

NANCY SERWINT

**A TERRACOTTA MOLD SERIES FROM MARION*
(PLATES XVI-XXII)**

Out of the vast corpus of sculpture recovered from antiquity, some of the most interesting material comes from Cyprus. Because the island lacks large quantities of marble and hard stone suitable for extensive production of figurative sculpture, the Cypriote contribution lay, instead, in the medium of clay. Cyprus claims abundant clay beds, and craftsmen were able to capitalize on this plentiful resource, creating a diverse range of figures from a material that was malleable, inexpensive, and easily accessible. As a result, the coroplastic arts thrived.

Terracotta sculpture has been found at numerous sites throughout the island, and recent excavations at Marion have produced an immense quantity of terracotta figurative material. Although the site has not been fully explored, the rich body of sculpture fashioned from clay confirms that Marion was an important center of artistic production during the Cypro-Archaic and Cypro-Classical periods. Study of the terracotta votive sculpture from the site offers important evidence of the coroplastic industry and provides an assessment of how ancient coroplasts practiced their craft.¹

Craftsmen who manufactured terracotta clay sculpture at Marion utilized a variety of techniques, ranging from handbuilt methods (including slab construction, the use of coils, and free fashioning by hand) to employing molds. And it was in the use of molds that artisans were free to be inventive - manipulating and altering the primary molded product in order to produce a varied sculptural repertoire that avoided monotonous uniformity. The creative use of the mold is no better seen than in seven fragmentary statue faces found within a sanctuary complex associated with ancient Marion. Study of the fragments indicates that they were likely produced from the same mold and form a mold series.

CONTEXT

The seven fragmentary faces (Nos. 1 - 7, see catalogue at the end) were recovered during several seasons of fieldwork within the excavation grid square A.H9 that revealed two cult structures sited on a narrow ridge located on the northern outskirts of the modern village of Polis tis Khrysokhous (Pl. XVIa).² Both buildings were positioned just to the west of the circuit of the city wall of ancient Marion. The smaller structure (Plate XVIa, bottom) was a rectangular building (6.10m. x 4.40m) of ashlar and rubble construction. Among the debris found within its confines were scores of fragments of terracotta sculpture of a votive nature. Given the size of the structure and the type of material recovered, the building likely functioned as a naiskos.

* Study of various aspects of the terracotta votive sculpture from ancient Marion was conducted during 1992 - 93 at the Cyprus American Archaeological Research Institute (CAARI) in Nicosia. Research was made possible by the award of a National Endowment for the Humanities grant from the United States government. The author wishes to thank the American Schools of Oriental Research for administering grant monies, the Department of Antiquities of the Republic of Cyprus for assistance in the project, and the staff of CAARI for making accessible the research facilities of the Institute.

1. For a preliminary discussion of the terracotta sculpture from Marion, see N. Serwint, «The Terracotta Sculpture from Ancient Marion: Recent Discoveries», in P. Åström, ed., *Acta Cypria*, Part 3 (Jonsered, 1992) 382 - 426, and N. Serwint, «The Terracotta Sculpture from Marion», in F. Vandenabeele and R. Laffineur, eds. *Cypriote Terracottas* (Brussels - Liège, 1991) 213 - 220. Final publication of the terracotta votive sculpture from the site is in preparation.
2. Fieldwork was conducted between 1984 and 1986. For a brief discussion of the archaeology of the sanctuary complex, see W.A.P. Childs, «First Preliminary Report on the Excavations at Polis Chrysochous by Princeton University», *RDAC* (1988, Part 2), 121 - 130, esp. 123 - 127.

Immediately to the north of the naiskos, excavation revealed the remains of a more elaborate architectural complex composed of three distinct units: a nearly square cella (8.00m. x 8.50m), fronted at its north end by a narrow porch, which in turn was preceded by an open forecourt. Within the complex and in the area between the structure and the city wall, nearly 1,000 fragments of terracotta sculpture were recovered. The sculpture was all dedicatory in nature, confirming the identification of the building as a sanctuary.

The sanctuary had been violently destroyed. In the course of excavation, a level of dense, hardpacked mudbrick was found over most of the area, representing the collapse of the mudbrick walls of the superstructure. Beneath this stratum, a thick, white ash layer was discovered within the confines of the sanctuary walls, indicating that the building had met a violent end and was destroyed by fire. The fragmentary condition of the sculpture, evidence of deliberate mutilation of the votives, and traces of burning and discoloration of the terracottas further attest the violent destruction of the sanctuary. Although evidence for the demise of the naiskos is less clear - cut, it is presumed that it was also destroyed during the same activity that devastated the A.H9 sanctuary.

