. Much controversy exists in modern scholarship concerning the date of these statues as well. According to E. Unger, the Kululu figure’s overgarment that ends with zigzag folds imitates Ionian Greek art and therefore has to date to the middle of the sixth century. Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte 10, cited in Tahsin Ö zgü ç, Demir Devrinde Kültepe, 47. H. Th. Bossert believes that the Palanga figure is the oldest forerunner of Greek draped figures and cannot date later than the seventh century. Altaaiolien No. 786, 70, cited in ibid. See chapter two for Barnett’s account of the Palanga figure concerning the zigzag folds. As for Ekrem Akurgal, he argues that the Palanga figure was produced under the influence of eastern Greek art and that it dates to the sixth century or even earlier. Spätethnische Bildkunst, 33, cited in ibid.

36 Ibid., 48.

37 This statement once again draws attention to the complexity and inconsistency of the Orientalizing phenomenon in the eastern Mediterranean area in the seventh and sixth centuries especially with regards to different genres and media.
V Headless marble kore from the Athenian Acropolis. Figure 68

This is a truly Ionicizing work that contrasts with the immature disposition of the Berlin kore. It is certainly later than Cheramy’s dedication (Fig. 9) since it reflects Samian influence although Richter dates both to the second quarter of the sixth century.\(^{39}\) “She wears a chiton and a short Ionic himation, as does the Samian kore, draped from the right shoulder to below the left armpit.” However, in this case the element of an epiblema is totally eliminated.\(^{40}\) Moreover, the folds of the himation are indicated by curving instead of by vertical and oblique lines, another divergence from the Samian tradition.\(^{41}\) The most important difference, however, is the overall form of the statue, slightly rectangular in cross-section like the Pomegranate kore (Fig. 44). The fact that it is made of Naxian marble\(^{42}\) may suggest the lingering of island practices in early mainland korai.\(^{43}\) One can contrast this work to the upper part of a kore again from the Athenian Acropolis, and made of Naxian marble (Fig. 69).\(^{44}\) Although she too reflects Ionic

---

\(^{38}\) Richter, Korai, no. 57.

\(^{39}\) Ibid., 47.

\(^{40}\) The epiblema which also covers the head is obviously an eastern element in korai. Apparently it was not favored in the mainland. However, it lingers on eastern korai such as the kore holding a partridge from Miletos, also belonging to Richter’s Cheramy-Geneleos group.

\(^{41}\) Ibid.

\(^{42}\) Ibid.

\(^{43}\) The Pomegranate kore (Fig. 44) too, despite its Ionic epiblema, reflects the same morphology and might have been made of island marble as well.
features with her chiton and himation, they are executed in a primitive fashion. Even though these two works may date more or less to the same period, our kore, being very close in her stance and surface rendering to Samian korai, may have been carved by an eastern artist whereas the other statue is apparently an unsuccessful imitation executed by local hands.

VI The Geneleos korai. Figures 70 and 71

The two standing female figures from the Geneleos group, Philippe (Fig. 70) and Ornithe (Fig. 71), reflect important differences from the dedications of Cheramyes. For one thing, even though they are wearing the Ionic chiton and himation with many vertical folds, they are not wearing epibilemata.\(^45\) Therefore, their hair is not covered, but falls on their backs and shoulders in highly patterned and solidly rendered tresses.\(^46\) Actually, this sort of hair treatment was not new to Ionia. Two early fragments said to be from Chios display the same understanding (Figs. 72-73).\(^47\) Interestingly enough, although the Chian korai are wearing chitons, patterns are incised on them. Philippe and Ornithe, on

---

\(^{44}\) Ibid., no. 59. Richter states that this statue is generally considered to be an importation from Samos. Ibid., 45. This seems to me extremely unlikely since the work is not of comparable quality. It would be more convincing to suggest this for the headless marble kore.

\(^{45}\) On the other hand, we do here see the deep pouches (kolpoi) of the girded chiton falling on the hips of the figures.

\(^{46}\) Ridgway, Archaic Style, 136.

\(^{47}\) Richter, Korai, 37, 38. Richter places them in the first quarter of the sixth century.
the other hand, simply reflect the standard Samian surface articulation composed of vertical folds.

