

Reviews

BEATE BÖHLENDORF-ARSLAN / ALI OSMAN UYSASL / JOHANNA WITTE-ORR (eds.), *Çanak. Late Antique and Medieval Pottery and Tiles in Mediterranean Archaeological Contexts* (Byzas 7). Istanbul: Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Abteilung Istanbul, 2007. 560 pp., figs.; 27.5 cm. – ISBN 978-975-807-197-5.

This book results from a conference held in June 2005 at the Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale. Most of the 36 papers published here address excavated pottery from locations across the Mediterranean, with an emphasis on Turkey, as well as Cyprus, Greece and Italy. There is little in the way of editorializing, although the subject matter is arranged in roughly chronological order, starting with the Late Roman and Early Byzantine period (4th to mid-7th century), through the Middle (8th to 11th) and Late Byzantine (12th to mid-15th) centuries, and concluding with Seljuk and Ottoman contexts. But these historical phases and sub-phases are not so neatly demarcated: several of the papers deal with sites and sequences spanning long stretches of time and different cultural milieux.

Rather than attempting a synopsis of each article, I will here focus on some recurring issues that emerge from reading them together. Although wide-ranging in their temporal and geographical scope, the contributions to this volume implicitly and explicitly raise a number of common themes. These relate to method and approach, and may be summarised as follows: chronology; typology; and, more generally, the role and aims of the ceramics specialist.

The difficulty of matching material culture with political events and entities is exemplified in what we call 'Byzantine'. For Jerusalem, Byzantine rule is customarily dated from AD 335 to the Arab conquest of the city in AD 638 (R. Avner, p. 196), while in parts of Greece and Asia Minor it can be seen to last from the mid-4th to the mid-15th century. But, of course, ceramics crossed political boundaries. During the long, Byzantine millennium, around the lands controlled (and not controlled) by Constantinople, regional identities were continually evolving and coalescing. Thus, the labels assigned to ceramics - Byzantine, Seljuk, Frankish, Genoese etc. - are often inadequate to describe the diversity of settings in which they were produced, consumed and circulated. Even where precise production centres are known for certain classes of, say, sigillata or sgraffito, derivatives and imitations were often being made elsewhere.

Whether we call a pot Roman or Byzantine, the first concern of the ceramics specialist is often to provide a date and origin. Most desirable is the stratified deposit or closed context. Several such contexts are presented here, including late antique deposits from Zeugma (C. Abadie-Reynal et al.), Hierapolis (D. Cottica) and Deir el-Bachit in Egypt (T. Beckh), and medieval and post-medieval assemblages from Aegina (B. Wille), Sparta (J. Dimopoulos), Paphos (J. Rosser), Belgrade (V. Bikič), Pliska in Bulgaria (V. Petrova), Dürres in Albania (J.

Vroom), Harim Castle in Syria (S. Gelichi and S. Nepoti) and Kubad-Abad in central Anatolia (R. Arık). Three stratified deposits from Amorium are presented: 6th to 9th-century bricks and tiles (J. Witte-Orr), terracotta spacers from the late antique bathhouse (O. Koçyiğit) and a long sequence from the southwest of the city wall (B. Böhlendorf-Arslan).

Pottery is not always found in well-stratified contexts or below dated destruction levels. The relationship between potsherd, coin and historical text can be tenuous. In these circumstances there is greater reliance on typologies, established through characteristics of vessel shape and attributes. Sometimes more general features of production and distribution typify certain phases: forms of Early Byzantine table ware display remarkable conservatism and continuity from Roman times. Slight morphological variations allowed for taxonomies to be formulated, notably, John Hayes' influential work on red slip ware and the various amphora classifications. However, as more material comes to light from more sites, and as closer attention is paid to fabrics, regional trends emerge and the picture of mass, centralised manufacture becomes more nuanced. Surface finds from Pednelissos in Pisidia indicate the co-existence of imported and locally produced fine wares in late antiquity, and may show the relocation of established workshops (F. Kenkel); chemical analysis of finds from Priene near Miletus show that pottery was imported from a range of places (Z. Yılmaz); and at Elaiussa Sebaste on the Cilician coast, 'derivatives' were produced alongside imports, and distinctive, vernacular techniques of carving and painting were practiced (M. Ricci).

Increasingly regional and localised traits are recognised from the 6th century onwards, including in Greece (P. Petridis), the lagoon of Venice (E. Grandi) and southern Apulia (P. Arthur). Classification based on well-known, site-specific forms therefore becomes less valid; more so when fabric analysis reveals a range of sources, and when newly-discovered contexts allow for more precise dating. All too often classification schemes are imposed on the material culture and reports abide by reified typologies rather than dealing with the evidence at hand. Typologies can obscure subtleties in the material record. And they can lag behind developments in the field - who knows how discoveries at the ongoing Yenikapı excavations in Istanbul will affect long-held precepts?

Adherence to outmoded typological schemes is highlighted in a review of scholarship on medieval ceramics from Cyprus (M.L. von Wartburg). Categories have derived from stylistic studies that focused on form and surface decoration - slip, glaze, and painted and incised motifs. However, stratified finds from controlled excavations allow for far more precision and detail that are not always compatible with former classifications. But where precise contextual evidence is not available, as is often the case, it may be necessary to turn to fabric analysis to discern origins, or to consider alternative questions - how vessels reflect the activities or status of

consumers, or to look more broadly at regional distributions, using a looser chronological framework.

Archaeologists will always be faced with variable qualities and quantities of evidence. Much depends on what work has been done, and where: distribution maps of certain pottery classes are often more representative of archaeological fieldwork and publication than they are of past patterns of deposition and circulation. What is important is to use all the evidence at our disposal - from archaeometric studies of individual fabrics to broad syntheses of surface assemblages collected on wide-ranging field surveys - and continually ask 'what do we want to learn from this material?'

Simply describing pottery classes and their findspot is not enough. The tyranny of the taxonomy can be challenged through interpretation and synthesis; of who produced, used and deposited the pottery and why, and comparison of assemblages across different sites and contexts. Empirical descriptions of form, fabric and spatial context are integral to the pottery report, and will continue to be a mainstay of archaeological knowledge, but the more successful and stimulating papers in this volume are those that go beyond the descriptive, to explore pottery's historical and social significance.

W. Anderson

MARIA ELISA MICHELI / VALENTINA PURCARO / ANNA SANTUCCI, *La raccolta di antichità Baldassini-Castelli. Itinerario tra Roma, Terni e Pesaro*. Pisa: ETS, 2007. 268 pp., figs., 24 cm. - ISBN 978-884671728-3.

It was through various vicissitudes, and more than one passing of property, that a set of antiquities, built in the walls of the *Gallery* at the piano nobile of the Baldassini-Castelli palace in Pesaro, reached their present location. Their history, and that of their owners, is engagingly handled by the authors of this book, providing a thought-provoking insight into the issues of use, perception and taste for antiquities within a 'peripheral' Italian context over the span of four centuries.

In the first Chapter, Anna Santucci deals with the Castelli family from Terni and its estates during the 16th and 17th centuries. Two key documents record the collection of art owned by the family: a detailed inventory (the *Inventario di Scolture*) and a receipt for its removal to Pesaro in 1740. Basing herself on both paleographic and historical ground, Santucci convincingly dates the list to the early 17th century, and identifies its author as Gabriele Castelli (1566-1636). It was probably during his stay in Rome, until 1590, as Pope Sixtus V Peretti's *cubicularius intimus*, that he purchased most of his antiquities, selecting the items according to the mainstream iconographic taste: Classical *virii illustres*, Christian *exempla virtutis*, relief panels with theatrical masks and Dionysiac themes, a few exotic *Aegyptiaca*. Santucci's detailed analysis of Gabriele Castelli's attitude towards Classical (i.e. Roman) past, as a source of promotion and legitimization for his own family, throws new light on the local debate about 'civic identity' and ancestors at that time. This section ends with a transcription of the relevant archival documents.

Chapter 2 traces the history of the family from 1712, when Francesco Maria Baldassini (the son of Cleria

Castelli) moved to Pesaro to marry Chiara Gozze, to the present day. Valeria Purcaro's contribution includes a precious paragraph on the Del Monte-Gozze-Baldassini palace in Pesaro. The author addresses both its building history and attribution, as well as the role of the area where it stands into the texture of the Roman town from the 1st century AD. The publishing of several documents about the family, and its estates, after the move to Pesaro follows. In a shorter paragraph, Mareva Cardone reconstructs in detail the history of both the Gozze family and the antiquities that Francesco Maria inherited from his wife's relations, for the most part found in the Gozze estate at Calibano, except for a small group presumably purchased in Rome.

Maria Elisa Micheli's Chapter 3 is probably the most captivating. In these pages, all the information on both collections (in Terni and in Pesaro) acquired so far are set within a wider cultural context. At the same time, Gabriele Castelli's taste in purchasing antiquities, and his descendants' in displaying them, is described with striking clarity. Notwithstanding the relative worth of the collection, it apparently met with two centuries of oblivion after the death of its initiator. During the 18th century, these works of art and antiquities were scarcely considered, and were probably not given a defined place in the Pesaro palace yet. According to Micheli, today's display can be most probably ascribed to the 19th-century naturalist Francesco Baldassini and was perhaps mainly due to the need of preserving the works of art belonging to the family. Sculptural fragments and relief panels were thus tidily organized all over the Gallery without following recognizable typological criteria or an iconographic sequence.

A substantial part of this last contribution is also devoted to an in-depth study of all sculptures now in the Baldassini-Castelli palace: part of those owned by Gabriele Castelli, a few architectural fragments probably found during the construction of the Dal Monte building, other pieces from the Gozze estates. For a closer analysis, Micheli chooses to divide the pieces into the categories of marble sculpture and clay reliefs, concentrating on their iconography, provenance (see especially pp. 125-127) and modern restorations (particularly convincing the suggestion of a link between the marble tondo discussed at pp. 130-132 and a similar panel from the Farnese collection, that could have served as a model for restoring the former).

A complete catalogue of the 70 ancient and modern pieces in the collection follows, including relief panels (only a few of them bearing partially intelligible scenes, i.e. no 35 with reaping), statues, architectural and figural fragments of minute dimensions (i.e. nos 33, 39, 42, 43, 45, 55). Fragments belonging to the same panel are dealt with together (nos 8 and 15, 18 and 34, 44 and 50). All entries are clear and well documented, each of them completed with a good choice of bibliography for further study. When possible, authors try to trace the provenance of the object on stylistic ground (i.e. nos 16, 18/34, 19, 22, 23, 25, 27, 36, 49), thus integrating the overall view with significant pieces of information.

A concordance list and a schematic drawing (pp. 149-153) provide useful tools for finding each piece in the inventories and catalogue, immediately visualizing its position on the walls of the *Gallery*. Unfortunately, the

choice of adding an independent appendix with archival documents after each article, and the lack of a common bibliography for all contributions does not always make the reading as agreeable and flowing as one would wish. Beyond this minor editorial remark, the book and its arguments are considerably well constructed through all sections. No subject or clue suggested by the intriguing topic is neglected, leaving very little out of the analysis. From such point of view, the greatest merit of the authors is undoubtedly that of studying this collection (or, as it should be said, these collections) under every possible respect, skilfully turning a somewhat 'minor' and 'peripheral' episode into a privileged mirror that frames and reveals the taste for antiquities within a precise geographical area over a long span of time. The book could provide a useful model for other scientific publications dealing with similar material and cultural issues, and is strongly recommended to all specialists engaged with the study of collections in modern Italy or with local history, as well as to those approaching the topic from other backgrounds.

Anna Anguissola

SUSAN I. ROTROFF, *Hellenistic Pottery. The Plain Wares*. Princeton New Jersey: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 2006. 441 pp., figs. in text, 98 figs., 90 pls.; 31 cm (The Athenian Agora 33). – ISBN 978-0-87661-233-0.

Der vorliegende Band 33 ist bereits S.I. Rotroffs dritte monographische Abhandlung einer hellenistischen Keramikklasse im Rahmen der Agora Serie. Nach *Hellenistic Pottery: Athenian and Imported Moldmade Bowls* (1982) und *Hellenistic Pottery: Athenian and Imported Wheelmade Table Ware and Related Material* (1997) beschäftigt sich die Verf. nach dem ausführlichen Studium der Feinkeramik hier mit der zeitgleichen Gebrauchskeramik des Athens des späten 4. bis 1. Jh. v. Chr. Die Materialaufnahme und anschließende Auswertung aller drei Keramikgattungen nahm mehr als 30 Jahre in Anspruch (S. vii) und setzte sich zum Ziel, das Keramikrepertoire des hellenistischen Athens in seiner Gesamtheit zu analysieren.

Für die Untersuchung der Gebrauchskeramik, die Küchenwaren (zu ca 33%), kleine Salb- und Ölgefäße/Unguentarien (zu ca 25%) und sonstige Formen ('household vessels', zu ca 45%) umfasst, wurden ca 1400 möglichst gut erhaltene Gefäße aufgenommen (S. 3). Dieses Material stammt vornehmlich aus geschlossenen oder relativ ungestörten Kontexten der amerikanischen Grabungen auf der Agora und wurde größtenteils in den 30er Jahren, aber auch nach dem Ende des 2. Weltkrieges gefunden (S. 9). Gefäße aus gestörten oder unklaren Fundzusammenhängen wurden nur dann berücksichtigt, wenn sie typologisch relevant - weil in den 'closed deposits' nicht vertreten - waren (S. 5).

Diese Auswahlkriterien verdeutlichen die beiden wichtigsten Maßgaben der Verf. für die Klassifizierung der attischen Gebrauchskeramik der hellenistischen Zeit, die untrennbar miteinander verbunden sind, nämlich das Auftreten eines Typus innerhalb möglichst vieler, stratifizierter Fundkontexte. Die Datierung der Fundkomplexe aus den amerikanischen Grabungen in

Athen basiert auf der Kombination der Datierungen verschiedener, voneinander unabhängiger Klassen, hauptsächlich der gestempelten Amphorenhenkel (S. 342) und der Feinkeramik (S. 7). Münzfunde haben sich - wieder einmal - als längst nicht so hilfreich für die Bestimmung der absoluten Chronologie eines Kontextes herausgestellt, da sie häufig um einiges älter als das späteste datierende Element waren (S. 342). Eine sehr nützliche und komplette Übersicht aller berücksichtigten 'deposits' einschließlich eines kurzen Fundinventars und weiterführender Literatur finden sich in Kapitel IV.

Dieser 'stratigraphische' Ansatz, der alle miteinander vergesellschafteten, diagnostischen Elemente innerhalb eines Kontextes zur Datierungsgrundlage macht, entspricht den Kriterien der modernen Materialauswertung. Exemplarisch in dieser Hinsicht sind die methodischen Ansätze der englischen und amerikanischen Grabungsteams in Nordafrika in den siebziger und achtziger Jahren (vgl. z.B. J.A. Riley, *The coarse pottery from Benghazi*, in J.A. Lloyd (ed.), *Excavations at Berenice Benghazi II*, Tripolis 1979, 91-467, mit weiterführender Literatur). Insbesondere im Fall von chronologisch weniger aussagekräftigen Klassen, wie eben der Gebrauchskeramik, ist die systematische Berücksichtigung der Verbreitung der einzelnen Typen in geschlossenen Fundzusammenhängen unabdingbar. 'Individually, coarse pottery can only be dated in general terms ... when taken as a whole ... coarse pottery does provide a clearer indication of the date of a deposit...' (Riley siehe oben, 107).

Die hier vorgelegte Typologie der attischen Gebrauchskeramik aus stratifizierten Fundkontexten stellt zweifelsohne einen Meilenstein im Feld der Keramikforschung dar! Eine ausführliche Beschreibung und Diskussion der einzelnen Formen mit zahlreichen Abbildungen bilden das Herzstück der Publikation (Teil II). Die diachronische Verbreitung der ca 80 Typen (S. 6) ist zudem in sehr übersichtlichen und hilfreichen Tabellen auf den Seiten 226-239 (charts 23-36) dargestellt.

An Wichtigkeit den Parametern 'Typus' und 'geschlossener Fundzusammenhang' untergeordnet ist die 'fabric', d.h. der Scherbentyp der einzelnen Gefäße (für eine rezente Diskussion des deutschen Termins siehe V. Gassner, *Materielle Kultur und kulturelle Identität in Elea in spätarchaisch-frühklassischer Zeit*. Untersuchungen zur Gefäß- und Baukeramik aus der Unterstadt (Grabungen 1987-1994), in *Archäologische Forschungen 8. Velia-Studien 2*, Wien 2003, 25-26, Anm. 37). Daher sind für die typologische Untersuchung alle zu einem Typus gehörenden Objekte - unabhängig von ihrem Scherbentyp - zusammen berücksichtigt worden (S. 5).