The destruction occurred sometime during the last quarter of the fourth century B.C. The dates for the use period of the sanctuary can be determined only by the style of the terracotta votives associated with the structure. The earliest sculpture dates to the end of the seventh century, whereas the latest objects fall comfortably within the second half of the fourth century. Literary testimonia offer more precision in fixing the terminus of the sanctuary. During the wars of the Diadochi after the death of Alexander, Marion was the focus of hostile actions committed by military forces loyal to Ptolemy I Soter because the city kingdom had refused to align with the Macedonian general's side. The destruction of the sanctuary complex occurred during one of three separate military incursions in 321, 315, or finally in 312 B.C. when Marion was razed and her population transferred to Paphos.³

The seven fragmentary terracotta faces were all remains of votive statues dedicated in the sanctuary complex and the naiskos. The focus of cult worship in the sanctuary likely was directed toward two divinities: Aphrodite and Zeus;⁴ the identification of the god(s) who received worship in the naiskos remains unknown.

DESCRIPTION

Although all seven of the faces are broken and presumably suffered when the sanctuary area was destroyed, enough remains of the fragments to allow for assessment of style and discussion of the original mold. Not one of the fragments preserves a complete head in its entirety. Nos. 1, 2, and 3 (Pls XVIb, XVIIa and XVIIb) are the best preserved fragments and evidence important information about the configuration of the face and the placement of facial features; nos. 4 and 5 (Pls XVIIIa-b) provide details of ears and the crafting of hair framing the face; nos. 6 and 7 (Pls XIXa-b) are quite fragmentary but still allow for comment on the structure of the mouth and chin. Careful examination of all seven fragments makes it possible to reconstruct the original appearance of the molded face.

3. In 321 B.C., Ptolemy arranged an alliance between himself and the kings of four Cypriote kingdoms (Salamis, Paphos, Soli and Amathus) against Perdiccas. Arrian mentions that the alliance assembled a fleet of 200 war ships and laid siege to Marion, presumably because the city had remained loyal to the Macedonian royal house; see Arrian *Met. Alex. (FGH Hist II B, p. 848, fr. 10.6)*. Later in 315 B.C., Diodorus (19.62. 1-6) reports that Ptolemy had amassed a large army to be used against those cities in Cyprus still opposing him; Marion is mentioned as one of the resisting cities. The final action against Marion occurred in 312 B.C. when Ptolemy had had enough of Marion's recalcitrance and ordered the city destroyed; see Diodorus 19.79.4.

4. See Serwint, «The Terracotta Sculpture from Ancient Marion: Recent Discoveries» (supra n.1) 384 - 385.

That all fragments derived from the same mold is clear. Even though the size of the fragments varies, the proportions of facial features preserved on the different fragments are identical, the dimensions of diagnostic features are consistent among fragments, and the style of the faces remains characteristic - confirming that a single mold was employed to craft several heads. No one finished head replicates exactly any of the others; the basic molded face was altered in each instance by the application of handmade elements indicating that variety was an intended end. The primary form of the molded face was subsequently modified by the addition of different attributes, giving evidence that the face was regarded as a fluid form capable of being used as a vehicle for different iconographic types.

Close examination of the fragments reveals that the mold included only the face. The rest of the head, hair, headgear, and the neck were all separately fashioned by hand. The bottom of the mold extended just below the chin with the edge continuing to follow the jawline up the side of the face. Equal care was not taken by the coroplast(s) who worked on the several heads to mask the juncture between the mold and neck because in some cases the seam line of the mold is still visible beneath the chin (Pl. XXa). The edge of the mold passed beneath the ear; the presence of the seam line on the inside of No. 2 (Plate XXb) indicates that the mold ended just behind the temples and the edge of the forehead. From the dimensions of the preserved fragments as well as from the presence of exterior and interior mold seam lines, it is possible to estimate the dimensions of the mold: from top to bottom it would have measured ca. 9.85 cm., and from side to side it likely extended ca. 9.50 cm.

A close examination of the exterior surfaces, especially of Nos. 1, 2, and 3, reveals that the facial features included in the mold were the eyebrows, the eyes, the nose, the cheeks, and the projection of the chin. The mouth was separately added, as were the ears, and additional buildup of the chin occurred once the face had been removed from the mold. The eyes are almond shaped and project slightly from the surface of the face. Within the orbit of the eye, there is an additional slight protuberance, indicating that the iris was articulated. The eyebrows are plastically rendered as slight ridges of clay which arch delicately above the eyes and merge with the bridge of the nose. The nose is small and refined with the bridge narrow; the wings only slightly flare and though the mold includes naturalistic detail, the nostrils are not indicated in any of the fragments. There was some attempt to render the bony structure of the face: cheekbones subtly swell beneath the eyes. Prominence in the mold was also given to the chin. Although additional clay was applied to the chin on each of the fragments in order to augment its form and slightly change the configuration among the heads, the primary shape is sharp and pointed as best seen in a profile view (Plate XXII). The various features of the face are, on the whole, naturalistically integrated and the disparate facial planes merge and blend with some subtlety; yet the basic effect is one of angularity and sharpness which is all the more reinforced by the resulting triangular shape of the face.