Unlike Cheramytes’ dedications, the Geneleos korai are pulling their skirts and stepping forward. The idea of having the kore hold her skirt aside with one hand, usually the right, is thought to have been introduced to Archaic sculpture by Geneleos. This became a highly influential prototype for all later rendering.\textsuperscript{48} All in all, one cannot deny that Geneleos sisters signal the approaching mannerism in the kore type. Richter’s placing them in the same category with Cheramytes’ dedications is understandable only as far as such factors as locale and stylistic parallelism are concerned. However, the salient differences between them not only suggest a much later date for the sisters but also point to a change in the way the kore type was conceived by the Archaic sculptor and beholder. This idea may further be supported by the fact that the statues are inscribed with their names and that the signature “Geneleos made us” (\textit{êmas epoièse Geneleos}) speaks in the first person, all of which are quite exceptional in Archaic art as far as korai are concerned.\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{48} Ridgway, \textit{Archaic Style}, 135.

\textsuperscript{49} Although Phrasikleia has her name inscribed on her grave marker as well, she is not speaking in the first person.
The kore Phrasikleia which was found in Merenda, Attica is the work of Aristion, a Parian sculptor.\textsuperscript{50} We have seen that, since the beginning, the Cyclades concentrated on planklike forms and favored an abstract, non-naturalistic approach.\textsuperscript{51} Although Phrasikleia looks quite rigid, she does not lack the fashionable traits of the Archaic sculpture of Attica such as sandals, a necklace with pendants, an elaborate headdress and a belted peplos that has a meander-ornamented paryphē in the center. Moreover, there are rosettes incised on both sides of the paryphē. The sculptor was not unaware of the current developments on Samos either, as the skirt-pulling motif occurs here too. Thus, one can see in Phrasikleia the conservative planklike form enriched with surface patterning. There are other examples that reflect a similar understanding such as the two korai from Cyrene (Fig. 74).\textsuperscript{52} These statues have squarish kolpoi and patterned paryphai, revealing their insular pedigree. Again, they are not without Samianizing features such as the fluted lower chiton and the arm diagonally pressed against the breast holding an offering. Hence, one can conclude that there was a final phase of the kore type in which Ionic and Cycladic aspects were blended, shortly in vogue mostly outside Ionia, before it gave in to the mannerism of the so-called International style.

\textsuperscript{50} Ridgway, \textit{Archaic Style}, 99.

\textsuperscript{51} John Griffiths Pedley, \textit{Greek Sculpture of the Archaic Period: The Island Workshops} (Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern), 1976.

\textsuperscript{52} Richter, \textit{Koral}, nos. 56a-b.
VIII The International Style

Richter’s fourth group of korai is named the Lyons Kore-Ephesos group (ca. 555-535). The Lyons kore (Fig. 49), which has been examined in the previous chapter is an example for the so-called International style, which is characterized by exaggerated zigzag edges, clinging drapery, especially on the hips and buttocks, and extensive modeling. Another typical feature of these korai is the headdress which, in the case of the Lyons kore is a polos, but can as well be characterized by stephanai and metal attachments. The kore I have selected for this section is Richter’s no. 122 (Fig. 75) belonging to her fifth group, “Korai from the Akropolis of Athens.” She combines most of the elements we have so far seen in a mannerist, almost rococo fashion. The right hand is holding an offering, either an apple or pomegranate, the left hand is pulling the skirt. She is wearing both the Ionic chiton and himation rendered with lots of zigzag folds, and a curved stephanè as well. There are painted designs on her garments such as meander and guilloche bands, and rosettes.

It is interesting to contrast this work to an “International-style” kore from the East which was found near Klazomenai in Ionia (Fig. 76). The eastern kore reflects most of

\[^{53}\text{It has been suggested that the Lyons kore might have served as a Caryatid for a wooden structure on the Archaic Acropolis. In this case, the polos would be a normal element for the obvious architectural function. Moreover, the sturdy character of the kore with squared shoulders and muscular arms would be particularly suitable for a supporting function. Ridgway, Archaic Style, 144. The suggestion that the Erechtheion architect might have incorporated the Caryatid porch into his design as an element alluding to the Archaic past of the Acropolis is a very sophisticated one. However, the fact that the upper surface of the kore’s polos is slanted should raise doubts concerning the validity of this hypothesis.}\]