Der Diskussion und Verbreitung der unterschiedlichen 'fabrics' wird dennoch ein angemessener Platz eingeräumt (Unterkapitel 2 des Teiles I, S. 13-53). Es wurden sechs lokale und 12 importierte Scherbentypen unterschieden (siehe Übersicht in Tabelle 2 auf S. 14), die größtenteils auch beprobt und naturwissenschaftlich untersucht wurden (Übersicht in Tabelle 3 auf S. 15 und Anhänge A-D). Außerhalb dieser Gruppen verblieben jedoch noch immer ca. ein Drittel der Gebrauchs- und mehr als die Hälfte der Küchenwaren (S. 14), was die Vielzahl der zu vermutenden Werkstätten noch deutlich erhöht. Zu jedem unterschiedlichen Scherbentyp werden eine Reihe von sehr hilfreichen Tabellen und

Abbildungen mit dem jeweils produzierten Formenrepertoire vorgestellt (Tabellen 4-13, Abb. 2-16). Das erstaunlichste Ergebnis der Untersuchung der Scherbentypen ist wohl die Tatsache, dass unter der untersuchten Gebrauchskeramik (N. 541) wenigstens ein Viertel aller Gefäße aus nicht lokalen Werkstätten stammt. Aus dieser Betrachtung ausgenommen sind Formen, die aufgrund ihres Inhalts eingeführt wurden, wie z.B. Lagynoi, Aryballoi und weitere Parfüm- und Salbgefäße sowie Gefäße zur Aufbewahrung von Heilmitteln. Ähnliches gilt für die Küchenware, bei der sogar ein Drittel als importiert gelten darf (S. 61-62). An dieser Stelle sollte auch daran erinnert werden, dass im 'Industrial Quarter' von Thorikos nach archäometrischen Untersuchungen sogar 60%-78% der Küchenkeramik des 6.-4. Jh. v.Chr. als aus dem südkykladischen Raum, bzw. der Gegend um den Saronischen Golf importiert gelten darf (P. De Paepe, A Petrological Study of Coarse Wares from Thorikos, S. E. Attica (Greece), *Miscellanea Graeca* 2, 1979, 61-88, besonders 62, 83, Abb. 3, 86).

Der hohe Anteil an Importen unter der Gebrauchskeramik des hellenistischen Athens entspricht überhaupt nicht dem Erscheinungsbild der zeitgleichen Feinkeramik, bei der der überwiegende Teil lokal hergestellt wurde. Die Erklärungsmodelle für dieses Phänomen sind vielfältig, sicherlich richtig und wichtig ist Rotroffs Hinweis, dass der hellenistische Überseehandel auch mit Gebrauchskeramik nicht unterschätzt werden sollte (S. 64). Diesbezüglich ist es interessant, auf eine möglicherweise aus Athen importierte Lekane aus einem Grabungskontext des späten 5. Jh. aus Karthago hinzuweisen (M. Vegas, Phöniko-punische Keramik aus Karthago, in F. Rakob (ed.), *Die deutschen Ausgrabungen in Karthago* (Karthago III), Mainz a.R., 1999, 93-219, 114-115, Abb. 12,14). Sollte es sich bei dieser Schüssel tatsächlich um ein attisches Gefäß handeln, wäre der nach Rotroff sehr beschränkte Verbreitungskreis attischer *Plain Ware* (S. 64) um die punische Mittelmeermetropole zu erweitern, was im übrigen angesichts der massiven Importe attischer *Black Glaze Ware* zu ebendieser Zeit nicht weiter verwunderlich wäre.

Zukunftsweisend ist schließlich die kurze, aber prägnante Funktionsanalyse ausgewählter Formen (S. 59-60). In dem Maße, wie die Zusammensetzung des Küchenwarenrepertoires Aufschluss über die Ernährungsgewohnheiten gibt, können auch die wiederholten Fundumstände z.B. von Krügen auf dem Boden von Brunnenschächten Hinweise auf die Verwendung des entsprechenden Typus zum Wasserschöpfen geben. Bemerkenswert an der von Rotroff untersuchten Gebrauchskeramik ist auch der hohe Anteil - ungefähr zwei Drittel - an geschlossenen Gefäßen zur Verwendung für Flüssigkeiten, dem nur ca. ein Fünftel an Gefäßen für die Speisezubereitung gegenüberstehen.

Die vorliegende Untersuchung der attischen Gebrauchskeramik hellenistischer Zeit gehört zweifelsohne in die Reihe der ganz wichtigen, für den gesamten Mittelmeerraum relevanten Keramikstudien. Durch die Kombination aller in archäologischem Grabungsmaterial beinhalteten Daten, d. h. dem Typus, dem Scherbentyp, bzw. der Werkstatt und dem stratigraphischen Fundkontext, skizziert die Verf. ein umfassendes Bild der von ihr untersuchten Klasse. Besonders hervorzuheben ist die extreme Benutzerfreundlichkeit des Bandes. Für den

im konkreten Fall nach Comparanda für sein eigenes Fundstück recherchierenden Archäologen ist die Suche sowohl nach bestimmten Typen, als auch nach 'fabrics' oder die Kombination von beidem schnell und einfach.

Babette Bechtold

CHRISTIAN FREVEL/HENNER VON HESBERG (eds.), *Kult und Kommunikation. Medien in Heiligtümern der Antike*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2007. 468 pp., 116 ill.; 24 cm (Schriften des Lehr- und Forschungszentrums für die Antiken Kulturen des Mittelmeerraumes (ZAKMIRA) 4). – ISBN 978-3-89500-574-9.

Although means of communication were less ubiquitous in the past than they are nowadays, forms of communication comparable to the ones we are familiar with did exist in ancient times. Like today, message carrying objects appeared in various contexts. By combining a variety of essays on cult places and votive offerings, editors Frevel and Von Hesberg in 'Kult und Kommunikation' have attempted to provide a coherent overview of different forms of communication that were thought to be present in and around ancient sanctuaries. The volume consists of a selection of papers delivered in 2005 at two separate conferences that were organised around the theme of sanctuaries.

Each contribution to this volume in its own way examines the complex relation between communication and media in ancient sanctuaries. In their introduction to the volume, the editors argue very convincingly for the existence of four levels of communication that cover the fields of direct and written communication, as well as the mediating and symbolic representative role that communication can play. With this framework in mind, the reader is offered six different essays on a number of ancient sacred places and the cults that were practised in those locations. The use of the concept 'sanctuary' amongst different ancient cultures is examined in the essay by Garcia-Ramon. The author gives an interesting twist to his study by arguing that the different meanings that were attached to this concept reflect the various perceptions that may have existed of sanctuaries. By analysing a couple of cave sanctuaries in detail, Sporn also comes across the problem of the multifunctional and therefore multi-interpretable role of sanctuaries. In the third contribution to this volume, Boschung argues for the importance of including the context in the research of cult statues. The role that texts may have played as documents of a ritual communication system, is analysed by Manuwald. By elaborating on the texts that once were used in the cult of Asclepius, the author points out that these cult texts could also be regarded as advertisements for the sanctuary. Like in the third essay, here again the point is made that including the context - the setting in time and space - is vital to the study of these material categories. Moving to the 'state cult' of the Seleucid empire, in the fifth essay Thiel offers various examples of traits of communication, based on the reflections of interaction between different layers of society that can be retrieved from both the literary sources and archaeological record. The final contribution to the first part of 'Kult und Kommuni-

kation' is written by Wisskirchen, who as well examines the political aspects of cult, albeit in this case focussed on the links between the cult practices of the western pope and the eastern Byzantine emperor.

I agree with Frevel and Von Hesberg that the essays in the first part of their volume demonstrate that sanctuaries should be conceived as communication systems through which the religious, political and economical questions of society are negotiated by various means of visual media. Therefore, I think that the editors made a wise choice by discussing one category in detail, being votive offerings. It should be emphasised that votive gifts served a double function: while being a gift to a god or goddess, the votive offering at the same time communicated a message to the other people visiting the donation spot. In his contribution to this volume, Frevel argues quite convincingly that when votive offerings were disconnected from their sender, they still could be considered as mediums. The essay by Wenning offers the reader a nice overview of the Nabataean votive niches and sanctuaries in the region of Petra, although the discussion of the votive offerings seems to be somewhat artificially added. Von Hesberg, on the contrary, fully focuses on ancient votive offerings and the treatment they have received in contemporary research. He carefully notes that votive practices should not be studied apart from the cult they were part of. Doepner hopes that her study of a depot of votive offerings that was found in Calderazzo, Italy, can contribute to the discussion of the mediating aspects of terracotta statuettes in Greek sanctuaries in general. Votive offerings in Greek sanctuaries is also the main theme of the essay by Bumke, who in particular analyses the occurrence of Egyptian statuettes in the sanctuary of Hera at Samos. By assessing the statues in Archaic and Classical Period Athens that were erected to honour some of its citizens, Krumeich argues that they should be regarded as media in political and religious communication - communication between the state and the people as well as interaction between polis and divinities. A changing audience and the consequences that this may have had, is also a theme in the next contribution. In a good, readable essay on the Matronae cult in Germania Inferior, Eck provides the reader with an extensive list of the material expressions of the cult that became so popular with the Roman soldiers in the region. The final essay in 'Kult and Kommunikation' written by two scholars, Fiedler and Höpken, treats the differences in votive practices regarding the context in which they appeared, whether they were practised in private and communal spheres. The scholars' argument that remembrance should be considered an inherent aspect of votive gifts, makes their essay a very worthy contribution to this volume.

All in all, the book is commendable for those interested in a brief introduction to the variety of cults and votive practices that once existed. Albeit more obvious in one essay than in the other, every point of the triangle consisting of votive giver, the receiving god or goddess, and the space in which the votive offerings functioned, is treated in each of the contributions to this volume. Of course, the value of a collection of essays lies in the individual contributions. Although each single essay demonstrated to be product of high standard scholarship,

a standard outline for the contributions would have improved the volumes' coherency. Adding a concluding essay would have convinced the reader of the point that was concealed in every contribution, being: *Cult is Communication*.

Marije Boonstra

MARIA-KALLIOPE ZAPHEIROPOULOU, *Emblemata vermiculata. Hellenistische und spätrepublikanische Bildmosaiken*. Paderborn/München/Wien/Zürich: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 2006. 311 S., 21 Abb., 8 Taf., (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, Neue Folge, 1. Reihe: Monographien, 26. Band). – ISBN 3-506-75669-9.

Bei der vorliegenden Arbeit handelt es sich um eine Dissertation, die im Wintersemester 2001/2002 an der Universität Freiburg/Br. eingereicht worden ist. In der Einführung definiert die Verfasserin die von ihr bearbeitete Gruppe der Mosaikemblemata wie folgt (9; vgl. auch 17): 'Mit Ausnahme der großen Vermiculat-Mosaiken machen sie nämlich nicht das Paviment aus, sondern sind besondere Einsätze, die manchmal in einem strukturellen Zusammenhang zum Raum bzw. zum Paviment stehen, in das sie eingelassen sind. Diese Selbständigkeit, welche sich auch durch ihr kleines Format und den kompakten Setzkasten zeigt, hat die Aufnahme der *emblemata* in den verschiedenen Museen begünstigt, wo sie heute meistens wie Gemälde an den Wänden hängen.' An diese ihre Definition hat sich Z(apheiropoulou), wie wir noch mehrfach feststellen werden, erstaunlicherweise nicht gehalten. Zudem erklärt sie den Platz des Bildmosaiks im Zentrum eines Pavimentes mit der antiken Gewohnheit, sich beim Gastmahl durch ein Bild im Fußboden zu Diskussionen anregen zu lassen (9). Doch stimmt dies so nicht, denn Emblemata kamen nachweislich in größerer Zahl auch in anderen Raumtypen zutage, z.B. in Tablina und Cubicula, wie die Autorin selbst im Katalogteil bemerkt.

I. Hier werden zunächst die literarischen Quellen untersucht (13-18). Betreffs Moschion bei Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 5.207 c wird mit Recht auf die Umschreibung der Bildfelder mit Iliasszenen auf dem Prunkschiff Hierons II. hingewiesen. Anders sieht es nach Z. mit der Heroon-Inschrift von Apateira aus. Aber erstens stammt der Text höchstwahrscheinlich aus Thyaira – Tire (R. Mersic/R. Merkelbach/S. Şahin, *ZPE* 33, 1979, 191-192) und zweitens ist die allgemein vorgebrachte Interpretation als Mosaikeinsätze kaum haltbar (Rez. in *Les civilisations du bassin méditerranéen, Hommages à J. Sliwa*, Krakau 2000, 235-238).

Statt auf die kleinasiatische Inschrift der Kaiserzeit hätte jedoch auf eine Mosaikinschrift in Nîmes verwiesen werden müssen, da sie höchstwahrscheinlich den bisher einzigen epigraphischen Beleg für das Wort *emblemata* liefert (J. Lancha, *Mosaïque et culture dans l'Occident romain*, Rom 1997, 101-103 Nr. 50 [Lit.]; C. Balmelle u.a. in *La Mosaïque gréco-romaine* VII, Tunis 1999, 632 Taf. 233,1). An literarischen Nachweisen führt Z. die bekannte Lucilius-Stelle bei Cicero und Plinius d.Ä. an (*Quam lepidè lexis compositae ut tesserulae* [nicht *tesserullae*!] *omnes arte pavimento atque emblemata vermiculato*) sowie Belege bei

Varro und Sueton (13-14); bei dem letztgenannten Autor wird jedoch mit dem Wort *emblemata* nicht notwendigerweise ein Mosaik bezeichnet. Allerdings vermisst man Hinweise auf Quintilian (*de institutione oratoria* 2.4.27) und Augustinus (*de ordine* 1.1.2).

Auf die lückenhafte Darstellung der literarischen Quellen folgt ein Bericht zur Lage der Forschung (18-26), untergliedert nach Abhandlungen über *emblemata*, materialbezogene Untersuchungen, ikonographische Studien und Monographien. Es schließt sich ein Abriss über die entwicklungsgeschichtlichen Aspekte der figürlichen Mosaiken an (26-39). Hier lehnt Z. - wohl zu Recht - ein strikt lineares Entwicklungsschema der Mosaiktechniken ab. Die ersten *emblemata* werden in Alexandria lokalisiert (33-37), doch muss der Fundort nicht notwendigerweise mit dem Herstellungsort identisch sein, zumal ein Problem nicht übersehen werden darf: Ägypten besitzt keine Brüche, die Kalksteine in einer breiten Farbpalette hätten liefern können (Rez. a.O. 238). Von den Bildmosaiken Pergamons (36) geht Z. zu denen Italiens über (37-38), die in der Regel auf hellenistische Gemälde zurückzuführen sein dürften.

II. Hinsichtlich der Datierung von Figurenpaneelen wird zunächst auf die Bilder der Burg von Pergamon verwiesen, die kurz vor der Mitte des 2. Jh. v. Chr. angesetzt werden (41-42). Betreffs Interpretation und Datierung der beiden Mosaiken mit Frauenbüsten aus Thmuis, deren Herstellung aufgrund der Identifizierung der Dargestellten mit Berenike II. im ausgehenden 3. Jh. v. Chr. angenommen wird (42-43), gibt es starke Bedenken, auf die Z. nicht eingeht (vgl. Rez., TrZ 50, 1987, 451-452). Die delischen Bildmosaiken werden gemäß *communis opinio* mehrheitlich zwischen 166 und 89 v. Chr. datiert (43-44).

III. Zum Thema Mythologie (51-58) stellt Z. verständlicherweise fest (52): '(Es) sind nicht mehr als zehn *emblemata* mit mythischen Themen überkommen.' Allein im Katalog des Buches findet sich eine mehr als doppelt so hohe Zahl! In diesem Rahmen wird auch das Europamosaik aus Palestrina besprochen, das heute in Oldenburg aufbewahrt wird (54-55; 280-281 Nr. 81). Allerdings hat der Rez. dessen Authentizität mit zahlreichen Argumenten bezweifelt (Rez., AA 1990, 174-177), was aber die Autorin nicht einmal der Erwähnung für wert erachtet hat. Es folgen Abschnitte über das Theaterwesen (58-69), Allegorien - Rätsel (69-74), Dionysos und seinen Kreis (74-77) - ein Thema, das eigentlich zur Mythologie gehört hätte - sowie Xenia und Realia (77-82). In dem letztgenannten Abschnitt erwähnt die Autorin auch ein *emblemata* im Magazin der Staatlichen Antikensammlungen zu München (79 Anm. 211), doch unterlässt sie es, darauf hinzuweisen, dass es als Fälschung verdächtigt wurde (Rez., AA 1990, 170 Abb. 19).