STYLISTIC CONSIDERATIONS

The remains of the various face fragments allow for fixing the style of the primary mold with surety. Diagnostic characteristics like the shape of the face, the treatment of the eyes, the contours of the nose, and the execution of the mouth all firmly place the mold within Gjerstad's Sub-Archaic Cypro-Greek style⁵. Sculpture reflecting this style have as their hallmark moldmade faces which admit much

5. E. Gjerstad, *The Swedish Cyprus Expedition*, Vol. IV, Part 2: *The Cypro-Geometric, Cypro-Archaic and Cypro-Classical Periods* (Stockholm 1948) 118 - 119; hereafter cited as *SCE IV.2*. Although the basic stylistic schema established by Gjerstad are still, by and large, followed, alteration of terminology and revisionist dating have emended the Sub-Archaic Cypro-Greek to the following: Sub-Archaic Style (ca. 490-450 B.C.); see C. Vermeule, «Cypriote Sculpture, the Late Archaic and Early Classical Periods: Towards a More Precise Understanding», *AJA* 78 (1974) 287-290, esp. 287; and P. Gaber-Saletan, *Regional Styles in Cypriote Sculpture. The Sculpture from Idalion* (New York 1986) 58 - 59.

subsequent retouching; the application of separate ears, hair, and attributes is commonplace. The archaic smile has either disappeared or is muted and is replaced by a more naturalistic rendering of the mouth with the lips horizontally arranged. Molded eyes permit slight elevations suggesting the outward curve of the orb of the eye. Ears remain schematic and are, at most, roughly modelled. Above all, the style reflects a movement toward a more naturalistic conception of the human face.

Although the faces from the Marion mold series reveal, in general, a departure from schematic anatomical forms, the debt owed to the preceding Cypro-Archaic style is yet profound.⁶ Strong, pointed chins impart a triangular appearance to the face. Prominent noses can verge on delicacy with carefully molded examples becoming quite thin and straight. And the Marion faces still reflect very clearly the strength of Ionian stylistic traits which permeated Eastern Mediterranean sculpture as a leit motif throughout the second half of the sixth century.

Not surprisingly, the closest Cypriote stylistic parallels for the Marion molded faces are to be found in those areas where sculpture was still heir to Ionian artistic influences. In Cyprus, the East Greek sculptural style was most keen in the western and northern parts of the island.⁷ The Marion mold series finds a near reflection in Vouni Style IIA, with some examples of large scale terracotta sculpture discovered in the palace bearing close resemblance.⁸ At Mersinaki, affinities with the Marion heads are transitional between Mersinaki Style IIA and III.⁹

That the Marion mold would have been indebted to the Ionian sculptural tradition is not surprising given the close mercantile and commercial contacts Cyprus had with various East Greek states throughout the sixth century. Earlier in the century, Cypriote presence at Naucratis guaranteed familiarity with Ionian styles; the dedications in the several temples in the northern sector -- the Temple to Hera, which was probably a Samian foundation, and the Temple of Apollo founded by the Milesians -- as well as in the Hellenion, which was jointly founded by several East Greek states, would have offered

6. For a discussion of Gjerstad's Archaic Cypro-Greek style, see *SCE* IV.2, 110.

7. Regionalism in Cypriote sculptural styles had already been recognized earlier in the Neo-Cypriote style; see *SCE* IV.2, 105 - 106. In sculpture dated to the middle of the sixth century, Gjerstad had identified two distinct stylistic groupings which he argued could be classified geographically and reflected different extra - insular stylistic sources: in the eastern and southern regions of the island, sculptural production which admitted softer, fleshier forms and fuller treatment of facial features was thought to reflect Egyptian - Syrian styles; sculpture produced in the west and north of Cyprus incorporated Ionian influences, resulting in more angular and attenuated facial characteristics. Although it has been argued (Vermeule [supra n. 5] 287) that Gjerstad's Eastern and Western Neo-Cypriote styles might more correctly reflect provincial interpretation of a more general Cypriote style, the attempt to identify stylistic differences based on geographical divisions remains; cf. P. Gaber-Saletan, «The Limestone Sculpture from Kition», *Medelhavsmuseet Bulletin* 15 (1980) 41 and P. Gaber, «Regional Styles in Cypriot Limestone Sculpture», in *American Expedition to Idalion, Cyprus 1973 - 1980*, L.E. Stager and A.M. Walker, eds. (Chicago 1989) 398, 400.