\[^{54}\text{Richter, Korai, no. 163.}\]
the elements we have cited for the Acropolis work. However, she is rendered much more elegantly in that the masses and drapery folds are more legible. Individual components such as the forearms, tresses falling over the shoulders, the upper pleats of the chiton and himation, and the offering are paratactically rendered but are nevertheless the constituent parts of a coherent whole. The visually tiring features of the Athenian kore here leave their places to smooth surfaces that recall the golden age of the eastern Archaic style. The arm holding the offering is not stretched forward but is kept against the breast in accordance with the Ionic custom and the left arm, even though it is pulling the skirt, is held tight along the flank. One can once again observe, through this comparison, the austerity and nobility of eastern craftsmanship in plastic rendering together with the loyalty to a former tradition. The International style is apparently a late Attic and island development that eventually influenced the East. However, one kore in the midst of this Acropolis mannerism stands out as different.

IX The Peplos Kore, the Athenian acropolis. Figure 77

This work is one of the latest examples of a kore wearing a peplos in Attica. We have seen that the Ionic chiton and himation had already become the norm for mainland korai carved in the International style. The Peplos kore too wears the chiton which is visible with its crinkly folds above her feet. However, over it she is wearing a heavy,

55 Ibid., no. 113.
belted peplos with overfold. The loose ends of the belt fall down in two vertical bands. Decorative borders were added in color on the peplos. Her right arm is lowered, the forearm is semi-supinated and the angular hand had some object. The left forearm was brought forward holding an offering.

Although this kore is dated to 535-530 BC by Richter, it reflects traces of an older style. The overall form of the statue is like a rectangular block and the fact that it is made of Parian marble is revealing in this respect. The plainness of the drapery surfaces and the semi-supinated right lower arm may suggest a kinship with the Pomegranate kore (Fig. 44). The layering of clothes, the linear treatment of the belt ends, the pleat on the upper garment, and the zigzag folds of the peplos on the two flanks reinforce this suggestion. In short, there are important Ionicizing features belonging to this kore. Nevertheless, to my eyes, the insular tradition as exemplified by Phrasikleia (Fig. 42) and the two korai from Cyrene (Fig. 74) seems to be much more dominant. The blocklike morphology and the painted geometric ornaments on the statue, and most of all the fact she is wearing a belted peplos, are elements that remove her from the eastern tradition.

56 The same rendition of a belted peplos can be seen on a small kore from Eleusis. Ibid., no. 75.
CONCLUSION

Having delineated the basic differences between mainland and eastern korai, we should now turn once again to their probable sources. Ridgway argues that both the Pomegranate kore (Fig. 44) and the Peplos kore (Fig. 77) might have been imitations in stone of very old wooden cult images. Her hypothesis seems to be well taken as far as the Peplos kore is concerned since she shares comparable characteristics with the famous wooden image from the Samian Heraion (Fig. 8). The kore is not wearing a polos but the two rows of holes drilled into her hair and some lead pins still preserved in some cavities suggest an elaborate crown (Fig. 78). Ridgway also suggests that the kore is wearing a cape pinned over the shoulders. Actually one can see on the statue the borders of this element which is rendered in very low relief. The fact that she wears a cape, if true, is a further indication of the statue’s alluding to a wooden cult image. Again, the wooden idol from Samos as well as the Auxerre statuette can be taken as derivatives of such images.

57 Her account on the Pomegranate kore: “I believe that her sculptor was trying to imitate an earlier image. In any case he knew that his work was to be placed in a position where the back was not fully visible since he did not carve it in detail.” Archaic Style, 144.


59 Ridgway, Archaic Style, 148.

60 Ibid., 110.
On account of its later date and deliberate adoption of old features and perhaps imitation of an ancient cult image in wood, the Peplos kore (Fig. 77) may be regarded as archaizing or archaistic. However, I believe that one cannot talk about the Pomegranate kore (Fig. 44) within the same framework. As has been mentioned before, this kore, although it shares morphological features with the Peplos kore, reflects the Anatolian understanding of drapery and surface treatment. We have already drawn attention to the difference in conception between eastern and non-eastern korai. Let us now summarize the tentative development of the kore type in the Archaic Greek world in order to further articulate this difference.