IV. Dieses Kapitel ist den Bildmosaiken in den Palästen von Alexandria (83-84), Pergamon (84-90) und Samosata (90) gewidmet. Nach Z. gibt es bisher nur ein einziges figürliches Mosaikpaneel - allerdings später entfernt - in einem Tempel, und zwar in Pergamon (83 Anm. 222); aber die Autorin führt, ohne diesen Widerspruch zu bemerken, in ihrem Katalog (237 Nr. 25) einen analogen Fall im Samothrakeion von Delos auf; möglicherweise wurde das zentrale Bildfeld (?) aus der Cella des Venus-Tempels in Pompeji entfernt - oder zerstört (E. La Rocca/M. und A. de Vos, *Guida archeologica di Pompei*, Mailand 1976, 96). Mit Recht dagegen wird auf die auf-

fällige Anordnung mehrerer *emblemata* innerhalb dreier Böden der Burg von Pergamon verwiesen, für die es im Hellenismus bisher offenbar keine Parallelen gibt. Diesbezüglich hätte man jedoch auf die analoge Anordnung von Einsatzbildern in der Villa Hadriana zu Tivoli verweisen können (zuletzt B. Andreae, *Antike Bildmosaiken*, Mainz 2003, 279-291). Es folgt die Behandlung zahlloser Bildmosaiken in hellenistischen Privathäusern, zunächst derjenigen auf Delos (96-111). Nach Aussage der Autorin soll das Paneel mit Dionysos auf einem Tiger in einem Setzkasten gearbeitet sein (98. 234), doch findet sich in der bisherigen Literatur kein Hinweis darauf; im Katalog (233-234 Nr. 21) fehlt bemerkenswerterweise der Hinweis auf Bruneaus einschlägige Monographie (*Les Mosaïques, Délos XXIX*, Paris 1972, 240-245), die bei allen anderen Böden der Insel konsequent zitiert wird. Dennoch dürfte es sich um ein wirkliches *emblemata* handeln, da es schräg im Paviment sitzt; doch dies weist eher auf das nachträgliche Einsetzen eines älteren (?) Mosaikbildes in ein bereits vorhandenes Paviment hin. Beachtung verdient die Verteilung vieler Bildmosaiken innerhalb der delischen Häuser (110-111): Mehrfach ist offenbar das Obergeschoss prächtiger ausgestattet gewesen als das Erdgeschoss. Angeschlossen wird die Besprechung sizilischer Figurenpaneelen von Morgantina, Cefalù, Solunt und Syrakus (111-115). Hier findet sich die Aussage, dass das Paneel in Solunt mit Darstellung der Armillarsphäre hinsichtlich der Verwendung von Bleistegen ein Unikum in Italien sei (114 Anm. 357). Mitnichten: Zahlreiche Belege dafür finden sich bei H. Brem, *Das Peristylhaus I von Iaitas. Wand- und Bodendekorationen*, Lausanne 2000, 75 Anm. 158; anzufügen sind: Aquileia (L. Bertacchi in *EAA Suppl.* 1970, 1973, 69 s.v. Aquileia) und Urbs Salvia (G.M. Fabrini, *Picus* 20, 2000, 125 Abb. 5). Ein Abschnitt über Gestaltungsprinzipien der Mosaiken mit hellenistischen Bildfeldern beschließt das Kapitel (115-118). Meistens sitzt das Paneel im Zentrum des Mosaiks, selten - wie in Pergamon - wurde eine parataktische Reihung gewählt.

In der Regel etwas jünger sind die vom italischen Festland stammenden Bildmosaiken, von denen die große Mehrheit in Pompeji zutage kam (119-126). U.a. wird auch das berühmte Alexandermosaik aus Pompeji genannt, doch wird dessen Import nach Pompeji bezweifelt. Dem Rez. wird dabei unterstellt, er habe einen alexandrinischen Ursprung des Pavimentes angenommen (122 Anm. 379); dies tat er mitnichten. Repliken italischer *emblemata* fanden sich im spanischen Ampurias (126-127), auch die große römische Villa von Rabat auf Malta barg mehrere Einsatzbilder (127-128). Die Beispiele Italiens oder der davon abhängigen Regionen erscheinen zwar ebenfalls im Zentrum eines feinen Tessellatbodens - nur ausnahmsweise innerhalb eines aus bunten, polygonalen Steinen geformten Pavimentes (129-130), doch werden die rahmenden Glieder nun entweder stark reduziert oder wirken überdimensioniert.

Zu Recht verweist die Verfasserin im folgenden Abschnitt auf das zunächst überraschende Faktum, dass Bildmosaiken nur ausnahmsweise einzelne Räume der Villen des Golfes von Neapel schmückten. Der Grund: Die Häuser gehörten sowohl dem ersten vor- wie dem ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhundert an und damals seien Bildpaneelen in der Regel bereits durch Sectile-Felder abgelöst worden (130-137). Dass dies nicht generell

zutreffen kann, zeigen jedoch zahlreiche Emblemata, die in Villen außerhalb Kampaniens gefunden worden sind (137-143). Ausführlich widmet sich Z. dann den figürlichen Mosaiken der Villa Hadriana bei Tivoli. Das Taubenmosaik, das übrigens nicht in einem Kasten (141, 142, 282), sondern auf einer Marmorplatte gearbeitet ist (so Furietti in der editio princeps S. 33; vgl. Rez., RM 98, 1991, 195 mit Anm. 44), wird in die augustische Zeit datiert (142. 282), die übrigen Bildpaneele unter Berufung auf M. De Franceschini und K. Werner in die hadriani-sche Zeit. Allerdings hat die erstgenannte Autorin an der zitierten Stelle nichts zur Datierung gesagt; diese erfolgt vielmehr auf S. 610 ihres Werkes: 'quadri d'epoca ellenistica'. Der letztgenannte Autor hat dagegen die Paneele in einer jüngeren Publikation, die Z. offenbar nicht kennt, hinaufdatiert (*Die Sammlung antiker Mosaiken in den Vatikanischen Museen*, Vatikanstadt 1998, 112. 127).

In dem Abschnitt über die Funktion der Bildmosaiken in einzelnen Räumen (143-159) wird zutreffend konstatiert, dass Bildprogramme in römischen Häusern nicht feststellbar sind. Allerdings ist die Aussage (147) 'Ebenso wenig (sic) können ihre Themata eine ganz bestimmte Raumfunktion direkt indizieren' in dieser generellen Art nicht haltbar: Die pompejanischen Symplegma-Paneele der Casa del Fauno (254 Nr. 47) und der Casa del Menandro (247 Nr. 40) stammen eindeutig aus Cubicula und sind in Räumen anderer Funktion kaum vorstellbar (so richtig 156-157). Die meisten Bildmosaiken schmückten die Böden von Triklinien (155), wengleich das gewählte Motiv nicht immer einen direkten Bezug zum Raumzweck erkennen lässt. Z. rechnet aber überraschenderweise die Speisezimmer nicht zu den repräsentativen Räumen in dem der Öffentlichkeit zugänglichen Bereich des römischen Hauses (154).

Im vorletzten Kapitel geht es um Repliken und Varianten unter den vorkaiserzeitlichen Bildmosaiken (161-182). Die Verfasserin versucht die Abhängigkeiten von Vorbildern bzw. untereinander zu klären. Ein neues Licht auf die Überlieferung von Musterzeichnungen als Vorlagen wirft ein Turiner Papyrus (164 kurz erwähnt), der jetzt ausführlich publiziert vorliegt: C. Gallazzi/S. Settis (edd.), *Le tre vite del Papiro di Artemidoro*, Ausstellungskatalog Turin 2006, Mailand 2006; C. Gallazzi/B. Kramer/S. Settis (edd.), *Il Papiro di Artemidoro*, Mailand 2008. Hinsichtlich des beigebrachten Materials hätte nicht nur auf Mosaikrepliken verwiesen werden können (vgl. auch eine Replik der Musikantenszene des Dioskourides, ebenfalls aus Pompeji: G. Stefani in *Atti del VI. Convegno dell'Associazione Italiana per lo Studio e la Conservazione del Mosaico*, Venedig 1999, Ravenna 2000, 282-286 Abb. 4), sondern auch auf Parallelen in größeren Tessellatmosaiken und in anderen Handwerkstechniken (Rez., AW 36,2,2005, 59-68; *Musiva et Sectilia* 2/3,2005/2006 [2008] 81-113). Ob es sich allerdings bei den beiden Bildern aus Thmuis mit einem angeblichen Porträt Berenikes II. (zur Problematik s. Rez., TrZ 50, 1987, 451-452) um etwa gleichzeitige Repliken handelt (162-163), darf angesichts der starken Qualitätsunterschiede bezweifelt werden. Zudem kennt der Rez. hinsichtlich des Tondo mit dem Schuppenmuster keine sichere vorkaiserzeitliche Parallele für dieses Motiv, so dass das Mittelbild später kopiert worden sein muss und vielleicht in einen noch jüngeren Boden sekundär eingesetzt worden ist. Bei der Behandlung von Fischmosai-

ken nennt Z. als Parallele ein Emblemata mit Buchtpanorama (178 Anm. 529), offensichtlich ohne zu wissen oder zumindest darauf zu verweisen, dass dessen Authentizität angezweifelt worden ist (K. Parlasca, RM 65, 1958, 173-174).

Das letzte Kapitel ist der Herauslösung und Wiederverwendung von Emblemata im Altertum gewidmet (182-196). Nicht nur - wie bisher schon allgemein bekannt - auf Delos, Sizilien und in Pergamon sind Belege für die Entfernung von Figurenfeldern bereits in der Antike zu finden, auch sonst gibt es allenthalben Beispiele für dieses Vorgehen, und zwar nicht wenige Fälle, wie Z. suggeriert (190), sondern bis in die späte Kaiserzeit in großer Zahl; ja sogar Pavimente mit geometrischen Rapporten konnten ganz oder teilweise entfernt und wiederverwendet werden (Rez., Pavimente als Bedeutungsträger herrscherlicher Legitimation, JRA 7, 1994, 257-262).

Die nun folgende Abkürzungsliste (201-203) hätte leicht mit der sich anschließenden Bibliographie (205-210), welche die Autoren ebenfalls mit Kurz- und Originaltitel aufführt, vereinigt werden können. Der Index Locorum (211-213) ist lückenhaft; es fehlen z.B. die meisten der in Kap. 1 genannten literarischen Quellen (13-18). Aber wozu soll dieser Index überhaupt dienen, wenn die Seitenangabe in Bezug auf das vorliegende Buch nie angegeben wird? Vergebens sucht man Indices der Fundorte und Museen sowie ein allgemeines Sachregister. Im Abbildungsverzeichnis (215-216) werden die Quellen der Tafelabbildungen einfach unterschlagen.

Den Abschluss des Buches bildet der Katalog mit 109 Nummern. Die geographische Gliederung ist allerdings merkwürdig: Die Fundorte Ägyptens werden weit vor denen Afrikas aufgeführt, diejenigen Siziliens nach denen Italiens! Innerhalb der Länder- bzw. Regionenabschnitte wurden die Orte in der Regel in alphabetischer Reihenfolge genannt, nicht jedoch innerhalb Ägyptens und Italiens.

Einige Ergänzungen seien zum Katalog beige-steuert: Nr. 29: Hinsichtlich des Emblemata mit Fischen aus Kos ist die Aussage 'Setzkasten: Nicht geklärt' unrichtig: Das Mosaik wird heute zwar im Archäologischen Museum von Kos aufbewahrt - nicht *in situ*, wie angegeben -, doch befindet sich der steinerne Setzkasten noch am Fundort im Zentrum eines Sectile-Pavimentes, das deutlich jünger ist als das somit wiederverwendete Emblemata: L.M. De Matteis, *Mosaici di Cos dagli scavi delle missioni italiane e tedesche (1900-1945)*, Athen 2004, 144-145 Nr. 69 Taf. 85, 1. - Vgl. auch A. Kankeleit, *Kaiserzeitliche Mosaiken in Griechenland*, Diss. Bonn 1994, II, 1994, 124-127 Nr. 64. Nr. 66. 67. Zu den beiden von Dioskourides signierten Mosaiken aus Pompeji mit Szenen aus Menanderkomödien vgl. jetzt ausführlich D. Stefanou, *Darstellungen aus dem Epos und Drama auf kaiserzeitlichen und spätantiken Bodenmosaiken*, Münster 2006, 268-313.

Nr. 69 Taf. 6: Man kann sich fragen, ob dieses runde Emblemata mit Theseus und dem Minotauros, das weder eine gesicherte Provenienz noch ein festes Funddatum besitzt, überhaupt antik ist: In der Hintergrunddarstellung, die wohl auf zwei Bildfelder gleichen Themas aus Kampanien (242 Nr. 34 Taf. 1; 248-249 Nr. 42 Abb. 14) zurückgeführt werden kann, ist offenbar einiges vom Setzer missverstanden worden; gleiches gilt für die Partie unterhalb des Kopfes des athenischen Heros. Die Über-

reste von zwei Skeletten im Vordergrund wirken ausgesprochen impressionistisch. Zudem spricht die stark unregelmäßige Setzweise der Würfel, die breite Fugen deutlich werden lässt, gegen einen antiken Ursprung. Nr. 73: Das Löwenmosaik in Holkham Hall stammt aus dem Theater von Gubbio (172 Anm. 516), ist dort aber wohl wiederverwendet (vgl. auch E. Angelicoussis, *The Holkham Collection of Classical Sculptures*, Mainz 2001, 158-159 Nr. 58 Farbtaf. 5, 1); wieso im Katalog angegeben ist 'Fundkontext: Wahrscheinlich aus einer republikanischen Villa in Rom', erschließt sich dem Rez. nicht. Nr. 75: Im Gegensatz zur Aussage der Verfasserin ('Setzkasten: Nicht festzustellen') ist ein Terrakottasetzkasten des Mosaiks mit Raub des Hylas aus Tor Bella Monaca sowohl im Original als auch auf allen publizierten Abbildungen deutlich zu erkennen: S. Muth, *Erleben von Raum - Leben im Raum*, Heidelberg 1998, 100 Anm. 333; 126-127 Anm. 443. 445 Taf. 42,1; M. Sapelli, *Museo Nazionale Romano. Palazzo Massimo alle Terme*, Rom 1998, 8 Farbabb.

Nr. 76: Betreffs des runden Fischmosaiks aus Rom, Via Sistina 111, zu dem Reste von Terrakotta gehören sollen (A. Tammisto, *Birds in Mosaics*, Rom 1997, 359), die dann eindeutig auf einen Setzkasten deuten, fehlt der Hinweis auf eine technische Besonderheit: Ein Teil des Rahmens wird nicht durch Mosaiksteinchen gebildet, sondern besteht lediglich aus bemaltem Mörtel (C. Fiorini in *Topografia romana. Ricerche e discussioni*, Rom 1988, 47 Anm. 5). Nr. 84: Der Aufbewahrungsort des Mosaiks mit Wasservogel muss korrekt lauten: Cefalù, Museo di Fondazione Mandalisca.

Nr. 93. 94: Es fehlt der Hinweis darauf, dass beide Fragmente mit Tierdarstellungen aus dem Palazzo delle Colonne zu Ptolemais auf Sandsteinplatten gearbeitet sind: A.-M. Guimier-Sorbets, *RA* 1998, 281.

Nr. 98. 100-102: Der Aufbewahrungsort der Emblemata aus Ampurias muss korrekt lauten: Barcelona, Museo Arqueológico de Barcelona.

Nr. 99: Das Emblemata aus Ampurias mit Darstellung der Opferung der Iphigenie befindet sich in Empúries, Museu d'Arqueologia de Catalunya.

Außerdem vermisst man Emblemata, welche die Autorin - mit Ausnahme der Neufunde (Privernum [Raub des Ganymed] und S. Lucia di Pollenza [Eberjagd]) sowie einer Neuvorstellung (Capri [Katze mit Geflügel]) - hätte kennen können: Agrigent, Casa della Gazella (äsende Gazelle); Rom, S. Susanna (Poseidon und Amyone bzw. Perseus und Andromeda [?]); Solunt (Fische); Todi (Reste einer Theatermaske); Val Catena, Brioni (Theaterszene ?); Tarragona (Medusa); Alexandria (Medusa); Ptolemais (Medusa); Uthina - Oudna (Speisereste). Für Literatur s. die Bibliographie in den Bulletins der AIEMA.

Zu den genannten sachlichen treten viele formale Mängel. Die meisten griechischen Zitate weisen Schreib- oder Akzentfehler auf, einmal wird sogar falsch übersetzt: Statt Dionysios Herakleides (33) lies Dionysios, Sohn des Herakleides. Gelegentlich begegnet falsches Deutsch (80. 81. 104). Zu verbessern sind weiterhin: Statt *asaroton oecon* (36 Anm. 85; 81, 87, 134) lies *asarotos oecus*; statt Kollax (61 Anm. 149) lies Kolax; statt lybisch (84) lies libysch; statt begleiteten (119) lies bekleideten; statt Aurigemma (147 Anm. 457; 172 Anm. 516; 205) lies Auriemma; statt Receuil (202) lies Recueil; statt Chari-

tonides (206) lies Charitonidis; statt Daszweski (206) lies Daszewski; statt Stilleben (207) lies Stilleben; statt Matini (208) lies Morricono Matini; statt Wien (215) lies Vienne; statt Gaitsch (245) lies Gaitzsch; statt Cèbe (246) lies Cebé; statt Casa del Frutetto (259) lies Frutteto; statt Lybien (292. 293) lies Libyen; statt Puigi Cadafalch (296) lies Puig i Cadafalch.