8. For a discussion of the progression of sculptural styles reflected in the figurative works executed in clay from the Vouni palace, see E. Gjerstad et al., *The Swedish Cyprus Expedition*, Vol. III: *Findings and Results of the Excavations in Cyprus, 1927 - 1931* (Stockholm 1937) 268 - 270; hereafter cited as *SCE* III. Two Vouni terracotta heads from female statues reveal close stylistic similarities to the Marion heads: No. 39, p. 231, pl. LXXI. 39.1 - 2; and No. 480, p. 256, pl. LXXIII. 480. 1 - 2.

9. A close but not exact parallel is a female terracotta statuette, Mersinaki No. 793, which has been assigned to Style IIA (*SCE* III, no 793, p. 363, pl. CXXI. 793.3). The Marion heads reflect a slightly more mature style with the angularity of the face and the pinched features somewhat softened. For a discussion of the development of style found among the terracotta sculpture from Mersinaki, see *SCE* III, 385 - 389. Similarly, a head from a female terracotta statue of unknown Cypriote provenance, dated to the late sixth century and now in the Fitzwilliam Museum (Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, GR 3c 1888), bears stylistic kinship with the Marion mold; for the Fitzwilliam head see G.M.A. Richter, *Korai* (London 1968) no. 156, pp. 90-91, figs. 501 - 503.

ample awareness of current Ionian sculptural trends.¹⁰ Cypriote familiarity with Ionian styles at Naucratis appears to have been quite direct. That Cypriote artists were present in Naucratis is attested by inscription.¹¹ Some stone statues and statuettes found in the excavations have been argued to be of Cypriote origin suggesting either importation of Cypriote sculpture or production by Cypriote artisans at the site.¹² It also appears that at Naucratis stylistic influences could work both ways -- stone sculpture attributed to East Greek artists bears the stamp of Cypriote inspiration.¹³

Exposure to Ionian sculptural styles also occurred directly in East Greece. Limestone and terracotta sculpture of Cypriote type (primarily Gjerstad's Neo-Cypriote style) found on the acropolis at Lindos indicate imports from Cyprus and perhaps the presence of Cypriote sculptors working in Rhodes.¹⁴ Equally, the large amount of Cypriote sculpture discovered in the Samian Heraion confirms a vigorous artistic dialogue between Samos and Cyprus that lasted for most of the sixth century.¹⁵ So it is hardly surprising that the face mold used by Marion coroplasts for a series of terracotta statue heads should so clearly bear an Ionian stamp.

ADAPTATION OF THE MOLD

The Marion terracotta faces are not slavish imitations of an Ionian prototype. Although East Greek stylistic reminiscences are apparent in the mold, the soft modelling of the eyes and cheeks reflects the contribution of a local coroplast.¹⁶ Perhaps the most important feature of the molded faces is their variety. Despite the fact that the same mold was used for all seven faces, exact duplication of the faces does not occur. They are all different. Because the mold did not include the mouth, ears, or hair reveals that the original mold was intended from the start as a basic form from which artists could create *adaptations*. The absence of specific attributes, like headgear, or distinctive decorative elements, like jewelry, guaranteed that the mold could be variously used for a range of iconographic types as well as for both male and female statues.

The demand for terracotta sculpture at Marion to be used as religious votives, as attested by the large quantity of dedications found in the A.H9 sanctuary, necessitated an inexpensive and relatively quick means of production. The use of face molds for that part of the statue that was not only the most difficult to produce but also the most important resulted in efficient manufacture of votive sculpture.

10. See J. Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas* (London 1980) 117 - 133 for a discussion of the Greek presence at Naucratis.

11. *SCE IV. 2*, 318.

12. See G. Schmidt, *Samos*, Vol. VII: *Kyprische Bildwerke aus dem Heraion von Samos*, (Bonn 1968) 113 - 119; and E.A. Gardner, *Naucratis*, Part II (London 1988) 55f.

13. *SCE IV. 2*, 318; Boardman (*supra* n. 10) 125 - 126. Also see B. Lewy, *Studien zur archaischen kyprischen Plastik* (1975). Kouroi figures from Naucratis exhibiting affinities with a Cypriote style are well illustrated in G.M.A. Richter, *Kouroi* (London 1960): London, British Museum B 442 (Richter, no. 59, p. 73, fig. 206); London, British Museum B 441 (Richter, no. 60, p. 74, fig. 207); Cairo, Museum No. 27426 (Richter, no. 61, p. 74, figs. 204 - 205); Moscow, Museum of Fine Arts No. NI 1.a.3000 (Richter, no. 82, p. 88, figs. 264 - 266); London, British Museum B 446 (Richter, no. 83, p. 88, fig. 270); London British Museum B 443 (Richter, no. 84, p. 88, fig. 271); and Boston, Museum of Fine Arts No. 88. 734 (Richter, no. 85, p. 89, fig. 272).