The beginning phase occurred in the Cycladic islands, especially on Naxos and Paros. The prototype for the morphology and significance of this incipient phase could have been the monumental funerary or votive stele in stone not infrequent in the Cyclades (Fig. 60) as well as archaic cult images in wood. One may as well talk about a conflation of the two to result in a new type. Why this incipient semi- iconic type exclusively depicted female subjects can be explained through the influx of oriental female images, the Great Goddess-oriented religious predilections of Anatolian and island peoples, and the affinity of this ubiquitous female divinity with aniconic representation. Although early examples such as Nikandre (Fig. 7) and the Ptoan kore (Fig. 28) are still in the Daedalic tradition, they reflect a denial of the patterned surface treatment so typical of that trend.

The initial stage of the type seems to have been felt on Samos along the same lines with the developments in the Cycladic area as the first extant kore from the island well attests (Fig. 61). However, the next step both in Ionia and the mainland appears to have
been an extension of this “Orientalizing” stage with Daedalic hair and incised surfaces as exemplified by the fragments from Chios (Figs. 72-73) and the Meschato torso from Attica (Fig. 46). Leaving behind for the time being the Berlin (Fig. 51) and Pomegranate korai (Fig. 44) that come next in Richter’s catalogue, one should take note of the radical novelty that found fertile grounds on Samos. This new draped kore type unquestionably drew upon native Anatolian examples such as the Palanga and Kululu figures. However, it did start its own school with the unprecedented way it put together graphic and plastic elements.

The whole picture puts into question the term “Orientalizing.” We have so far used the term as a stylistic designation that referred to representations that look Daedalic, and ultimately Phoenician or Palestinian. It is very interesting that the mainland and the Cyclades seem never to have lost the visual qualities of this international trend. One can see lingering Daedalicizing facial features on almost all Attic korai, including the Peplos kore, until one encounters the “severe” face of the Euthydikos kore (Fig. 80). The plasticity and rounded nature of mainland lips clearly go back to Oriental ivories depicting purely Semitic types such as the goddess figurine from Kültepe (Kanesh) dating to the eighteenth century BC (Fig. 80). The so-called Archaic smile, though much more symmetrical and stylized, betrays the influence of such prototypes. Even the Moschophoros (Fig. 1), despite all his “Ionicizing” austerity, has that peculiar smile. Another unusual feature of this dedication is the use of inlay for the eyes, one of the hallmarks of the art of the ancient Near East. The Pomegranate kore (Fig. 44) probably had similar facial features as well, combining semi-iconic morphology with a mainland
face. On the other hand, eastern korai usually reflect a facial type in squarish form with horizontal slit eyes and less fleshy and more spread lips (Fig. 61).

Thus, it is reasonable to view Ionic korai as the products of another branch of the Orientalizing influx which may have followed a land route. This current probably adopted the facial features of a different ethnic type, perhaps a local Anatolian one, or was simply influenced by the types depicted in Mesopotamian and Egyptian stone sculpture in the round. In general this branch has things in common with Neo-Hittite and Phrygian art.

As well, one has to keep in mind the fact that the Palanga and Kululu figures come from an area that had been an internationally active trade center since the Bronze Age. At the beginning of the second millennium BC the Assyrians who were living in northern Mesopotamia established great trading colonies in Anatolia which they called karums. The Karum of Kanesh was the controlling center to which all the other karums were subordinate.\(^{61}\) Actually no comparable commercial establishment existed at that time in all Mesopotamia, Syria and Iran.\(^{62}\) The Assyrians did not claim political power and administrative rule in Anatolia. The merchants paid taxes to the local princes who reigned in the area at that time. "The most advanced phase called the 'Assyrian Trading Colonies Age' in Anatolian history, is represented by Level II and dates approximately from 1950 to 1850 BC."\(^{63}\) This level was destroyed by a fire and was followed by the city Ib which

---


\(^{63}\) Akurgal, *Ancient Civilizations*, 319.
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was built about 1800 BC by people of the same origin.\textsuperscript{64} The new city was contemporary with Hammurabi the Great, King of Babylon.\textsuperscript{65} The ivory goddess (Fig. 80) we have looked at belongs to this level.