Das Fazit: Die Arbeit weist zahlreiche formale und inhaltliche Mängel auf. Es beginnt schon mit einer unscharfen bzw. falschen Definition: So werden auch Bildmosaiken als Emblemata bezeichnet, bei denen nichts auf eine gesonderte Herstellung im Atelier und/oder auf einen Transport zum Zwecke eines Einsatzes in einen nahezu gleichzeitig verlegten oder gar jüngeren Tessellatboden hinweist. Zudem fehlen Hinweise auf einschlägige Monumente in größerer Zahl, auf welche die Verfasserin bei intensiverer Beschäftigung mit dem Material hätte stoßen müssen. Ebenso ist die Literaturkenntnis sehr lückenhaft. In einem Aufsatz des Rez. (*Mosaikemblemata - Rationelles Herstellungsverfahren und schwunghafter Gebrauchtwarenhandel*, *BAParis* 28, 2001, 101-132) hätte die Autorin noch vieles zum Thema finden können, zumal sie ansonsten Literatur bis zum Jahr 2003 zitiert hat.

Dem Rez. bleibt unverständlich, wie diese Arbeit als Dissertation angenommen werden und darüber hinaus in eine renommierte Reihe Aufnahme finden konnte.

Michael Donderer

MAGDALENE SÖLDNER, *BIOΣ EYΔAIMΩN. Zur Ikonographie des Menschen in der rotfigurigen Vasenmalerei Unteritaliens. Die Bilder aus Lukanien*. Möhnesee: Bibliopolis 2007. 248 pp., 283 figs., 27.5 cm. - ISBN 978-3-933925-80-0.

Since the middle ages, scholars and collectors have been intrigued by ancient vases with their exquisitely applied decorative motifs found throughout Greece and Southern Italy. Once labeled as 'Etruscan', then later grouped under the heading of 'Attic', and finally separated into their due categories, these vases have spawned generations of thought, theory, and interpretation. Among the most recent scholars building on the work of Kramer, Furtwängler, Beazley, and Trendall is Dr. Magdalene Söldner. Her book, a reworked version of her 1996/97 *Habilitationsschrift*, as she writes in the foreword, is a further *tessera* in the mosaic of modern understanding of Magna Graecia.

The book consists of seven chapters, conveniently divided into labeled sections and subsections, and each concluding with a summary of the topics discussed and conclusions drawn. The appendices comprise a list of abbreviations (237-238), a catalogue of public collections of Lucanian red figure vases (239-243), and references for the 283 photographed vases which follow (244-248). Unfortunately there is no index or bibliography at the end of the book (one must peruse the footnotes on each page in search of further references). Cross-references between figures and their mention in the text would also have been useful.

In chapter one (1-9), Söldner recounts the history of the study of South Italian red figure vase paintings and

identifies what she sees as errors in the interpretation of a group of figures she dubs 'youth-woman paintings'. Chapter two (16-45), addresses these figures in the context of chase scenes, beginning with the earliest examples from the Pisticci and Amykos painters, then moving to the intermediate groups and the workshops of the Kreusa and Dolon painters, and finally the Brooklyn-Budapest painter and late Lucanian painting workshops, thus following the subject through the life span of Lucanian vase painting. The third chapter, 'Paintings with youths and women in relaxed postures and their iconographic surroundings' (47-159), encompasses the essence of Söldner's hypothesis. Addressing the iconography through a time line represented by the painters and workshops mentioned above, the author analyzes depictions including attributes of the *palaistra*, war attributes, youths with club and *kerykeion*, various accolades, Nike, offerings for departing warriors, Eros, youths and women with Dionysian features, Apollonian youths and oriental warriors, Eros and winged youths, the deceased, nuptial and Dionysian elements. The chapter concludes with a discussion of Attic vase paintings and iconography of Dionysus, Heracles, and Hermes. Next are chapters about the 'men's world' (165-75) including iconography of athletes and warriors and the 'women's world' (177-200), covering women's quarters with and without Eros or winged youths, and Aphrodite and women with Aphrodite attributes. Chapter six (201-25) is an analysis of 'marriage paintings' including youth-woman paintings with a *klismos* and paintings with embracing couples and a *kline*, finishing with a look at a Lucanian and an Attic example of this motif. The final chapter (227-33) covers Söldner's conclusions and outlooks on the subject.

As the title implies, the primary aim of the book is to reinterpret representations of humans on Lucanian red figure vases, specifically 'Jünglings-Frauenbilder'. The scenes incorporate naked youths, often with attributes of highest male virtue including those of athletics and war, and fully clothed women often holding mirrors or attributes of Nike or Aphrodite which epitomize feminine virtue. While these depictions have been variously identified as non- or un-mythological, everyday or daily life scenes, such designations fail to capture the unrealistic nature of these depictions. Söldner is quite right; it is difficult to imagine a real-life situation in which a young, fully clothed woman would be adorning an entirely naked youth with a fillet or crown (e.g. fig. 65), or one in which a similarly virtuous young woman would be found in the company of an otherwise normal naked youth with wings sprouting from his back (e.g. fig. 169). At the same time however, these scenes are clearly taking place in the earthy realm.

Söldner sought the solution in the philosophy of ancient Greece. Plato's *daimonios aner* and concept of *bios eudaimon* provide a basis to Söldner's argument that these images depict the presence of *daimones* on earth to indicate the blessed lives of otherwise ordinary individuals. Forestalling obvious objections to the idea that people of the 5th and 4th century BC would have been well versed in the works of Plato, the author cites references to concepts of merging mortal and divine in older Greek writings (11-13), convincingly supporting the possibility that they were well known and accepted. The fact that this point of Platonic philosophy provides

the title of the book however would lead one to expect more than a brief reference to the epistle from which the term comes (*Epist.* VII, 326 b, 327 a; also references *Symp.* 203 a, *Phaid.* 58 e in respect to *daimonios aner*).

Herein lies the one weakness of this work, inherent of the sheer vastness of its scope. While Söldner does systematically and convincingly lay out the arguments for a separate classification of youth-woman figures, a slightly less ambitious and more thorough exploration of the theme might have been possible if the focus had remained on the evidence in chapter three with references to depictions from other chapters reinforcing the ideas presented there. This would have allowed for a deeper exploration of the philosophy in respect to the iconography.

Söldner's conclusions leave the door open for much more exploration. She recognizes that problems remain in the analysis and offers the enticing possibility of future application of new theories to vases of other regions and to South Italian tomb paintings (233), a study which would no doubt prove an invaluable complement to Dr. Söldner's research.

This ambitious and very well organized book presents provocative new ideas. As it is a fresh look at the subject and not an introduction to it, this book should stimulate avid discussion especially among graduate students and scholars of archaeology and iconology of the ancient world.

Helena N. Dyer-Müller

MICHAEL I. GALATY / CHARLES WATKINSON, *Archaeology Under Dictatorship*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, 2004). 218 pp., 67 ill. in the text; 23 cm. – ISBN 0-306-48508-7.

In 2002 a group of young archaeologists from Albania visited the *Archaeological Institute of America* to discuss the archaeology in their country during the age of communism, especially during Enver Hoxa's time in power. It must have been an exciting session. Although the invited Albanians were open-minded, it became clear that some ideas on prehistory, which were developed during the communist rule, were still current. This is a well-known phenomenon: 'regime change' does not automatically lead to a 'new' archaeology. That same year, inspired by their meeting with the Albanians, Michael I. Galaty and Charles Watkinson organized a session on 'Archaeology under Dictatorship' at the 67th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology. The present publication is the outcome of that session.

Archaeology under Dictatorship focuses on the archaeology of the Mediterranean during the inter-war period. It contains papers on archaeology in Spain during Franco's reign, in Turkey during Atatürk's time in power and in Greece during Metaxas' New State and the Colonels' junta. Furthermore there are papers on colonial excavations of fascist Italy in Egypt, Albania and Libya (there are even two papers on Libya, one by Stefan Altekamp and one by Massimiliano Munzi). Most of these articles on colonial excavations also deal with the archaeology in fascist Italy itself. Galaty and Watkinson write the theoretical introduction, which mentions briefly the archaeology in Hoxa's Albania. Bettina Arnold

writes the theoretical conclusion, which also deals with the archaeology in Nazi Germany. The case-studies are without exception of high quality. They give, even though half of them actually deal with a variety of colonial archaeology, an inside view in the lives of archaeologists in authoritarian political systems. Regarding the introduction and conclusion some critical remarks can and should be made.

Considering the main theme of the book - the problematic relation between archaeology and politics - it is surprising that Galaty and Watkinson formulate a highly political objective in their preface: 'Perhaps in the not-too-distant future Iraqi archaeologists can learn from the Albanian experience.' As the differences between Albanian and Iraqi society are obvious, one might think one deals with a 'sweeping statement'. But the authors are serious. Their statement refers to their appeal to interview archaeologists who once worked under a dictatorship. Thus crucial information can be collected which is needed for the 'deconstruction' of archaeological knowledge created in a dictatorial context. Galaty and Watkinson argue that this should be done both in Albania and in Iraq. Furthermore they emphasize that there is a need to hurry: the older generations have almost vanished. It is remarkable that they do not bring up the question if these archaeologists are willing to be interviewed, or able to be self-reflective.

This 'blind spot' seems to be connected to a theoretical framework chosen by Galaty and Watkinson. They apply the 'totalitarian state' concept taken from the work of Juan J. Linz and Hannah Arendt. According to them the main feature of dictatorial systems is that one person - the dictator - has almost unrestricted power. This person establishes this power not only by terror but also with the help of an ideology. For formulating this ideology support of academics is needed. But eventually totalitarian states can only put up an academic 'facade'. The academics involved are suppressed and not allowed to hold on to the ideal of objectivity. Meanwhile critics have pointed out that not all dictatorial states should be put in the same category, especially with regard to the position of scholars. The mechanics of regimes in binding intellectuals to their goals turn out to have been very diverse and complex. For example, scientists from the Soviet-Union were able to make some important discoveries. It is also brought forward by these critics that scholars in authoritarian states were certainly not always academics under pressure. Prehistorians in the Third Reich were able to create unprecedented opportunities for themselves. Unfortunately, Galaty and Watkinson do not take remarks like these into account.

However, the editors do take notice of some recent theoretical debates on the relation between archaeology and society. In the 1990s, when archaeology was hit by post-modernism, the history of the discipline was studied intensively. It was recognized that archaeology and nationalism have profoundly affected each other since the beginning of the nineteenth century. Building on these insights the editors of *Archaeology Under Dictatorship* formulate the hypothesis that the relation between archaeology and politics exists in every nation, but is more intense in the context of a dictatorship. All things considered, the essays in this book do not confirm this

proposition. What they do show is that the function of archaeology in dictatorial systems can differentiate considerably. Margarita Díaz-Andreu and Manuel Ramírez Sánchez describe why in Francoist Spain archaeology was not part of the main agenda: national roots were identified in the late Middle Ages when Spain became a religious and territorial unity. Still 'harm' was done. Archaeologists who obtained influential positions were often chosen because of their political allegiance and not because they were qualified academics. Wendy Shaw on the other hand reports that Atatürk was well aware of the fact that archaeology could create a Turkish national unity. He even personally decided in which direction archaeological research should develop. Academics had to make the Turks, who had populated Anatolia during the 11th century, into the autochthonous people of Anatolia.

Against this background, it is tempting to underestimate the quality of archaeological research under dictatorship. Altekamp concludes that field research in Libya regressed in the style of early and mid-19th century. Archaeology had only to communicate non-verbal political messages. Munzi nevertheless argues that one should not accuse Italian colonial archaeologists in Libya of vandalism: their fieldwork could easily be compared with that of the Italian archaeologists in Rome or French archaeologists in Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco. In line with that, Dimitra Kikkinidou and Marianna Nikolaidou emphasize that the Greek authoritarian regimes were not alone in 'abusing' archaeology for propaganda means. The parliamentary governments of Greece have in that respect been equally active. This is an important conclusion; implicating that archaeological knowledge created in a dictatorial context should not be explained from that perspective alone. Oliver Gilkes - discussing Italian fascist archaeology in inter-war Albania - observes that many aspects of fascist archaeology were already in gestation prior to the First World War. It required only the catalyst of the fascist cultural and foreign policy to coalesce these.

The last critical remark of this review regards the role of archaeologists themselves. In the casestudies in this book the absence of an explicit moment of choice is shown beyond dispute. It is fascinating to read Munzi's description of the Italian archaeologists Giulio Quirino Giglioli, Carlo Galassi Paluzzi and Antonio Maria Colini taking the initiative for the famous *Mostra Augustea della Romanità* (The Augustan Exhibition of Romanità) of 1937-1938. At this exhibition the fascist myth of the Roman Empire reached its maximum aesthetic realization. Munzi observes that the scholars involved did not need any political encouragement: they were spontaneous converts to fascism. If one takes into account this last consideration, one wonders why Bettina Arnolds in her theoretical conclusion still speaks of 'the Faustian bargain of archaeology under dictatorship'. Archaeologists in authoritarian systems often turn out to be loyal to the system, of which they are part and by which they are - partially - intellectually formed. Labelling these archaeologists as academics under pressure or opportunists only does not lead to a better understanding of their position and certainly not to a better understanding of archaeology under dictatorship.

Martijn Eickhoff

PETER BAUMEISTER, *Das Fries des Hekateions von Lagina. Neue Untersuchungen zu Monument und Kontext* (Byzas 6). Istanbul: Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, 2007. 250 S., 11 Abb., 43 Taf., 2 Beilagen; 27.5 cm. ISBN 978-975-807-156-2.

In this impressive book, Baumeister treats us to an exhaustive account of the frieze of the Hekateion in Lagina (Koranza), a *demos* of Stratonikeia, which is a city in Caria. The temple where the frieze was found, a *pseudodipteros* influenced by Hermogenes (ca 200 BC), was excavated in 1892. Some 38 slabs of the frieze are preserved in Istanbul, and these represent about half of the original frieze. These belonged to the eastern (front) side, showing the Birth of Zeus; to the southern side, with the Carian 'pantheon'; to the western side, with a Gigantomachy; and to the northern side, with an enigmatic gathering of cuirassed male warriors, Amazons, deities and personifications. Opinions differ about the date and especially about the meaning of the northern part of the frieze. In his book, the author deals in turn with the research history; the as yet unpublished excavation of 2000; the dating of the frieze and the interpretation of the scenes; the production process; Caria; the frieze and the artistic context; the temple; and finally the compositional, narrative and typological aspects of the frieze and its figures.

In the historical context, we know that the Roman Senate rewarded Stratonikeia for its loyalty during the second Mithradatic war with privileges, e.g. the right of asylum in the Hekateion. An inscription in the pronaos gives the temple building a *terminus ante quem* of 81 BC. However, the date of the construction of the temple and frieze can only be estimated on the basis of typological and stylistic comparisons. Using this method Baumeister dates the frieze at between ca 120/110 and 90 BC, and distinguishes five contemporaneous workshops of sculptors who were mainly of local and partly of Rhodian origin.

The handshake scene on slab 223 of the northern frieze plays a prominent role in the interpretation. The emphasis that scholars place upon this scene raises several questions. For example, what is the relationship between the four frieze themes and Hekate? Which side of the frieze is the main one and why? Does the frieze have historical elements or a political message, or both?

For example, on the Lagina frieze Hekate does not have a triple body, and only in the Gigantomachy on slab 228 is an object found that could be a torch. Baumeister hardly addresses the issue of the identification of Hekate on the east and north side, in particular why the goddess does not carry her traditional attribute that allows visitors to identify her as Hekate. She has been depicted on Hellenistic coins from Stratonikeia with or without torch, and on several coins she is depicted with Zeus or Nike on the reverse side.

People approaching the Hekateion would see the eastern side of the frieze first, showing the Birth of Zeus. The question not fully addressed by Baumeister is why the handshake scene has been positioned on the northern side. If the handshake scene was so important to the identity of the *polis*, why was this slab not positioned in the middle of the frieze? The answer to this

question depends on the interpretation of the remaining fragments of the northern frieze, and more specifically slab 223 that shows an armoured man shaking the hand of an Amazon. If the frieze should be read clockwise, starting with the Birth of Zeus, then assuming that a procession would encircle the temple, the handshake scene could have been seen as the culminating point.

The gathering depicted on the northern side can be viewed as a unique case that differs from the standard iconography of the Amazon battle of the classical period. On one hand a tropaion visible behind the handshake scene suggests a victory. On the other hand the defeated Amazons do not show signs of submission. Though a torch cannot be seen, Baumeister suggests that, based on depictions of Hekate on coins from Stratonikeia, the woman to the right of the Amazon could be Hekate making a libation. Baumeister presumes that the deity to whom the temple has been dedicated must have been depicted in what has been considered to be the most important scene of the frieze.