14. Ch. Blinkenberg, *Lindos*, Vol. I (Berlin 1931) 394f.; also *SCE IV.2*, 327.

15. See Schmidt (*supra* n. 12) and *SCE IV. 2*, 333 - 335.

16. Where the Marion mold was produced can be claimed with no certainty. Given the fact that the Ionian stylistic presence circulated elsewhere in northwest Cyprus besides Marion suggests that artists working on the island were capable of integrating East Greek features into local coroplastic production. Indeed, Gjerstad argues that most molds used for the manufacture of heads in the Sub-Archaic Cypro-Greek style were of Cypriote origin; see *SCE IV. 2*, 119.

The archetype or patrix from which the Marion mold was made cannot be identified. Whether an existing statue served as the archetype or whether a unique archetype was specially made remains uncertain. Fragmentary limestone sculpture has been recovered from the Marion sanctuary and much contemporary stone sculpture from Vouni and Mersinaki, not that far distant from Marion, was readily available from which a mold could easily have been derived. The mold would have been made out of wet clay pressed over the archetype until the desired thickness was created. Once the clay dried, the frontal mold would have been lifted directly off the archetype. In its leather hard stage, the mold would then have been adapted for the specific requirements of the coroplast -- because the mold series faces all have different mouths, the mouth from the mold (as derived from the archetype) would have been removed and filled in with clay. After minimal retouching of the interior to remove blemishes, the clay mold would then be fired. After cooling, it would be ready for use.¹⁷

In order to create a statue face, the coroplast would press moist clay into the mold. Because the front surface of the face was what mattered, little care was taken in smoothing the inside surface of the face, and all seven fragments bear traces of finger prints (Pl. XXIIa). The thickness of clay which was built up inside the mold varied, as the dimensions in the Catalogue indicate; the thinnest sections of the face tended to be the areas of the eyes and the cheeks whereas the thickest sections were the chins. Once the mold had been filled, the clay was left to dry and in the process, moisture evaporated and also was absorbed into the porous clay mold, causing the pressed clay to shrink and pull away from the mold. The face fragment was then removed. The back of the head would be constructed freehand with the application of coils or small slabs of clay onto the sides of the mold but leaving the interior of the head hollow.¹⁸

After the head was created, the coroplast would then attend to finishing the face by adding the mouth and building up the chin; specific features like hair and headgear would be affixed. Once the head was completed, it was then joined to a separately made body with the point of juncture at the neck. At Marion, for this period, remains of statue bodies indicate that they were constructed by hand, usually by means of coils. Final surface smoothing would occur once the head and body were assembled. Traces of striations on some of the fronts of the faces suggest that a moist cloth was used to remove unwanted marks and to even out the surface. The statue was then dried to a leather hard stage and then painted. Paint was used judiciously to clarify anatomical forms (eyes and lips), to embellish hair, and to elaborate attributes; black and red were the primary colors used, although sometimes yellow was added for specific details.¹⁹ After the application of paint and further drying, the statue would be fired.

Comparison of the seven molded fragments reveals that the use of the molded face to which separately made handmade features were added insured variety. Because distinctive features, like the mouth and hair, differ among the fragments further suggests that several different coroplasts may have been involved in the construction process. Whether the artists were all members of the same workshop with the mold being the property of the establishment or whether the mold was shared among the wider Marion coroplastic community (however large that may have been) cannot be determined. The style of

17. See R.A. Higgins, *Greek Terracottas* (London 1967) 1 - 3 for a discussion of the technical process of moldmade sculpture.

18. Although the molded face would have to be firm enough to maintain its shape, the coroplast would not allow it to become too dry before adding the rest of the head. The more plastic the clay paste of the parts to be joined, the more secure the join. For a practical discussion of the process of joining molded clay parts, see A.O. Shepard, *Ceramics for the Archaeologist* (Washington, D.C. 1956) 64.

19. A detailed discussion of the decoration of terracotta sculpture is found in R.A. Higgins, «The Polychrome Decoration of Greek Terracottas», *Studies in Conservation* 15 (1970) 272 - 277.

the faces is consistent enough to indicate that, at least for this series of heads, the mold was probably used for a short span of time.²⁰ The surface quality of the faces varies indicating mold wear -- No. 2 shows the clearest features, while by the time the mold was used for No. 3, considerable wear had occurred with the features appearing muted. The same clay was not used for all the faces. Relatively fine clay was used for No. 2, while a coarser clay was used for the other faces. The clay of No. 7 is particularly rough with varied inclusions visible to the eye, perhaps indicating added temper. The color of the clay also varies (see Catalogue), signifying different mineralogical composition of the clay and/or different firing strategies.²¹

It is in the formation of the mouth that the most divergent approaches are to be seen. Mouths are preserved on Nos. 1, 2, 3, 6, and 7. In each case, additional clay was added from which the coroplast fashioned the lips. On No. 3, there is no plastic articulation of the lips; rather, the mouth is a projecting mound of clay smoothed at its edges with the sides subtly angled upward, perhaps to suggest a slight smile. A faint horizontal band of red paint is visible across the lip area. No. 7 bears traces of a very slight archaic smile produced by scoring the mouth with a sharp tool turned upward in the clay at the edges of the mouth. Nos. 1, 2, and 6 all have mouths with a horizontal gash separating the lips. Nos. 1 and 2 are close in form with the gash shallow, although more sloppy in the case of No. 1. No. 6 reveals an awkwardly formed mouth with the incision separating the lips particularly deep. Seen from the side (Pl. XXIb), the projecting mound of clay makes the mouth look almost fish-like. Only Nos. 3 and 6 bear traces of red pigment to indicate the color of the lips.