This figurine as well as some other images found in the region among which are anthropomorphic metal statuettes (Fig. 81) do not have much in common with the contemporary art of Mesopotamia. Rather, they reflect Canaanish features. Given the trade traffic and flexible tax-dependent administrative structure of the region, it is not unthinkable that coastal people were here at work. On the other hand, in the Iron Age the area witnessed the merging of Hittite, western Semitic and Mesopotamian cultures. The Assyrianizing Palanga and Kululu figures should be viewed within this context.\textsuperscript{66} It is almost certain that these fragments antedate our Samian statues. Samian korai, in turn, must have influenced mainland work such as the Berlin and Pomegranate korai which, I believe, could not be earlier than Cheramyes' dedications. In this respect one can talk about successful and unsuccessful mainland imitations. Whereas the Berlin kore displays an immature response to the new artistic demand, the Pomegranate kore and the

\textsuperscript{64} Ibid., 320.

\textsuperscript{65} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{66} Although examples of turn-of-the-millennium Assyrian sculpture in the round are not as abundant as those of relief sculpture, there existed a tradition of Mesopotamian sculpture that went back to the Neo-Sumerian and Isin-Larsa periods. The Puzur-Ishtar of Mari (Fig. 82) is an example from the Isin-Larsa period (2025-1594) that reflects the diagonal, tasselled drapery that the Kululu figure wears. Going further back in chronology, the diorite torso of Gudea (Fig. 83) dating to the Neo-Sumerian period (2125-2025 BC), though not much similar to the figure from Mari, displays the same fold treatment on his left arm as does the bent arm of the Pomegranate kore (Fig. 44). The conceptual affinity between stone Mesopotamian sculpture in the round and korai has already been emphasized in the third chapter.
Moschophoros are Ionicizing masterpieces of the Archaic Acropolis even though their form still owes a lot to the Attic-Cycladic tradition.

Once Attica and especially Athens were opened to Ionic influence, they held on to it for the rest of the Archaic period. The abundance of korai with Ionic chitons and himations is a testimony for this phenomenon. Even after korai were buried as the debris of the Persian wars, the introduction of the Ionic order into the Acropolis testifies to the ongoing interest in and bonds with Ionia.

As we have seen, such examples as Phrasikleia (Fig. 42) and the two korai from Cyrene (Fig. 74) were produced at the threshold of the so-called International style. With their columnlike forms they attest to the presence of a brief conservative stage in the non-eastern realm. However, they can be viewed within the same framework as the Peplos kore in that they may have drawn upon archaic cult images. The element of paryphe is the hallmark of this type and is never encountered on the garments of eastern korai. This kind of central patterned band must have been a common feature on small holy images in wood or other materials as can be seen on the garments of the wooden Hera from Samos (Fig. 8) and the sphylata statuettes from Dreros (Fig. 17).

One can consider the general stylistic disposition of the mainland korai as always more elaborate and ornamented than those of the East. The International style, a mainland-Cyclades creation, ultimately influenced Asia Minor as well. However, there are instances from Ionia such as the kore from Klazomenai (Fig. 76) which nevertheless preserves the native eastern austerity. Most of the Acropolis korai have traces of meander and other geometric patterns painted on them. With their Daedalicizing faces, elaborate
head dresses enriched with metal attachments and extensive surface treatment, both
carved and painted, they are closer in conception to our first type of holy images which
has been outlined in our previous chapters. As far as the morphologically conservative
non-eastern korai such as Phrasikleia (Fig. 42) and the Peplos kore (Fig. 77) are
concerned, the suggestion that they reflect former cult images is very well taken since
such images did probably unite semi-iconic form with patterned ornament. In short,
although the driving force for the production of these standing marble images reached the
mainland from the East, it had to submit to the strong “Daedalic-Orientalizing” heritage
of the mainland in its execution. The few Ionicizing examples may suggest foreign artists
or very skillful disciples of eastern art at work.