J. Chamonard interpreted the scene as an act of friendship in which the male warrior would represent Roma, a personification of the Romans, and an Amazon, personifying the people of Stratonikeia or Caria. However literary sources do not mention a link between Stratonikeia, Lagina or Caria and Amazons. In Greek mythology Amazons originally lived in Pontus, and they were supposed to have founded Smyrna, Ephesos, Sinope and Paphos. It was also believed that they invaded Lycia, but a link with Caria has not been demonstrated. The problem is that the handshake scene suggests equality between two parties, which does not match the Roman view of conquered enemies.

Baumeister presents an alternative interpretation of the handshake scene, to which K. Tuchelt has already hinted. He argues that the scene should be interpreted as an allegory, which is typical in Hellenistic art (cf. the Archelaos relief and the Tazza Farnese, both dated by Baumeister to the end of the 2nd century BC). The 'Roman', according to Baumeister, who is shaking the hand of the Amazon, should be seen as a Greek. The handshake would represent the reconciliation between old enemies. The theme of the relief would express the *utopia* of peace (pp. 56-61).

The representation of the warrior as a Greek, however, cannot be accepted at face value. Cuirassed Greeks are not known in visualized Amazonomachies. The military dress of the male warrior suggests that he is Roman; his helmet, however, does not show the typical cheek pieces visible on Roman Republican coins.

There is some suggestion that linkage with documented political events, critical to the good fortune of Stratonikeia, can be found. In this particular case, the two candidates involved appear at the end of the Aristonikos revolt, and a treaty following the end of the second Mithradatic War. The latter option is, however, impossible as temple and frieze pre-date this war if Baumeister's stylistic analyses are correct. The northern part of the frieze may hint at the revolt of Aristonikos (130 BC), who drew the western part of Anatolia into war with Rome. Due to Roman intervention peace returned to the region. Caria probably became part of the Roman province Asia in 129 BC. Thus the handshake

scene could then be interpreted as an act of enduring peace. The Stratonikeians were already indebted to the Romans as the latter 'liberated' them from Rhodian dominion a few decades before. An undated inscription on the *cella* wall describes good fortune for Stratonikeia, due to a divine intervention of Hekate.

In summary, it is our opinion that the northern part of the frieze probably symbolizes the solidarity between Roman warriors and Stratonikeia/Caria, impersonated by Amazons, and guaranteed by a libation, possibly taken by Hekate. As Amazons were supposed to have been mythical city founders, they also can have had a positive meaning in Caria.

An appendix presents three frieze slabs similar in style and theme to the temple frieze but of smaller size, one of which was found in 2000. They may have belonged to an altar in front of the temple.

The book offers also a summary and conclusions in Turkish. All the frieze slabs are well illustrated. Photos of *comparanda* are absent. The book is without an index and a bibliography; however references can be found in 953 footnotes.

P. de Graaf and L.B. van der Meer

CRAIG A. MAUZY, with contributions by John Mck Camp II, *Agora Excavations 1931-2006; a Pictorial History*. Princeton N.J.: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 2006. 128 pp., 267 col. & b/w figs.; 30 cm. – ISBN 0-87661-910-3

This book celebrates the 75th anniversary of the American excavations of the Athenian agora; besides, in the same year the American School itself celebrated its 125th anniversary. It is a sympathetic, agreeable book, full of interest and at times truly moving. It starts with two photographs of the shadow of a photographer: of Dorothy Burr Thompson in 1932 and of Mauzy himself in 2006. The book is dedicated to 'all the photographers who have captured and preserved a visual record of our work during the past 75 years'.

It contains an account in old and recent pictures of a limited number of subjects. These subjects are: the first season, 1931 (pp. 1-30) and three of the most spectacular enterprises: the reconstruction of the stoa of Attalos (pp. 31-73), of the Church of the Holy Apostles (pp. 74-89), and the landscaping of the park (pp. 90-107). The chapter on the first excavation explains the notebooks and plans of the time and shows, in very fine photographs, the first field work and, e.g., the discovery of the altar of Zeus Agoraios (fig. 35) and of the torso of Hadrian (figs. 42-43); also we see the early workmen in action (figs. 47-48).

The stoa of Attalos is treated extensively in a truly adventurous account: we follow the planning (figs. 71-72), the work of the engineers and architects (pp. 29-43); we are taken to the quarries (pp. 44-49), and note the loading of the blocks for transport from the quarries to Athens. We follow the stone cutters at work (figs. 89-99); how the foundations are laid and the basement is constructed (pp. 54-55); the steel and concrete that is used (pp. 56-57); the constructions of the floors, the raising of the columns (pp. 60-61), the laying of the roof tiles

(fig. 144); the inauguration (p. 71) and the museum (pp. 72-73). All this provides very welcome and visually intelligible and enjoyable information.

The restoration of the church of the Holy Apostles was a very different piece of work (pp. 74-89). After fine drawings of the church (figs. 160-165) we follow the building of the complicated domes (pp. 82-85) and at the end we enter the church and see the frescoes, some taken from the church of Hagios Spyridon (pp. 86-88).

The chapter on landscaping (figs. 199-237) shows the proposal and the choice of plants and then illustrates the great change in the way the site of the agora is now to be viewed: formerly, empty and full of highly fascinating ruins and traces of walls, such as archaeologist enjoy, in figs. 206 and 209; 212 and 215; and now full of lush trees that mask almost everything that is archaeologically of interest, in figs. 208 and 211, 214 and 217. The garden of Hephaestus is treated separately in figs. 218-224: the inauguration and the final result of the project is seen in figs. 228-237.

The book ends with a kind of 'family-album' of the staff (pp. 108-128), sometimes lively action pictures, sometimes embarrassingly stiffly arranged groups of ladies and gentlemen, very like the 'nostalgic' pictures of our own school days (figs. 240-267). Look at the impressively aristocratic photograph of Leslie Shear (fig. 241), the lively snapshot of Homer Thompson with two fine pots (fig. 242b) and of Dorothy Burr hard at work in fig. 243b and Virginia Grace, graceful indeed: fig. 251b. Then there are, of course, Alison Frantz (fig. 253), John Travlos (fig. 249), Lucy Talcott (fig. 252) and many others who had a long association with the agora (William B. Dinsmoor Jr., Evelyn B. Harrison and others). And who would not like the sturdy workmen in the last picture, fig. 265, some young and muscled, others bellied and friendly? Such photographs in themselves justify the unexpected and rather untraditional conception of this festive edition which celebrates, after all, a most monumental archaeological enterprise that could never have been undertaken but for the grand American way of thinking. The archaeological world should be grateful to them and to the authors of this book.

J.M. Hemelrijk

ANNA LEMOS, *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum, Greece, Fasc. 10; Rhodes, Archaeological Museum, Fasc. 1; Attic Black Figure*. Athens: Academy of Athens, 2007. 138 pp., 51 figs., 95 pls.; 32.5 cm. – ISBN 978-960-404-098-8 / ISSN 1108-3670.

The committee for the *Greek Corpus Vasorum* may be proud of the steady growth of the series and the quality of the fascicules. The present one is no 10 of Greece and no 1 of the museum of Rhodes. It is lavishly edited. It contains part of the Attic bf. vases found by the Italians during their excavations of Ialysos and Camiros (but vases published in the CVA Italy 9 and 10, dealing with Rhodes, are excluded, apart from ten items mentioned in the Preface). Of most of the other pots photos and descriptions have been published in *ASAtene* or *CIRh*. As the total number of the Attic vases in question is over three hundred, the present fascicule contains only

the closed shapes; the open ones are planned for a following volume. Here we find amphorae type B, one of type A (Swing Painter) and one of C (the Affector), and numerous neck amphorae, hydriai, pelikai, kalpides, oinochoai, olpai, lekythoi etc.

It is interesting to see what vases the Rhodians approved of for the graves of their deceased. There are, of course, attractive and pleasing vases: pl. 1, for example, is a nice horse-head amphora (ht. 25 cm) and quite attractive are such vases as the tall amphora by the Princeton Painter (ht. 52.5 cm, pls. 12ff) and those of pls. 17-19 and others, but the general quality of the numerous slight vases, mostly small, of pls. 55-95, is mediocre and often downright shoddy.

The texts with the descriptions and discussions are very extensive: for 95 plates there are no less than 132 pages printed in two columns. The comments are very learned and instructive; they contain great numbers of bibliographical references for all kinds of details of shapes and paintings. There are 51 excellent profile- and section-drawings and most of the numerous photographs on the plates are impeccable. There are the indispensable indices for inventory numbers, artists and subject matter. In short, the work is in most respects highly praiseworthy and admirable. Yet some critical notes should be made.

In the Preface, a few words ought to have been devoted to the history and circumstances of the Italian excavations. Then, there is the fact that this is an exceptional fascicule in that the vases are nearly all from published excavations and therefore have a known context. Each context might have been specified with a few words (not only with the references to the publications in *ClRh* and *ASAtene*). Also, there is no index of the tombs in which the vases were found and we are not told which vases come from one and the same tomb (we can find some information with the help of the inventory numbers on pp. 133-134). Further, though we are sometimes told that the burial was inhumation or cremation, in most cases we are not (see ad pls. 2, 5, 6, 10, 57, 58 etc), neither are we told whether the grave in question was an individual burial or a family tomb; nor whether it contained a male or a female corpse (if known). These particularities are wholly lost for most vases in nearly all other fascicules of the *CVA*. Perhaps this objection can be addressed in the next fascicule?

The discussions of the texts are very detailed but they are not without inaccuracies. They could have done with a final proof reading. It would carry us too far to draw attention to many of these slight flaws, but a small number chosen arbitrarily may be mentioned.

That the numerous chariots are called *bigae* (though they are *quadrigae*) and that some vases are said to be 'intact' though big fragments may be missing (e.g. pl. 7, p. 21) is of little importance, but some descriptions are incorrect or incomplete, especially when the drawing is muddled. One or two examples may be mentioned.

In the scenes on the neck amphora by the Madrid Painter of pls. 31-33 (p. 51) the (badly drawn) left arm of the left-hand satyr (pl. 33.2) is slung over the right arm of the maenad in an impossible way (the painter probably meant that he had thrown this arm around both her shoulders); and the maenad is playing the *krotala*, her right arm lifted high (not her left).

Incomplete also is the description of pl. 6 (p. 20), where the horse A2 is said to have two tails (the author probably mistook the double incision outlining the shoulder of the left-hand horse, A1, for a second tail). Again, the drawing is bad: the right leg of the horseman, A1 on the offside, is incised right over the tail of the horse A2, on the nearside, and the front hooves and fetlocks of horse A1 are sketched too far off to the right (visible under the belly of A2 with hairs incised on the fetlocks). It seems as if the horse A2 (which wears a bridle) has broken loose and is now being pursued by horseman A1, a highly unusual scene: one expects a horseman falling off or on the ground. A similar lack of precision is found in the description of the scenes of the big amphora of pl. 11.2 (p. 25). Here Heracles chokes the lion with his right arm round its neck, while his left hand seems to pull at its tongue in its open jaws: a truly effective way to prevent biting. Heracles never wields a weapon with his left hand (the author supposes on p. 27 that he has thrust his sword with this hand down the lion's throat, but no sword is to be seen). Tongue-pulling does not, to my knowledge, occur in pictures of the Nemean lion, but it is not uncommon in fights against sea monsters (*kētē*). In the other scene of this vase (pl. 11.1) the attacking warrior stands on the pole of the chariot (as Heracles does in *Gigantomachies*): his (left?) foot is clearly visible in the somewhat blurred photo.

The chariot departure of the Princeton Painter on pl. 13 and the frontispiece, is called an 'everyday-life scene' (repeated on p. 35 for pl. 18), but the family of the deceased must have regarded it as a kind of heroization of the buried man, who is associated with the person in the chariot (who cannot be meant as the *paidagogos* as is said in the text; one is inclined to think that his son is thought to be next to him serving as his charioteer); and at the same time he may have been associated with the hoplite in full armour next to the quadriga (a natural assumption since all Athenians had to fight in the wars of their city). The family would view this scene as a happy symbol of the departure from life of an important male of the family, a thought prompted by scenes such as the apotheosis of Heracles, pl. 24, or the departure of Athena, pl. 33. The same holds for nearly all other departure scenes with a quadriga, such as pl. 18, where on the other side Dionysus with his frolicking satyrs forebodes, I think, happiness for the deceased. However, we are not told if these graves were of adult men or not.

On pl. 50.2 there is no comment on the way the painter muddled his concept: the right hand of the warrior (on the offside in the chariot) is open and empty, his left hand holds his shield not by the usual *porpax* but by a long, slack rope (four incisions) attached to the rim of the shield. His spear slants upwards from behind this shield but he does not hold it. Clearly the painter became confused by the complexity of what he wanted to draw: the edge of his shield on the offside cuts through the railing of the chariot which is on the nearside.

There are other interpretations of figured scenes with which one may disagree, but this must suffice because of the limited scope of this review.

There is little reason to criticise the author's dating, but the olpai of pls. 66 and 67, from one and the same tomb, are surely 510-500 at the earliest, not 530-520 BC, *pace* Lemos (curiously, the drawing of both is praised

highly - 'extremely delicate incising'; pp. 91-92 - though the lion's head on pl. 66.3 is simply awful). Another example is the flattish aryballos of pl. 95 which should, I believe, be dated to about 500 BC or later, judging by the legs of the runners (the hindmost being off the ground in the air and even the front feet, on which the athletes land, are above the ground).

Though more such points could easily be made, it would not be proper to continue in this manner: the text is so rich that minor defects may remain unmentioned here. There is one exception, however: the numerous mistakes in the indications of the scale of the section drawings figs. 1-51. I give a few examples (but there may be more): the vase of fig. 1 (pl. 1, ht. 24-25 cm) is printed 1:1 (not 2:3); that of fig. 6 (ht. 43.7 cm; pl. 17) is nearer to 1:2 than 2:3; fig. 7 (pl. 19, ht. 37.2 cm) is near 3:5 (not 1:2); fig. 8 (pl. 22, ht. 26.7 cm) is 1:1 (not 2:3) and fig. 10 is enlarged to about 5:3.5 (ht. 11.7 cm, pl. 23.1-4); erroneous also are the indications of the scale of figs. 12, 21, 22, 24, 35, 36 (the last two are 2:3). From the drawing fig. 33, of the olpe of pl. 66, 1-3, it appears that the indication of the height in the text should be 14.6 cm, not 15.6 cm (as mentioned on p. 91). As regards fig. 3 (printed 1:2), the thickness of its wall above the foot seems impossible: nearly 2 cm (pl. 7; ht. 31.5 cm). Finally, I suspect the accuracy of the section drawings of the inside of the attachment of the necks into the shoulders of the lekythoi figs. 39-49: there should be traces of the extra clay which is used to insert and fasten the necks into the shoulders (see the CT [computer tomography] scans in CVA *Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum* 3, 2006).

However, as has repeatedly been said above, this is a very thorough piece of work, containing a wealth of information; it is a welcome addition to our knowledge of Greek vases and a pleasure to study.

J.M. Hemelrijk

EVA SIMANTONI-BOURNIA, *La céramique grecque à reliefs. Ateliers insulaires du VIII^e au VI^e siècle avant J.-C.* Genève: Librairie Droz S.A., 2004. 174 pp., 72 pls.; 29.5 cm (Hautes Études du monde gréco-romain 32). – ISBN 2-600-00936-1 / ISSN 1016-7005.

The relief decoration of Greek pithoi and other monumental pottery of historical times starts in the 8th and disappears at the end of the 6th century BC. In her book the author presents the development of the pithoi and amphorae that were produced on the islands. The vases from Boeotia are also included, because they cannot be dissociated from those of Tenos (p. 7 with n.2; p. 113). Of the Cretan and Rhodian ware only the published material is discussed (and therefore very few photographs are printed here). The most instructive part is the chapter on the Cyclades, with the Appendix (pp. 135-145) which contains unknown fragments from Tenos (a full publication will follow). Here the photos are good: e.g. figs. 46-110. In the other sections the photos are few and often unclear (see, e.g. figs. 7-8, 14, 22, 24-36 etc; fig. 64 on pl. 28 is lacking). The author's main interest are the figured scenes, ornaments are treated incidentally (p. 8).

The book is written for experts; it has to be read with many other books at hand, for most of the items dis-

cussed are, unfortunately, not illustrated. As for the organization of the material, one would have liked numbered lists of the vases that are assigned to the groups of Crete (pp. 21-47), Rhodes (pp. 49-60) and the Cyclades (pp. 63-120), but no such lists are given. This makes it difficult to coordinate the figures with the text; the reader has to note the pages in pencil next to the pictures to find his way. The list of illustrations is not very helpful; it does not even indicate the size of the vases and fragments (pp. 167-171). Also, the reviewer would have welcomed section- or profile-drawings of some of the shapes, and drawings of the most striking ornaments, for example the remarkable multiple-hook-shaped or step-like patterns such as those of pls. 21-23; 24, 48. In other respects the book is well-organized and full of interest.