The same fragments preserving mouths also reveal that chins were built up differently among the faces. No. 6 is the most natural with the rounded contours of the chin merging with the jaw. Nos. 2, 3, and 7 exaggerate the bony structure of the chin and appear unnaturally pointed. Although part of the chin of No. 1 is damaged, enough of it remains to indicate that the added clay was placed off center beneath the mouth.

Ears are preserved on Nos. 1, 2, 4, and 5. The right ear of No. 1 is entirely schematic and appears as an unarticulated lump of clay merging with the hair or headgear above it. No. 5 is also poorly crafted; the remains of finger prints on the surface show that the artist formed the ear by pressing dabs of clay onto the side of the head and cared little for removing traces of his work. Nos. 2 and 4 reflect the fact that some care was taken to suggest the contours of the front of the ear; cartilage is hinted at by the projecting curved edge and the concave inner surface is a token articulation of the concha. The ear of No. 2 is placed unnaturally low on the side of the head.

Even though Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 all preserved molded almond shaped eyes, the way that the eyes and eyebrows were subsequently delineated by paint reveals noticeable differences. Nos. 1, 2, and 3 all show traces of black pigment along the edges of the molded eye, indicating that the eye was outlined in black; fugitive remains of black paint on the orb of the eye manifest the intention to define the iris. The eyebrows of Nos. 1 and 3 are the only face fragments which bear paint in this area. On No. 1, black pigment covers only the molded eyebrow; on No. 3, the black paint extends well beyond the molded brow angling downward to form an exaggerated attenuated curve. No. 4 preserves no traces of paint at all in the eye area.

20. The basic molded face was flexible enough to allow an artist to add handmade elements, like the mouth, hair, and headgear, which reflect prevailing artistic tastes and current style. The diversity of mouths and headaddresses, although varied, is still within a range to suggest contemporaneity of production.

21. Shepard (*supra* n. 18) 16-17, 20-24, and 102-113. Of course, within a single clay bed different mineralogical concentrations can occur as well as different types and amounts of foreign matter and impurities. Variation in clay color and texture does not necessarily mean that the clay used for the Marion faces was obtained from different clay beds.

The type of headgear and hair applied on the handmade parts of the heads indicates, in some cases, the intended sex of the statue. No. 2 is clearly male; the brim of a helmet crafted in two degrees and the rise of the helmet cap on the side of the head identify the figure as a warrior. No. 4 is certainly female; a bevelled ridge of clay painted black and decorated with an incised double concentric circle pattern forms a band of tightly curled hair along the edge of the face.²² Behind the hair, a separately added roll of clay represents the edge of a veil which covers the side of the head and falls onto the neck; a roundel of clay with traces of yellow paint added to the lobe of the left ear represents a golden earring. The hair and headdresses of Nos. 1, 3, and 5 do not confirm the sex of the statue faces. On Nos. 1 and 3, a ridge of clay painted black, bordering the forehead, could easily depict male or female hair framing the face as well as the brim of a helmet; on No. 1, the rise of clay on the back of the head might depict a high female headdress with hanging veil just as well as a male conical helmet. Fragment No. 5 preserves immediately behind the left ear a flat band of clay which likely represents the edge of a diadem; diadems are worn variously by both male and female votive statues dedicated in Cypriote sanctuaries. Below the left ear, the coroplast has added a vertical roll of clay to depict the termination of hair; the clay roll, as well as the clay falling onto the back of the neck, are painted black to represent the cascade of long hair onto the shoulders. Both women and men are depicted with long hair in terracotta sculpture in the Archaic Cypro-Greek style, although long hair on males becomes more infrequent in the Sub-Archaic style.

The seven molded statue faces from the Marion sanctuary evidence much about how coroplasts approached their craft. The use of a mold for the statue face freed the artisan from the time-consuming process of forming individual faces by hand. The demand for votive sculpture to be dedicated within the sanctuary was great to necessitate a manufacturing process that could guarantee speedy production. Perhaps the requirements of the dedicants were varied enough to require a multi - purpose, generic form that could be easily adapted by the application of various handmade additions to suit the purpose of discerning customers. Marion coroplasts ably employed a standard face mold yet carried on the tradition of inventive creativity that had always been the hallmark of the Cypriote coroplastic arts.