As for the Ionic tradition, examples are few but stylistically consistent enough to
suggest a deliberate semi-iconism especially in the incipient phase. Although it is hard to
make a suggestion concerning the exact origin of this type, it too may have reached Asia
Minor from the Near East. One fact is revealing though not conclusive by itself. The
word “chiton” designates the ordinary undergarment of the Greek dress, characteristic of
the Ionian fashion but not limited to it. “Herodotos knows that the chiton is foreign, and
came to the Ionians from their eastern neighbors, but he calls it Carian.” It seems likely
that the Ionians and Carians took it over from farther East. The word is the Aramaic
“kittana” which means linen or tunic of linen. It is noteworthy that draped images

67 Herodotos v. 88. 1, cited in Thomas James Dunbabin, The Greeks and their Eastern

68 Ibid.
among the Syrian Astarte plaques wear chitonlike undergarments (Fig. 24). Moreover, the orthostat relief from Carchemish depicting Cybele (Fig. 57), which we have looked at in our last chapter, wears a chiton as well. The latter image clearly antedates the Samian group of korai and should be considered as their precursor. It is an excellent example for the intermediate stage between the Kululu-Palanga (Figs. 67, 30) figures and early Samian statues.

Although it is not easy to account for the obvious stylistic duality in “Orientalizing” and Archaic female representation in stone, the clues that can be traced converge toward northern Syria and the Levant as the critical localities for both trends with seminal influence from the old Mesopotamian heritage. One may well speculate that these areas, especially the Levant, had a predilection toward non-representational holy images, besides portable figurine production in wood and precious materials that held sway in the entire eastern Mediterranean during the Orientalizing period. Presumably associated with the Goddess, as most of the litholatric practices in the old Semitic world were, this mode of representation might have been communicated to Anatolia through the Neo-Hittite territory in the eighth and seventh centuries. In this respect, one should also consider as effective such an extraordinarily creative and synthetic endeavor, as is the case with all Greek art, on the part of the Ionians in the emergence of their kore type.

Last but not least, the architectural picture can help one glean parallel clues. The entire architectural vocabulary of western Asia Minor draws upon a now lost tradition of wooden construction that existed in the ancient Levant. Moreover, the first volute capitals in stone, the hallmark of the Ionic order, were unearthed in such ancient
Palestinian sites as Megiddo and Shechem (Fig. 84).\textsuperscript{69} Further, the motif of the column with volute capital frequently occurs on Hittite hieroglyphics standing for the deceased deified king (Fig. 85).\textsuperscript{70} On the other hand, Ionia was always relatively immune to Egyptian influence though an Egyptian contribution in technical aspects to the formation of Samian statuary is generally acknowledged. The impact of Egypt on Greek art appears rather to have been in the realm of the Doric order and the \textit{kouros}, both mainland creations par excellence. The complexity and contradiction of the Orientalizing influx becomes the more apparent when one calls to mind the fact that it was the Ionians and Carians, not the mainland people, who helped Psammetichos conquer Egypt in the mid seventh century.\textsuperscript{71} The influence of Egypt on the \textit{korai} and architecture of the East seems not to have gone beyond technical aspects. On the other hand, the mainland once again stands out as having been more receptive to direct foreign infiltration. It was the native spirit of Asia Minor, elusive but grounded, and its own peculiar and selective bonds with the Near East that gave shape to its Greek art.


\textsuperscript{70} Muhibbe Darga, \textit{Hitit Sanati} (Istanbul: Akbank Yayinlari, 1992), 194.