The introduction (pp. 9-20) deals with terminology, the very difficult techniques of production of these monumental pots (sometimes about 2 m high); they were made in sections placed on top of each other, two or three for the body and one for the neck and the joints were sometimes covered by bands of clay, often ribbed. Further, we read about the application of their relief-ornaments, the (apparently only incidental) colouring of the reliefs or the background; the use of the vases (at home, in sanctuaries, tombs etc.) and the rather surprising fact that not only the potters but also the vases could travel, for vases produced with the same cylinder seals are found far from each other and shipwrecks show that big pithoi were not too difficult to transport, pp. 16-17. It ends with a short discussion of the precursors, their shape and decoration (but without illustrations, except for the hand-modelled, Late-Minoan fragment, pl. 1,1, figuring a colossal bull with a frontal head).

Chapter 1 discusses the relief pots from Crete which are arranged in five groups from 690-550 BC, a grouping proposed by J. Schäfer, *Reliefpithoi*, Kallmünz, 1957, here applied with a slightly later dating. This chapter contains a detailed discussion of no less than 25 pages (pp. 22-47) which cannot easily be summarized. Among the few pictures given of group I (690-660 BC), there is a fragment in Oxford (pl. 1.3) with friezes of impressed spirals above and below a row of supine warriors, each leaning far backward on his right hand looking round, and holding a staff in his left hand. The figures were made with a flat stamp seal. Underneath each there is a slanting line (vaguely reminiscent of the deck of an upturned ship). On the fragment pl. 2.4 we see, under a fine cable on the rim, parts of centaurs holding two branches (670-660 BC). On a fragment of group II a (small) Master of Animals is holding two (colossal) panthers by the ears (pl. 2.5-6; 660-640 BC). There is also a powerful woman's head (pl. 5.12; a sphinx?). In group III (which contains the studios of Arcades and central Crete; 640-610 BC, pp. 29-40) we have a variety of fine reliefs (pls. 3-8); e.g. a number of sphinxes, a lion with an arrow through his jaw (pl. 5.13), hieroi gamoi (p. 34, pl. 3.8; pl. 4.11), a (rather doubtful?) Bellerophon falling from his Pegasus (an incident alluded to by Pindar, *Isthm.* 7.44-47; p. 35, pl. 7.16), frontal hoplites (p. 35), a Mistress of Horses (pl. 7.17) and Clytaemnestra being killed (p. 37). Of group IV (610-590 BC; pp. 40-43) two metopes of the neck of an amphora from Phaistos are reproduced (pl. 9): a

healthy, short-bodied horse and a fine cock which looks later than 590 BC to me.

In group V (pp. 43-47, 590-550 BC) we find Heracles and Cerberus (pl.10, 23) and what is, I think wrongly, believed to be a hunt of the Kerynean hind (p. 45, see n. 207) but also a curious scene with two satyrs (?) holding a woman by the wrist (p. 46 n. 211), a scene that is reminiscent of those with the Dioscuroi and Helen. All through this excellent text one regrets the lack of pictures.

The second chapter deals with the relief-vases from Rhodes (pp. 49-60), first studied by Feytmans who recognised three centres: Lindos, Camiros and Ialysos. Schäfer distinguishes three groups (the date of the first group is here lowered): Group I 710-675 BC; Group II 675-600 BC; Group III 600-510.

Group I (710-675 BC), begins with short-necked amphorae (pl. 11,24); the ornaments are impressed on the surface, not on raised bands, and were made with cylinder seals; they become more and more interesting and intricate on the following vases (but are not visible in the pictures). In Group II (675-600 BC) shapes are more slender, necks tall with complicated handles (pls. 11,25 and 12,26-27). The ornaments are described on p. 52: they are arranged in a way reminiscent of tapestry, but with many curvilinear elements (spirals etc.); pls. 12-13. The cross-shaped decoration of the neck on pls. 11,25; 12 and 13,31, is continued in Group III (600-510 BC), pls. 14,32; 15. The vases from Ialysos III are very different (pls. 16-17; p. 55). Figures are rare (p. 56) and the artisans are only occasionally interested in mythological scenes or combats (pp. 56-62). The subjects are sphinxes, horses and the like, but there are two combats of a centaur and a warrior (pp. 57-58, pl. 18, 37-38; a Titanomachia?).

The third chapter deals with the relief vases from the Cyclades (pp. 63-120) and forms the author's main contribution. The original centre must have been Tenos (p. 63). The artisans of these vases were very gifted personalities, creating a kind of artistic *koinè*, different from the work of other regions. These amphorae are decorated with figured scenes, often mythological, from the geometric period onwards (in contrast with the painted pottery of the same region). In the 6th century the grand tradition of hand-made and mould-made decoration came to an end and was replaced by the use of the 'roulette' (cylinder seal). The author discusses the material in five chronological groups: Group I, 740-700 BC; Group II, 700-675 BC; Group III, 675-650 BC; Group IV, 650-600 BC and Group V, 6th century. The material is very rich: Group I (Andros, Tenos, Naxos and Amorgos) covers no less than 13 pages (pp. 65-78). The reliefs are made by hand and the linear motives are exceptionally fine. Three complete or nearly complete amphorae are preserved: pls. 20-21; and 22,42 (the shape of the last one is described as a gigantic version of an ovoid Proto-corinthian aryballos); and there are some big fragments (pl. 23). The most remarkable ornament is a multiplied angular z-shaped motif covering the whole surface (except the necks); on pls. 20 and 21 it makes for a confusing impression because the frieze lines do not stand out clearly. It occurs as a variety of the maeander, e.g. pl. 24,48. Some of these motifs are called 'motif en escalier' by the author (p. 70, pl. 23,43, especially frequent

on Naxos). Spirals appear a quarter of a century earlier than on painted pottery (p. 70). About 700 BC gigantic amphorae decorated exclusively with linear motifs are fashionable (p. 71). The figured decoration is remarkably rich (pp. 72 ff). The subjects are: dancers (male and female; pls. 25-26), battle scenes and rows of warriors (pls. 27-29), among which bowmen (pl. 29,70), centaurs and different animals (pls. 29,71; 30-31) and, in the last part of this period: elegant stallions (pl. 32,84) and a fragment with goats flanking a 'tree of life' (pl. 32,85).

The vases of Group II (700-675 BC, Tenos, Naxos, Attica, Boeotia and Euboea) are truly remarkable: in Tenos we have the "amphora of the dance" and that of the Birth of Athena (?), pls. 35-41. The figures on the earlier fragments, pl. 33,87 (p. 80; a man holding a billy goat by the horn) and pl. 34,88 (a horseman) are still a little awkward, but the fragment with an extremely wild animal fight (pl. 34,89) reminds one of considerably later scenes on Protoattic vases. The pair of a man and woman on the neck of the "amphora of the dance" (pl. 35,37) is not believed to be Theseus and Ariadne, because of 'une colonne de chevrons qui le sépare du reste de la scène' (p. 82). This 'column' is not visible in pl. 35 and one would like to have a closer look at the traces of three or four vertical ribs that seem to be preserved. I would rather associate them with objects belonging to the labyrinth or a ship; note that Theseus's thighs are marked by impressed lozenges, as are males on Cycladic and Middle Protoattic vases. Nearly all dancers are girls: apart from the boy who plays the double flutes (fig. 93), the only male to be seen grasps a girl by the lower arm and seems to pull her along (pl. 36,92). At any rate, the author may be right in believing that the dancers perform a non-mythological ritual (cf. the dancers on fragments in Tenos, pls. 25-26).

The 'amphora of the dance' in Tenos is dated about 690 BC (p. 83); after it, we see two cruel scenes (in Eretria and Athens, pl. 38) with corpses devoured by vultures (influenced by the Near East or scenes from the *Iliad*?). Then we come to the nearly complete amphora in Tenos with the so-called Birth of Athena, which is dated 675 BC (pls. 39-41). As reconstructed (pl. 39) the vase looks harmonious; the slightly concave outline of the neck fits the generous swelling of the body, which stands like a huge egg on a tiny foot (I do not agree with the rather deprecating description of the shape on p. 79). In the discussion of the Birth (pl. 40) we are not told how much of the 'divine' face is restored. In fact, it now looks definitely female; and the winged offspring emerging from this head does not look feminine at all (the pictures are unclear, but is there no beard?). However, we are - if I understand the text - told that the big frontal face originally did have a beard and is to be identified as Zeus (compare the later replica, a fragment in Tenos, of pl. 50,122, where a ridge may indicate a beard). The three little winged divinities - a female, believed to be Eileithyia, a male kneeling at a tripod (to kindle the fire for heating the bath water?) and one in the air, apparently observing the great event - make the scene even more mysterious.

The rest of the vase (pls. 39-41) may be by another artist: the figures are less detailed: a row of elegant horses on the shoulder and, below them, groups of panthers attacking animals and men; then, at the great-

est circumference, a fine procession of *bigae* (slender horses with stretched front legs) and, finally, a row of hoplites, only their upper part showing, as if they are marching behind a low fence (the four ridges forming the lower frieze line). There are some fragments of a later replica in Tenos, pl. 50, p. 95; but the winged female in fig. 123 cannot, I think, represent Eileithyia, because of its size and her grand polos; besides the object reaching upwards over her wing is not an *omphalotomos*, but clearly the claw of a lion, as appears from the lion's claw on the replica in Tenos of the famous Potnia scene, pl. 48,118 (see below).

Next we are shown two fragments, one (p. 85, pl. 42, 103) figuring a Minotaur (very like a horse!) and a well-known Europa on the bull (p. 86, pl. 42,104). Other sherds (pls. 43,107; 44,108-110) may be part of another scene with Theseus and Minotaur (p. 87-88); here we have the first prominent rendering of the human ear (pl. 44,108); note the protruding, thin-lipped mouths; the very round noses of the women contrast strangely with the pointed ones of the warriors, figs. 107-108.

Group III (675-650 BC; Tenos, Boeotia, Naxos, Paros, pp. 89-101) forms the *acmé* of the production, both in quantity and in quality. The amphora shape has changed: compare the pear-shaped, heavy-necked amphora of pl. 45 with the egg-shaped beauty of pl. 39 (Group II). To this period belong famous vases such as the one with the great frontal goddess with raised hands (Athens NM 5898, the so-called 'Potnia' vase from Thebes, not illustrated here), who is held by two small females and flanked by two lions who jump up seemingly to lick her hands (but compare the later replica from Tenos, pl. 48,118). She wears a kind of feather-crown with two branches sprouting from it to left and right (this she has in common with the famous colossal Hera head from the Heraion in Olympia; but the polos is lacking on the replica pl. 48,118). On pp. 90-91 no less than seven different explanations of this famous scene are given, none convincing. The composition with the lions reminds us of the monumental rock-cut Cybele in the Phrygian highlands (Arslan Kaya, recently ruined by treasure hunters).

Another famous vase is the Perseus amphora in the Louvre (CA 795; pl. 46, 112-113; p. 91); once more a fragment of a replica is known (Louvre CA 937; pl. 46,114). Medusa is portrayed as a true monster, a centauress (perhaps because she bore a man and a horse: Chysaor and Pegasus). The relief on these vases is relatively flat (p. 92), more so than on the famous Mykonos vase with the fall of Troy. Only three of the gruesome metope-scenes on the belly of this monumental vase are reproduced here: the lonely woman wringing her hands (Cassandra), Neoptolemos killing Astyanax while Andromache stretches her hands to protect him, and Menelaos menacing Helen who unveils her face (pls. 47-48). The murder scenes are gruesome; big eyes, thick arms and legs, huge swords. And, on the neck, the Greeks are pouring out of the large wooden horse like a swarm of vicious ants (not illustrated here). To sit through a series of recitals of the *Ilioupersis* must have been a most frightening experience. This vase is dated towards the middle of the 7th century, when lyric poetry began to flourish and civilised feelings of great sensitivity were spreading: the Mykonos vase seems to lag behind in this development. Another *Ilioupersis* vase is preserved in a number of

fragments from Tenos, with the wheels of the wooden horse, battle scenes and birds of prey at work on corpses (pls. 51-54; pp. 95-96, these scenes are not in metopes). This vase is attributed to the master of the Potnia discussed above, as are the fragments of pl. 55. Vases from Naxos and Paros are illustrated on pls. 56-57; the description of fig. 139 (in Naxos) on p. 99 is difficult to follow, but the scene is said to represent Achilles and Penthesileia.

Group IV (Tenos, Boeotia, Naxos and Thera, pp. 101-113) is dated 650-600 BC. The first vase of this group is the well-known Boston amphora with the solemn procession, possibly of Theano and the Trojan women, carrying the new peplos towards the Athena temple in Troy (pl. 60).

The famous amphora in Basle with Theseus and the Minotaur and the Athenian youths (complete with the thread and the unwound ball, pls. 58-59) is dated 640 (p. 105); the Minotaur looks more like a horse (except for its tail, pl. 59,143) and the manes of the horses on the shoulder are now rendered with separate locks (pl. 59,144). Of the same period is the fragment with part of a *quadriga* in Tenos, pl. 61,147, which is praised unduly: *rien n'égale la finesse et la plasticité des têtes* (p. 105). Four more fragments from Tenos are shown on pls. 61-62 (pp. 106-107), three with warriors, another (fig. 151) with a row of women, one with a child in her arms (hard to see) and a monkey on a leash; this may be a picture of the departure of Amphiaraios. About 625 is the date of a badly preserved, puzzling amphora in Boston (pp. 108-109) with, on the neck, perhaps Priam being killed by Neoptolemos in the presence of Hecuba (not illustrated, Priam sitting on a tripod, as the author explains; but it may also be the death of Agamemnon or of Aegisthus) and, on the belly (pl. 63,152), a warrior in ambush with a fine bull behind him (believed to be Achilles robbing Aeneas' cattle and menacing him; *Iliad* 20, 90-92). A fragment from Tenos, pl. 64,154, shows in the lower frieze the same motif as the Boston vase just mentioned (with the 'death of Priam'): strange snake-like ribbons waving up and down. To the same group belongs the Louvre fragment from Tanagra pl. 64,156 (p. 110) with the upper part of two women dancing (?) whose faces and clothes suddenly seem more progressive than all foregoing work (not before 600 BC, I should say); less advanced, it seems to me, is a Thera amphora, at least judged by the *bigae* in metopes on the belly (pl. 65,157; p. 111), while the fragment pl. 65,158 may again be about 600.

On pp. 112-113 the author summarizes the special character of the relief vases from the Cyclades (including those of Boeotia) belonging to the first four groups (down to about 600 BC): apart from the wealth of scenes, some inspired by the Near East, there is the grand style and the lack of filling ornaments (both due to hand-moulding). All this ends with the start of group V (6th century- beginning of the 5th, pp. 113-122); in this group the reliefs are mostly made with '*la roulette*', the cylinder seal, which rarely was larger than 6-7 cm; and indeed, the difference is remarkable (pls. 66-72). In group V many other shapes are decorated with reliefs (lekanides, perirhanteria, louteria and the like). Of course, cylinder seals could easily be transported, yet it is assumed that potters continued to travel (p. 115). Far less material is now found on Tenos

(pl. 66); the main production shifted to the north: Chios, Thasos and Samothrace. From the Cyclades we have fine fragments from Melos (pl. 67; Heracles and the centaurs; rows of chariots); from Siphnos (pls. 68-70, 168 mules, dancers and cables etc.), some good scenes from Kea and from Thasos (Dionysus and his thiasos, the departure of Amphiaros, pls. 70-72; pp. 120-122) and a picture of a Triton with an octopus in his outstretched hand from Chios (pl. 72, 174).

In the final conclusion (pp. 122-126) the representations in painted pottery are compared with those of the relief vases; this leads to a catalogue of the themes depicted (pp. 127-131). Then follows (p. 135-143) the Appendix with the fragments from Tenos. Finally there are a list of abbreviations (p. 147), an index of collections (p. 151; here the amphora in Jerusalem, discussed on pp. 23, 32, 34 is lacking), a general index (p. 153) and a table of illustrations (p. 167); the 72 plates that follow contain 174 pictures.

This swift, though rather lengthy, summary does in no way do justice to the wealth of material and the interest of the discussions in this very thorough book: it constitutes an important step forward in the study of this fascinating field.

J.M. Hemelrijk

AENNE OHNESORG, *Ionische Altäre, Formen und Varianten einer Architekturgattung aus Insel- und Ostionien*. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 2005. XIV+259 S., 105 Textabb., 80 Taf.; 34 cm (Archäologische Forschungen 21). – ISBN 3 7861 2481 7.

This is a monumental and very impressive piece of work. In his foreword G. Gruben calls it an exemplary success in *Bauforschung*: 'fast 100 Monuments kompetent untersucht, vermessen, zeichnerisch dargestellt und - soweit möglich - rekonstruiert'; it is a basis for all future research in the field. The average classical archaeologist is, of course, not sufficiently acquainted with the material and cannot really judge the merits of the book. Therefore I may refer to a rather less positive criticism in *RA* 2007 (1), 1-3 by Roland Étienne, who has himself devoted nearly thirty years of study to the altars of Delos and who ends his criticisms by stating, rather unkindly, that the value of the book lies mainly in the analyses of details. It is true, of course, that the presentation of details in the drawings and photographs is most enjoyable for the less specialized archaeologist who loves the inventiveness of Greek architecture and art; but it should be stressed that also in nearly all other respects, the text is crammed with highly fascinating information.