Nancy Serwint
Cyprus American Archaeological
Research Institute, Nicosia

22. The use of impressed circles is a common decorative technique employed in terracotta sculpture. It appears early at Ayia Irini already in the First Proto-Cypriote style and is used to indicate the curls of beards and to suggest the texture of eyebrows; see E. Gjerstad *et al.*, *The Swedish Cyprus Expedition*, Vol. II: *Finds and Results of the Excavations in Cyprus, 1927 - 1931* (Stockholm 1935) no. 1071, pl. CXCV. Impressed circles become increasingly more common in the Second Proto - Cypriote style for beards (SCE II, no. 2374, pl. CCVII) and later in the Neo-Cypriote style for helmets (SCE II, no. 1016 + 2505, pl. CCXVI). As a decorative device, it can be used to articulate female hair; a close parallel for the Marion fragment is found at Vouni: a head of a female statue of Archaic Cypro-Greek style preserves hair framing the forehead decorated with two rows of impressed shallow curls; see SCE III, no. 39, pl. LXXI.

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

Λόγω της έλλειψης μεγάλων ποσοτήτων μαρμάρου και σκληρής πέτρας κατάλληλης για γλυπτική, το πιο κοινό μέσο για παραγωγή γλυπτών στην αρχαία Κύπρο ήταν ο πηλός. Συνεπεία του γεγονότος αυτού παρατηρείται άνθιση της κοροπλαστικής. Οι πρόσφατες ανασκαφές στο αρχαίο Μάριο έδειξαν με καθοριστικό τρόπο ότι η πόλη-βασίλειο υπήρξε σημαντικό κέντρο της κοροπλαστικής. Η ανακάλυψη επτά προσώπων που ανήκουν σε πήλινα αγάλματα και όλα προέρχονται από ένα αρχαϊκό/κλασικό σύμπλεγμα ιερού, φανερώνει κατά τρόπο ικανοποιητικό μια πλευρά της μεθόδου με την οποία κατασκευάζονταν αναθηματικά γλυπτά από πηλό. Η σειρά των πήλινων αυτών αντικειμένων από μήτρες είναι ενδεικτική μιας κυπριακής τεχνοτροπίας γλυπτών, η οποία ήταν αγαπητή κατά τη διάρκεια του πρώιμου 5ου αι. π.Χ. Τεχνοτροπική συγγένεια με τη γλυπτική παράδοση της Ιωνίας υπογραμμίζει την αλληλεξάρτηση καλλιτεχνικών επιδράσεων μεταξύ Κύπρου και Ανατολικής Ελλάδας στα τέλη της αρχαϊκής περιόδου. Η μελέτη της σειράς των γλυπτών από μήτρες δίδει πολλές πληροφορίες για τον τρόπο με τον οποίο οι αρχαίοι κοροπλάστες εφάρμοζαν την τεχνική τους. Μια πιο λεπτομερής εξέταση των θραυσμάτων που αποτελούσαν μέρος από πρόσωπα, φανερώνει πολλά σχετικά με τη διαδικασία παραγωγής πλαστικής από μήτρες, αρχίζοντας από την κατασκευή της μήτρας, συνεχίζοντας με το σκάλισμα των βασικών χαρακτηριστικών του προσώπου, την προσθήκη άλλων χαρακτηριστικών και κοσμημάτων, τη συναρμολόγηση των μελών του αναθηματικού αγάλματος και τελειώνοντας με το ψήσιμο του ολοκληρωμένου πια αγάλματος. Τα πρόσωπα τα καμωμένα από μήτρες που προέρχονται από το Μάριο αντανακλούν επιπλέον σημαντικές μαρτυρίες, όπως με ποιο τρόπο οι μήτρες υφίσταντο αλλαγές για να εξασφαλιστεί η ποικιλία της παραγόμενης πλαστικής και να αποφεύγεται έτσι πληκτική επανάληψη και μονότονη ομοιομορφία. Διάφορα πρόσθετα χειροποίητα στοιχεία όπως τα μαλλιά, το κάλυμμα της κεφαλής και τα κοσμήματα, τοποθετούνταν στο βασικό πρόσωπο που φτιαχνόταν σε μήτρα, εξασφαλίζοντας έτσι ότι ένα τυποποιημένο πρόσωπο μπορούσε να χρησιμεύει ως μέσο για διαφορετικούς εικονογραφικούς τύπους. Αλλά, πάνω απ' όλα, οι κοροπλάστες του Μαρίου ήταν ελεύθεροι να αναπτύξουν την παράδοση της εφευρετικής δημιουργίας, η οποία υπήρξε πάντοτε η σφραγίδα της κοροπλαστικής τέχνης στην Κύπρο.

CATALOGUE

* all measurements are maximum and are in centimeters

P = preserved

H = height

W = width

T = thickness

D = depth

DI = diameter

R numbers are registry numbers and TC numbers are numbered objects in the terracotta sculpture sequence assigned in the registry of the Princeton Cyprus Expedition.