\textsuperscript{71} Herodotos (ii, 154) cited in Richter, \textit{Korai}, 23.
Figure 1. Calf-bearer (Moschophoros).
Figure 2. Cycladic marble figurines and head.
Figure 3. Mother Goddess figurine, Catalhöyük.
Figure 4. “Stylized” Mother Goddess figurine, Catalhöyük.
Figure 5. "Insert-head idol," Höyük Höyük.
Figure 6. "The Lady of Auxerre," probably from Crete.
Figure 7. The kore Nikandre, Delos.
Figure 8. Wooden statuette, probably of Hera, Samos.
Figure 9. *Kore* dedicated by Cheramyes to Hera, Samos.
Figure 10. "Statuette said to come from Chalkis."
Figure 11. Statue from Haghiogeorgitika, Crete.
Figure 12. Artemis of Ephesus, Roman copy.
Figure 13. Pounder of Ephesos.
Figure 14. Detail of a red-figur cup signed by Euphrnios as maker.
Figure 15. Terracotta statuettes, Argive Heraion.
Figure 16. "Idols," Asia Minor.
Figure 17. *Sphyrelata* figurines from the temple of Apollo, Delos.
Figure 18. Ivory goddess from the Dipylon cemetery, Athens.
Figure 19. Apollo with lion, Delphi.
Figure 20. Head of the Charioteer of Delphi.
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Figure 21. "Statue from Astritsi," Crete.
Figure 22. “Statue from Eleutherna,” Crete.
Figure 23. "Syrian Astarte plaques."
Figure 24. “Syrian Astarte Plaques.”
Figure 25. "Sculpture 9 from Gortyn," Crete.
Figure 27. “Sculpture 3 from Gortyn,” Crete.
Figure 27. “Sculpture 10 from Gortyn,” Crete.
Figure 28. *Kore* from the sanctuary of Apollo Ptoios, Boeotia.
Figure 29. Statue of Ashurnasirpal II.
Figure 30. The Palanga figure.
Figure 31. Ivory statuette, Ephesian Artemision.
Figure 32. Ivory statuette, Ephesian Artemision.
Figure 33. Ivory statuette, "Spinner," Ephesian Artemision.
Figure 34. Ivory statuette, “Megabyzos,” Ephesian Artemision.
Figure 35. Ivory statuette, Ephesian Artemision.
Figure 36. Statue of Ir-khonsu-aat.
Figure 37. Stone relief of the Moon Goddess Artemis, Perge.
Figure 38. “The Mantiklos Bronze.”
Figure 39. “The Antenor Kore.”
Figure 40. *Kore* dedicated by Cheramyes to Hera, Samos.
Figure 41. The Geneleos group, Samos.
Figure 42. The *kore* Phrasikleia.
Figure 43. Marble head, Miletos.
Figure 44. "The Pomegranate Kore."
Figure 45. Ram-bearer (Kriophoros).
Figure 46. Marble torso of a *kore* from Moschato, Attica.
Figure 47. Sacred column with pomegranate on stele, Carthage.
Figure 48. Headless marble kore, Miletos.
Figure 49. "The Lyons kore."
Figure 50. The Hagia Triadha sarcophagus, Crete.
Figure 51. "The Berlin Kore."
Figure 52. Marble kore, Miletos.
Figure 53. Marble relief from the Harpy Tomb, Xanthos.
Figure 54. Marble relief found in the prytaneion of Thasos.
Figure 55. Orthostat relief, Carchemish.
Figure 56. Orthostat relief, Birecik.
Figure 57. Orthostat relief, Carchemish.
Figure 58. Cybele with attendants, Bogazköy.
Figure 59. Relief found in Bahçelievler, Ankara.
Figure 60. Grave stele, Naxos.
Figure 61. Fragments of a kore, Samos.
Figure 62. Marble head, Didyma.
Figure 63. Head of sphinx, Delphi.
Figure 64. Late proto-Corinthian pot.
Figure 65. Procession of women on a vase from Anagyros.
Figure 66. Comparative side views of the Cheramyes’ dedication and the Pomegranate kore.
Figure 67. The Kululu figure.
Figure 68. Headless kore, Athenian acropolis.
Figure 69. Upper part of a kore, Athenian acropolis.
Figure 70. Philippe.
Figure 71. Ornitho.
Figure 72. Marble torso, Chios.
Figure 73. Marble torso, Chios.
Figure 74. Korai from Cyrene.
Figure 75. Kore, Athenian acropolis.
Figure 76. *Kore*, Klazomenai.
Figure 77. “The Peplos kore.”
Figure 78. Restored cast of the Peplos kore.
Figure 79. "The Euthydikos kore."
Figure 80. Ivory goddess, Kültepe.
Figure 81. Statuette of male deity, Kültepe.
Figure 82. Puzur-Ishtar, Mari.
Figure 83. Statue of Gudea, Telloh.
Figure 84. Typology of proto-Ionic capitals: Samaria (A), Megiddo (B,C), R.Rahel(E).
Figure 85. Drawings of Hittite aedicula seals.
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