It contains five chapters: In I, the Introduction, we read that the great 'Prunkaltäre' (Ephesus, Priene, Kos, Magnesia and Pergamum) are omitted.

Such architectural 'Untersuchungen hätten den Rahmen dieser Arbeit gesprengt', 'besides, they are partly still being studied for further publication and we have to wait for the result' (p. 1). This may be true but is a little disappointing for the reader.

In II the typology and terminology are explained: block altars (some with volute acroteria), *Wangen Altäre*, and Herkos altars (figs. 1-6). Chapter III is the

catalogue and contains no less than 180 pages, subdivided as follows: A. Naxos; B. Paros; C. Delos; D. some altars on Thasos; E. *einzelne ionische Altäre*, which means an extensive, rather mixed collection of altars and fragments, e.g., from Samos, Didymae, Miletus, Ephesus, and many others, such as Keos, Aegina, Abdera, Epidaurus etc. This section E of chapter III runs from p. 121 to 189 and bears a bad misprint at the top of the pages, where we read D instead of E, which is very confusing when we are looking for the references to items in section III E. The last item in the Catalogue is the Ludovisi/Boston 'throne', pp. 184-189. Here Ohnesorg gives a summary of a more complete treatment of hers (published in *Nürnberger Blätter zur Archäologie* 14, 1997-1998, 119 ff). She follows the explanation given by A. Gerkan. The two reliefs are not by the same artist, the date is 470-460 BC. They are most probably from Lokri in South Italy. She restores them as *Giebelwangen* at the ends of the monumental altar in front of the peripteros of Lokri/Marasà, (which measures 12.75 x 2.55 m; see fig. 100, in which there are no steps to mount the platform). She refers to the enormous quantity of literature and, perhaps understandably, ignores the curious inconsistencies and differences in the style of the two reliefs.

(The reader may want to know that Étienne's criticism is directed, among other things, against Cat. nos 11, 12, 21 and 24.)

Chapter IV is called *Ergebnisse* and discusses a great variety of subjects illustrated by type-drawings and chronologically arranged tables. It is subdivided into paragraphs that are marked with the capitals A to P. Some of them may be mentioned here. In section A (pp. 191-198) the characteristics of the altars are described (block altars etc.), with drawings of the *Giebelwangen* (fig. 102) and a collection of the Ionian *Antenaltäre* (16 examples in fig. 103; here too is a short summary of the altars of Hera at Samos, p. 191). In par. B (pp. 199-204) we find a discussion, with chronological tables, of the typically East Greek anta-capitals that, in side-view, display three superimposed volutes (see Table I, pp. 201-204, and e.g. figs. 71-77, 80, 104 and pls. 71-72, 76). This is of special interest to the present reviewer for this altar type is seen on the Caeretan hydria with the Busiris-myth in Vienna and, therefore, a clear indication of the original homeland of the painter and of the date of the hydria (note also the 'Caeretan' lotus-palmette on the front of such a capital in Didyma, pl. 72.2). Other topics in the following paragraphs are: proportions and dimensions (D; pp. 211-218, with Table 4), position and orientation in the sanctuaries (E), monolithic block altars (K), *bothroi* and *escharai* (L), floral and figurative ornamentation inclusive of *Giebelwangen* (M); continuity of cults (O) and representations of altars (P). Chapter V is a short summary ('*Schluss*', pp. 250-251) followed by a list of altars that are mentioned in the text but not extensively republished here (pp. 253-258).

There are some hundred text figures and 35 plates with splendid drawings; these are followed by 45 plates with photographs (pls. 35-80).

The plans and drawings are excellent and the comments full and masterful. Yet, the reader is sometimes puzzled when he tries to distinguish between the different drawings on a plate: on pl. 4, for example, we have fragments from Samos, Cos and Naxos but they

are not clearly distinguished from each other in the plate. One may occasionally feel left in the dark also in other respects: figs. 51-53 (pp. 110 ff) may serve as an example: what is the long rectangle of rough stones on the right? Besides, there are no photographs. Sometimes the reader may feel that there is a mistake: for example, the drawing of the lotus-palmette of fig. 65, p. 127, differs from the photo in pl. 66.6: see the horizontal ridges that close the hollow canals of the volutes in the photograph. In the same way, though very rarely, other slight mistakes seem to have been made: in fig. 13 there should be a *niedrige Deckplatte* (p. 24) covering the Ionic *kymation*.

These trivial remarks are mentioned only to make clear that the reader has to be very attentive when reading the text. It is clear that the book is an *opus maximum* that will be consulted and closely studied for many decades to come.

J.M. Hemelrijk

CAROL LAWTON, *Marbleworkers in the Athenian Agora*. Princeton, NJ: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 2006. 52 pp., 58 col. & b/w figs.; 21 cm (Excavations of the Athenian Agora Picture books 27). – ISBN 0-87661-645-7.

Marbleworkers in the Athenian Agora is a delightful addition to the Athenian Agora Picture Book series. An overview of the sculpture and the various sculpture-related establishments of the Agora was long overdue, and this informative and particularly well-illustrated book provides much of the findings and more recent research interests in the field.

The book sets off with a general introduction to Greek sculpture and a brief discussion of Athena Ergane. More interesting to sculpture scholars is the overview of sculpture workshops found in the Agora, notably in the southwest Residential-Industrial area. This part of the Agora was excavated mostly between 1939-40 and 1946-49, and published extensively by Robert Young (*Hesperia* 20, 1951, 135-288). Lawton smartly summarises the information in that article as well as later authorities such as John Camp (*The Athenian Agora: Excavations in the heart of Classical Athens*, 1986; also T.L. Shear, *Hesperia* 38, 1969, 382-417). Although this procedure results in a good overview of sculptural activity in the ancient Agora, it also is the cause of the one aspect where the book could be considered remiss. Since Young's 1951 article, and apart from an excavation report on a cistern in the so-called House of Mikion and Menon (S.G. Miller, *Hesperia* 43, 1974, 194-245), the Residential-Industrial area has to my knowledge been mentioned (F. Börner, *Die bauliche Entwicklung Athens als Handelsplatz in archaischer und klassischer Zeit*, 1996), but not thoroughly reassessed in publication. This has undoubtedly practical reasons, but the hope that some new information would be offered in this picture book was not fulfilled. Some particularities of the original report that could perhaps be readjusted with recently developed technological means have been copied in consecutive publications, including the book under review: I am thinking especially of the research regarding the painting of statues, which must have

taken place in many parts of the industrial district. In the 1940s the necessary technical research was uncommon, although some interesting tests were done at the time of excavation (Young 1951, 231-234, esp. n. 114). Lawton's good section on the colouring of ancient sculpture would have been even better had this aspect been included in the discussion of the workshops, where some suggestive installations may have had a purpose in producing paints (cf. Hochscheid diss. *Transactions in Stone. The social function of private sculpture in Athens in the sixth and fifth century BC*, forthcoming).

Another example of this issue is the aforementioned House of Mikion and Menon. Naming the house thus on the basis of a number of graffiti on pots at the later end (fig. 17), and an inscribed stylus (fig. 16) on the earlier has of course great charm. However, I would like to postulate that it is in fact not very likely that Mikion was the sculptor who used the stylus (cf. Hochscheid diss.). The house is doubtlessly a sculpture workshop and was in use as such, as Lawton describes, from the 5th until the early 3rd century BC. None of the publications mention any signs of bone working in the house itself. Further down the Street of the Marble Workers however, in a tank next to house F, a collection of sawn parts of bones was found (Young 1951, 233-234; Börner 1996, 95). It is at least possible that a bone worker lived in this house (or elsewhere in the district), who put his name on the styli he produced for commercial purposes: *Mikion made me*. A sculptor who had a relatively large house and workshop just off the Agora cannot have been unsuccessful; it is not entirely obvious why he would make his own styli, and moreover, why he would put his *fecit* on them when his real craft was marble sculpture. It seems somehow doubtful that a good sculptor in 5th-century Athens would have had a sideline in bone styli.

Of course, as the book points out, sculptors come in all shapes and sizes: the literarily famous, the epigraphically known, and the anonymous, sometimes brilliant at their trade and sometimes of mediocre skill. As can be expected from a scholar such as Lawton, the chapters on the craftsmen are eminently thorough and accurate and offer much material for anyone interested in the subject. Linking sculpture to known masters is notoriously difficult and less often practised in current scholarship than in earlier days. This section of the book shows how much ancient sculpture comes to life when the creator's personality - and his workplace - is studied. Finally, the description of the Omega house, home to a once beautiful collection of sculpture, brings the marble workers of the Agora to their nostalgic end.

There are some minor errors: the unfinished statue in fig. 24 is on Naxos, not Thasos; the pelike in the Louvre (inv. no Cp 10793) is not from c. 370 but about a century earlier; and it was Justinian, not Julian (p. 49) who in 529 AD 'closed the philosophy schools' as it is commonly described. Nonetheless, this picture book is a fine addition to its kind: well written, beautifully illustrated and easily accessible. Now we must wait for a new publication in the greater Agora series about the sculpture of the Agora and its creators.

Helle Hochscheid

CHRISTOS IOANITIS, *Le vase des Ibères. Un lécythe du Peintre de Darius*. Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 2007. 59 pp., 15 pls. and 1 folded plate; 26.4 cm. – ISBN 978-3-8053-3806-6.

Topic of this well edited booklet is an enigmatic main scene on a lekythos of one of the most fascinating painters of Apulian red figure vases, the Darius Painter. The vase, partially preserved and restored from fragments, is in the Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe at Hamburg (inv. no 2003.129; h. ca 80 cm). The representation shows a naiskos flanked by armed, oriental men. In the *naiskos* a bearded man with a ram's horn in his hair holding a scepter crowned by a *naiskos* is sitting (to left) on a throne. To left, almost frontally, stands a veiled woman with spread arms. On the plinth are two inscriptions: ΙΣ ... under the woman and ΙΒΗΡΕΣ under the seated man. Under - this means in front of - the *naiskos* stands an altar flanked by two tripods. A lifeless ram lies partly behind the altar. The armed men to the right stand near two palms and an altar. To the (damaged) left an old man holding a scepter seems to speak with a nude, long haired, crowned (?) young man holding a branch in his right and a scepter (?) in his left hand, who is standing in a higher position (there is no photograph of his upper body).

Chr. Ioanitis (= C.I.), interprets the horned man as Zeus Ammon at Siwa and the inscription *Ibères* as a title (cf. *Persai* and *Phryges* on other Darius vases). He discusses 11 Apulian vases (ca 360/340-320/310 BC) with *naiskos* scepters concluding that they only are held by mantic persons. The ram behind the altar would refer to the foundation of Ammon's oracle by Dionysos, son of Ammon, who sometimes is rendered with ram's horns too (see also Hyginus *Astr.* 2.20). How to complete the inscription *IS...*? There are no specific stories about a special relation between Isis and Ammon (at Siwa). Therefore, C.I. conjectures that *IS...* might be *Isonomia*, personification of Equality (of political rights). The concept fits in a story of the Lacedaemonian Lysandros, the winning general of the battle near Aigos Potamos, who wanted to become king. So, he wished that everybody could be elected as king. He went for advice to the oracles of Delphi, Dodona and Siwa, where he tried to bribe king Libys. That became the ruin of him. Ambassadors sent by the clergy of Siwa betrayed him at Sparta. C.I. interprets tentatively the lady in the *naiskos* as *Isonomia* pleading for Lysandros' case. In my opinion, the desperate gesture of her open hands suggests that she is flabbergasted, maybe guessing Lysandros' failure. As literary sources sometimes associate *Ibères* with Libya (the region of Siwa), the armed warriors are probably Ammon's guardians. The title *Ibères* might refer to a lost tragedy, written by Sophocles the Younger between ca 400 and 375 BC. It may have dealt with Lysandros' *hybris*, an amusing theme for the Athenian audience after the battle mentioned above. Although C.I. does not say so, the presence of the tripods may point to the successful staging of the tragedy (e.g. at Taranto, in or soon after 331 BC when Alexander the Great visited Siwa).

C.I. admits that his interpretation is a hypothesis. In fact, the conversation of the old man with the (higher placed) nude, young man to the left of the *naiskos* is not

convincingly explained (p. 38: possibly Dionysos as founder of the oracle). The nude man is, however, rather Apollo than Dionysos. In my opinion it may be Lysandros talking to Apollo at Delphi. In addition, Apulian vase representations often show more than one event at the same time, in fact a main scene showing flash back and prolepsis moments, in short a chain of successive events.

Although C.I. does not date the *lekythos*, it probably dates from 331 BC, when Alexander visited Siwa, or soon after that date.

The booklet further offers an interesting chapter about the exceptional interest of the Darius Painter in the actualization of, sometimes unknown, myths, historical events and exoticism. The bibliography is excellent.

L.B. van der Meer

RICHARD DANIEL DE PUMA, *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum. U.S.A. 4: Northeastern Collections*. Rome: «L'Erma» di Bretschneider, 2005. 251 pp., 55 figs., 33 cm. – ISBN 88-8265-325-0.

NANCY THOMSON DE GRUMMOND, *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum. Great Britain: Oxford*. Rome: «L'Erma» di Bretschneider, 2007. 157 p., 92 figs., 33 cm. – ISBN 978-88-8265-443-6.

MARIA PAOLA BAGLIONE/FERNANDO GILOTTA (con la collaborazione di Lorenzeto Galeotti), *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum. Italia 6: Roma – Museo nazionale etrusco di Villa Giulia*. Fasc. 1. «L'Erma» di Bretschneider, 2007. 240 pp., ill., 33 cm. – ISBN 88-8265-408-7.

So far thirty fascicles of the CSE, the international corpus of Etruscan and Praenestine mirrors, have been published. The last three ones, mentioned above, are almost organized according to the CSE-instructions, presenting a catalogue including history, technical details, descriptions of obverse and reverse decorations, subject, iconographic and stylistic analyses, tentative dates and possible provenances.

The fourth fascicle of the CSE USA is a monumental book, written by R.D. de Puma. He made the drawings too. After an introduction on classification and terminology, intended for a broad public, 54, most unpublished, Etruscan, engraved and blank mirrors, mirror handles and pear-shaped mirrors (see below), preserved in collections at Amherst, Bryn Athyn, Bryn Mawr, Newark, New Haven, Northampton, Norton, Philadelphia, Poughkeepsie, Princeton and Worcester are analyzed. The provenances of ca half of the mirrors is known, in one case even a context, the 'Toscanello Tomb' (3rd-2nd centuries BC) at Tuscania (p. 41, fig. H and I). Six mirrors are of doubtful antiquity: their engravings are modern. The Appendix offers the chemical analysis results, based on inductively coupled plasma (ICP) atomic emission spectroscopy at the University of Iowa Hygienic Laboratory; the same procedure was used for the CSE USA 1-3 mirrors. The only inscribed mirrors show *the[his]* and *ach[le]*, (no 2: Thetis presenting sword and helmet to her son; ca 460 BC), *vanth*, *aplū*, *urste*, *metua* (no 34;

ca 350-300 BC), *tethis*, *achule* and *achuvesr* (not *achuisr*) before a basin (no 49; ca 300 BC), *artumes* (no 50; 400-300 BC). No 34 shows the Purification of Orestes at Delphi in an Etruscanized way: instead of a Fury Vanth, a death demon, is present. The presence of Metua is unexplained. The same holds good for the Etruscan deity Achuvesr on no 49 (see, however, *Cosmos* 5 (1989) 77-91). As for representations without inscriptions ca. 15 mirrors show the Dioskouroi (ca 250/220-150 BC) and 7 items 'Lasa's' (3rd-2nd centuries BC). Interesting are mirrors representing Dionysos, guided by Hermes, rescuing his mother Semele from the Underworld (no 28), and the Prophesying Head of Orpheus (no 45, a theme represented on 5 other mirrors). A box mirror (no 29) shows Hermes and the infant Dionysos on mount Nysa, a theme present on 4 other ones, all from Tarquinia. As the photographs often show corroded and encrusted mirrors, the precise drawings are a welcome compensation.