1. *Face* (Pl. XVIIb)

PH 13.05, PW 9.23, PT 0.89 - 2.90.

Fragment from half lifesize statue preserving right side of face and neck and all of chin. Damage to right

ear, nose, and chin. Edge of helmet or diadem borders face. Facial features, although worn, include almond shaped eye with slightly projecting iris, narrow nose, and small mouth with horizontal lips. Traces of black paint on diadem of helmet brim, right eyebrow, and lower right eye; red paint on side of head or headgear. Hollow. Medium coarse clay with many grain size inclusions. Clay is reddish yellow in color (Munsell 5 YR 6/6). From naiskos. 500 - 450 B.C. R14643/TC6116.

2. *Male Face* (Pl. XVIIa)

PH 11.55, PW 10.73, PT 0.74 - 2.57.

Fragment from half lifesize male statue preserving most of face except for top of right eye and forehead and right side of face and chin. Damage to left ear and tip of nose. Edge and side of helmet or headgear remain on left. Facial features are distinct and include slightly modelled left eyebrow, large almond shaped eyes with slightly projecting iris, thin nose, and small mouth with horizontally configured lips. Black pigment remains on lower edge of right eye and on brim of helmet above left ear; red paint still visible on edge and side of helmet or headgear, on left ear, and lips. Hollow. Rather fine clay with few inclusions. Clay is very pale brown (Munsell 10 YR 7/4). From naiskos. 500 - 450 B.C. R14642/TC6115.

3. *Face* (Pl. XVIIb)

PH 10.32, PW 8.27, PT 0.74 - 2.93.

Fragment from half lifesize statue preserving right side of face except for top of forehead and right side of face and ear. Damage to nose. Edge of hair or headgear preserved over right temple. Facial features are somewhat worn and include almond shaped eyes, thin nose, and small lips configured into a slight archaic smile. Remains of black paint visible on left eyebrow and eye as well as edge of hair or headgear; traces of red pigment on upper lip. Hollow. Medium coarse clay with few inclusions. Clay is pink on the surface with a yellowish red core (Munsell 7.5 YR 7/4 [surface] 5 YR 5/6 [core]). From fill between east sanctuary wall and city wall. 500 - 450 B.C. R674⁴/TC2740.

4. *Female Face* (Pl. XVIIIa)

PH 8.72, PW 7.55, PT 0.82-2.39, DI (earring) 1.41.

Fragment from half lifesize female statue preserving extreme left side of face, hair, and part of side of head. Damage to outer edge of left ear. Gray discoloration of surface indicates fragment was subjected to heat and burning. Hair framing face decorated with impressed double concentric circle pattern and edge of headgear indicated immediately behind hair. Circular earring adorns left ear lobe. Only facial feature preserved is part of left eye, slightly rounded and almond shaped. Black pigment on hair; red paint preserved on ear and side of face; traces of yellow paint on earring. Hollow. Medium coarse clay with many grain size inclusions. Clay is yellowish red (Munsell 5 YR 5/6). From fill between east sanctuary wall and city wall. 500 - 450 B.C. R14927/TC6361.

5. *Face* (Pl. XVIIIb)

PH 9.54, PT 1.13, PD 10.66.

Two joining fragments from half lifesize statue preserving left side of face, diadem or band behind left ear, and fall of hair onto neck. Slight damage to ear. No facial features preserved save schematic left ear. Extensive black paint on hair; traces of red pigment on ear. Hollow. Medium coarse clay with many grain size inclusions. Clay is reddish yellow in color (Munsell 5 YR 6/8). From fill between east sanctuary wall and city wall. 500 - 450 B.C. R14939/TC6372.

6. *Face* (Pl. XIXa)

PH 5.01, PW 3.06, PT 1.19, PD 8.92

Fragment of half lifesize statue preserving mouth, chin, and lower left side of face. Trace of hair or diadem above neck. Only facial feature preserved is horizontal mouth with lips separated. Possible traces of red pigment in cut separating lips. Hollow. Medium coarse clay with many different sized inclusions ranging from grain size to 0.09 cm. Clay is very pale brown in color (Munsell 10 YR 7/4). Find spot within sanctuary area not reported. 500 - 450 B.C. R14893/TC6330.

7. Face (Pl. XIXb)

PH 6.58, PW 3.74, PT 1.46 - 2.27.

Fragment of half lifesize statue preserving nose, mouth, and chin. Facial features include badly damaged nose and mouth with corners slightly upturned and lips separated. No traces of pigment. Hollow. Heavy coarse clay with many different size inclusions up to 0.18 cm. Clay is very pale brown in color (Munsell 10 YR 7/4). From naiskos. 500 - 450 B.C. R14641/TC6114.