The third fascicle of the *CSE Great Britain* is a catalogue of 27, most unpublished, engraved and blank mirrors, in the Ashmolean Museum, Claydon House and Pitt Rivers Museum (once bought from 20 different dealers). The text was written by N. Thomson de Grummond (henceforth: De G.), the drawings were made by K. Bennett and N. Griffiths. The Appendix presents the analysis of the composition of 21 mirrors, carried out by the bronze expert, P.T. Craddock. He used atomic absorption spectroscopy; other scholars analysed 4 mirrors by electron probe microanalysis and one by energy dispersive X-ray fluorescence. From former studies it appears that bronze mirrors have a tin content around about 11%. The presence of a rather high cobalt content is helpful for authenticity studies (p. 41). Only one pear-shaped mirror (no 20) is, exceptionally, of silver but as the composition does not contain gold, it probably is not genuine, according to Craddock (p. 41). De G., however, holds it for possibly authentic (p. 35, though if it were false 'the forger did a superb job'). Only one mirror, also pear-shaped (see below), shows an inscription: *malavi(s)* (no 9) next to a woman, possibly a (mythological?) bride who is adorned for marriage by two winged goddesses. As for mirrors without inscriptions 12 items show Dioskouroi and 1 a 'Lasa' (3rd century BC). No 2 with the Judgment of Paris shows an interesting example of conflation with the Egg of Leda representations, Paris holding out an egg as the prize of the beauty contest. De G. interprets no 8 showing a unique scene, a winged, nude male with spear opposite a warrior with shield as the immortal Polydeukes and the mortal Kastor. Nos 13, 16 and 24 have false engravings. Nos 20 and 21 show Thesan, goddess of the dawn. The latter one, dated to ca 470/460 BC, shows a cicada in front of the flying deity. This detail was added as cicadas begin to sing at dawn. Moreover, they were thought to be fed on dew. The fascicle presents several mirrors published by Gerhard, whose present location was regarded as unknown by many scholars. It has a short bibliography at the end of the book instead of at the beginning.

The sixth fascicle of *CSE Italia* is a highbrow catalogue of 29 mirrors and 11 mirror handles (of Faliscan-Praenestine form, ca 325-200 BC), once belonging to the Barberini collection of 'Praenestine antiquities', which entered the Villa Giulia in 1908.

The objects were excavated in the Colomella necropolis; unfortunately, the precise tomb contexts are unknown. The book offers an excellent bibliography, a detailed history of the collection and an important essay on Praenestine, pear-shaped handle mirrors by F. Gilotta. He shows that the latter ones were rather made between ca 350 and 300 than between ca 380 and 340 as was suggested by R. Adam in 1980, in addition, that the images were heavily influenced by vase painting in *Magna Graecia*, especially in Lucania.

All mirrors have been cleaned: modern additions were removed. 21 mirrors are Praenestine. They are usually larger than Etruscan ones. The oldest, non piriform mirrors are Etruscan, have a circular disk and are dated to the 5th century (no 13 shows a banquet scene, no 22 a Gorgo mask, no 30 dancing woman with *krotala* and no 40 *elachsantre* seducing *elina*). Some handle mirrors (nos 28; 38: Judgment of Paris; no 35: two Lasa's), probably imported from Etruria, are dated to the 3rd century BC. The only epigraphic mirror, no 40, is remarkable, showing a boyish Paris who influenced by Turan/Aphrodite is about to seduce Helena who is lying on a bed with her little Hermione. The sphinx above the bed is not explained. It may predict the consequence of seduction: the Trojan War. As in the *Iliad* the sphinx is hovering above the heads like *Ate* ('Ruin'). Some Praenestine mirrors show themes which are not typically Etruscan, they are realistic, humorous and (sometimes explicitly) erotic (nos 15, 16, 31, 32, 37). Others represent themes which are also present in Etruscan art (nos 19, 25, 26 Judgment of Paris; no 33: Hercules and Victoria).

Unfortunately no chemical research was carried out. It should be done as the question is whether the composition of Praenestine mirrors differs from that of Etruscan ones. The same holds good for Praenestine *cistae*. All fascicles have useful concordances and indexes. As the production of a fascicle is a complicated job, all authors deserve our compliments. That other volumes may follow soon.

L.B. van der Meer

MARIJKE GNADE (ed.), *Satricum. Trenta anni di scavi olandesi. Catalogo della mostra. La Ferriere, Latina, 26 ottobre 2007 – 29 febbraio 2008*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam Archeologisch Centrum, 2008. 208 pp., numerous figs., all in colour, 27 cm. – ISBN 978-90-78863-14-4.

This tastefully edited exposition catalogue gives a fairly good impression of the results of thirty years of excavations at Satricum by teams of the Dutch Institute at Rome, the University of Groningen (1977/1978-1990) and by the University of Amsterdam (from 1991 until now). The first part of the book consists of a series of essays; some are of a reflective, summarizing character (based on or critically related to the monumental monographs of M. Maaskant-Kleibrink, J.W. Bouma, M. Gnade, B. Ginge, D.J. Waarsenburg, R.R. Knoop and P.S. Lulof), but most of them offer in main lines results of most recent research or work in progress. The second part is the real catalogue, describing, more or less in chronological order, 641 artefacts, ca 400 of which are illustrated! The exhibition did not take place in 2007/8 but

it will do in 2009. As for the new, until now unpublished results, Jeltsje Stobbe deals with the beginnings of an Iron Age community on the 'acropolis', focusing on traces of huts and (votive) pits under the Mater Matuta temples. The oldest huts date from ca 800 or, based on ¹⁴C research, ca 50 years earlier (see the timetable on p. 28). The pits date from the 9th until the third quarter of the 6th century BC. Remains from the Bronze Age are (still) missing. Interestingly, the huts are contemporaneous with the oldest tombs in the Northwest Necropolis. There is, however, no hard proof that the community of this cemetery lived on the 'acropolis' as the artefacts from the latter site may have a ceremonial function. Some votive gifts suggest that Temple 0 (in fact an *oikos*) was dedicated to a female deity, probably Mater Matuta herself. Stobbe also introduces the stone monumentalising of the city in the 6th and the beginning of the 5th centuries BC. Knoop and Lulof cast light upon temple architecture, especially on the roof systems and decorations of Temple I and II. The buildings around the Temple I/II have, according to Stobbe, an aristocratic character, probably with a (semi-)public function. Gnade explains the development of the urban zone, especially outside the 'acropolis', in Poggio dei Cavallari. Most interesting is the presence of a 5 m wide *via sacra* which can be compared with one near the sanctuary at Pyrgi and one near Rome (along the *via Tuscolana*). Gnade also summarizes her research of Volscian Southwest necropolis which dates from the 5th century BC. The tombs and their contents would prove that the Volscians were less rude than written sources suggest. Peter Attema and Tymon de Haas show work in progress: a first analysis of the enormous Votive Deposit II on the 'acropolis' from the 5th and 4th centuries. It has 12 layers... The contents show that pilgrims visited sacred site. Muriel Louwaard analyses a building of the Middle Republican period, which was used in the 5th and 4th and later on in the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC. Barbara Heldring and Loes van der Kruijf deal with the Votive Deposit III (in front of the temple(s)), which was first a cistern (ca 550-480 BC) and then converted into real dumps for votives in the 3rd century BC. Large part of the catalogue (pp. 154-182) shows the numerous finds, among which the famous *skyphos* (of the Gnathia type) with a Greek inscription mentioning Mater Matuta, again an indication that pilgrims visited the 'acropolis' at least until ca 100 BC. The statuettes of the Tanagra-Myrina type are supposed to have been imported (p. 154); they may, however, have made in Italy, even at Satricum. Reno Raaymakers presents the Roman *villa rustica* that was excavated in Poggio dei Cavallari. It dates from the beginning of the 1st century AD. It got a second life around 300 AD. De Haas gives a survey of villa's in the Pontine region during four successive periods, from ca 100 BC until 450 AD. It appears that the 1st and 4th centuries AD were periods of intensive agricultural activities. G. Colonna finally deals with the Latin, Etruscan, Volscian and Greek inscriptions, be it in a succinct way. His remark that all scholars consider Poplios Valesios as identical with Publius Valerius Poplicola (not: Publicola (p. 15)), one of the founders of the Roman Republic, is too optimistic. At the end of the book a list of the technical terms (where *ctonio* should be read as *catactonio*) and an excellent bibliography follow.

The book will stimulate discussions, as much research is still in progress and as several monographs are still to be expected. Further the vexed question of the dates of Temple 0, I and II (see the table on p. 35) has still not been resolved. The excavations seem to show that Satricum has an almost, uninterrupted material history from ca 950 BC until the Middle Ages. Much work has still to be done as only 40 % of the city area has been excavated.

Hopefully a permanent Satricum Museum will attract a large public. An English translation of the catalogue would be helpful for all those who cannot read Italian but are fascinated by modern Latian archaeology. A better, bigger and more detailed map of Satricum and the suburban area (with e.g. the position of the sacred street, only made visible on the photograph, fig. I.2) should be added (cf. fig. I.1 on p. 12).

L.B. van der Meer

DIETRICH GERHARDT, *Wer kauft Liebesgötter? Metastasen eines Motivs*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008 (Neue Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Neue Folge, Band 1). 209 pp., 14 pls; 24.5 cm. – ISBN 978-3-11-020291-5.

Central point of this literary study is a small Roman wall painting, found in room W29 of the Villa of Ariadne at Castellammare di Stabia in 1759 (on the find context, see Agnes Allroggen-Bedel, *RM* 84, 1977, 36-37, 82, pl. 3.3; not mentioned). This scene shows an old woman trying to sell three small amorini to a young lady and her servant. It must have formed the central figural panel of a third-style decoration in one of the rooms of this large villa. The book merits a brief mention in BABESCH because of the cultural impact of the motif. Gerhardt starts *mediis in rebus*, citing Goethe's poem 'Die Liebesgötter auf dem Markte' from 1796. It soon becomes clear that he wants to establish Goethe's sources, both for the idea of selling gods and the literary forms. Goethe fostered the plan to write a sequel to Schikaneder's and Mozart's *Zauberflöte*, in which this text would be sung by Papageno and Papagena. The double entendre is the nature of the sold figures: birds or men with wings (like the antique amorini). The inquiry brings us to variations in popular and literary poetry as well as songs, i.a. by Schubert (scores included!) and to comments on these texts. Most scholars from Goethe's time onwards saw a direct link between Goethe's visit to Pompeii and surroundings, the antique painting and this poem. A study of the sources about the picture itself starts with the question whether this was a *Spielerei* or, what seems not be in contrast, an 'ästhetische Vergnügung' (p. 44). Since no direct notices by Goethe about the painting can be found, a link might be the reproduction in the *Pitture d'Ercolano* (or, I would add, a French, English or German translation). Gerhardt does not refrain from learned observations, even when he reproaches the old scholars of being mere antiquarians, despised by Winckelmann (and now Gerhardt). He also elucidates Goethe's interest for Pompeii was rather weak in the *Italienische Reise* and mainly grew in the 1820s thanks to the contacts with Wilhelm Zahn. He extensively quotes descriptions of

the painting in 19th-century sources (see the list at pp. 63-64) and still does not find connections with Goethe's poem. Conclusion: poem and painting have little in common.

For the student of the painting itself, the section on its translations in the art, from Vien's painting of 1763 - Diderot loved the painting (p. 69) - onwards, is stimulating. Gerhardt discusses some variations like that by Fuseli. Special attention is paid to Thorvaldsen's relief 'Ages of Love' (p. 79, pl. 10), where the cage is part of a long depiction of stages of love. This provoked other poems as well. Gerhardt sees a waning interest in the middle of the 19th century. Other mutations include erotic scenes with Eros (or multiplied Erotes) as transmitters. Striking cases are a water colour by Genelli (p. 97, pl. 11), where three nude ladies amuse themselves with winged phalli taken out of a cage and a folkloristic Tree of Love (pl. 13). A digression (admittedly, so Gerhardt says p. 104) is about a long poem by Pusjkin: 'Czar Nikita and his forty daughters'. This section testifies Gerhardt's knowledge in this field, but is not relevant for the theme.

All in all, this is a curious and highly diverting book, by an old but in no way senile scholar (born in 1911, p. 145), not devoid of interest for those who love the *Nachleben* of things Pompeian.

Eric M. Moormann

FRANÇOIS QUEYREL, *Le Parthénon. Un monument dans l'Histoire*. Paris: Éditions Bartillat, 2008. 240 pp., 8 pls, foldout plate; 20 cm. – ISBN 978-2-84100-435-5.

It is a courageous enterprise to add a new title to the immense library of works on the Parthenon, an emblem of classical civilisation. In France, however, this bulk is smaller and for the francophone audience Queyrel's comprehensive book provides a welcome introduction. The author first sketches the mythical and historical backgrounds of Athens. Second, the architecture is described in a very succinct way; no attention is paid to the question of the Parthenon's status and function. Third, Queyrel focuses on the sculptural decoration of the shrine. The brief descriptions are efficient and informative and contain the main data about its iconography and function. Topography forms a major key for understanding the organisation of the huge amount of sculpted decorations. He stresses the internal and external relationships of the figures depicted. So, the way the gods are seated next to Athena's birth reflects the position of their shrines on top of or next to the Acropolis. The birth of Athena in the east pediment succeeds on that spot as does the match between her and Poseidon in the west one, where the two groups of judges are seated according to their support for one of the gods. Together they are the oldest inhabitants of Athens, living here before the arrival of the two Olympians. One might add: Athena and Poseidon are in a subordinate position and beg for the patronage. Entering the Acropolis, the visitor would first see this episode and understand the citizens' pride. Another connection is that between the Doric friezes and other parts of the decorative apparatus. The gigantomachia on the east facade is also embroidered on the four-yearly peplos and sculpted on the outer side of Athena's shield.

The gods feature in a logical order, with Athena and Hephaistos as the main couple. Two fish on the Helios metope would refer to the zodiac sign and so to the start of the seafaring season. Theseus is active in the west Amazonomachia and the south Centaureomachia alike. The central metopes of the south side interrupt the battle of Lapiths and centaurs, showing the ancestors of Athenian power. The Helios on the first slab of the north metopes, that display the last day of the Trojan War, connects the series with the Helios on the east pediment.

The puzzling frieze not mentioned in ancient sources exemplifies 'la cité dans son essence' (p. 85). All participants are going towards the entrance of the temple at the east side. Again, topography is important. The horsemen are on the Agora, as are the gods and the ten eponymous heroes. These two groups have their altars over there and the participants in the Panathenaic festival would just have seen them. The gods are put into more or less the same positions as their counterparts on the corresponding pediment. Regarding the frieze's interpretation, Queyrel shares the large group of scholars who see here the Panathenaic Festival. The 120 riders might reflect the 1200 horsemen of the cavalry reorganised by Pericles after 445. The tithe has its counterpart in ten cows of the hecatomb on the south frieze. The centre of the east frieze has two *arrephoroi* with wool on the stools above their heads, the priest of Athena Polias, the *archon basileus* with a child (male or female whatever) as a *mystes*. In sum, the frieze connects the autochthonous Athenians with the world of the gods and of legend in the remainder of the sculptural decorations.

The following chapter describes the aftermath: the change of the building into church, mosque, ammunition house and, again, mosque. French pride dominates the next chapters, highlighting the marquis of Nointel, who in 1674 had the famous drawings made by an anonymous artist from Flanders (falsely attributed to Jacques Carrey), and Choiseul-Goffier and Fauvel, who were here around 1780. Fauvel lived for decades at Athens and collected some pieces of sculpture lying on the ground, which is a fundamentally different procedure than that of Choiseul-Goffier's colleague as ambassador at Istanbul, Lord Elgin (p. 153). The sack Elgin caused was heavily criticised by Lord Byron. The 19th century is passed over rapidly, as are modern times. Without clearly saying so, Queyrel seems to argue that the Elgin marbles can now safely return to Athens to be exposed in Tschumi's new Acropolis Museum.

One wonders whom Queyrel is writing for. There are almost no footnotes, whereas there is a good *bibliographie raisonnée* according to the themes discussed. Illustrations are few and of little help. In contrast, technical terms have an asterisk in the text that refer to a glossary. This means that a layman must get a book of images, while the expert misses the footnotes endorsing Queyrel's own ideas and referring to extant research. The latter will recognise in 'I'on' John Boardman, when Queyrel describes the theory of the 192 fallen men of Marathon or Jane Connolly when he discusses the suggestion of a sacrifice of the young girl on the east frieze. Nevertheless, the book provides a well structured and pleasant overview of the opinions about the Parthenon and does not stick to that, offering new insights as well.

Eric M. Moormann

CHRISTA LANDWEHR, *Die römischen Skulpturen von Caesarea Mauritaniae* III. *Idealplastik*. Mit Beiträgen von Rita Amedick, Dagmar Grassinger, Adrian Zimmermann. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 2006. XVI, 127 pp., 11 figs., 112 pls; 31.5 cm. – ISBN 978-3-8053-3441-9.

The first volume of this series of catalogues dates back to 1993. Since the political situation in Algeria is not very friendly and makes visits more difficult than wished, many researchers will be happy to have this rich documentation at hand. The last volume is now there and it contains a set of 98 descriptions, i.e. cat. nos 176-274, mostly showing figures from the atmosphere of Bacchus. The scope of the book is a pure presentation of the sculptures as such, which brings the question of original contexts and functions to the second plan. As I did not read thoroughly the previous volumes and consulted them for single statues only, my capacity to judge this work's full merits is restricted. All these catalogues have a very high standard of scientific consistency and profound knowledge of ancient sculpture and the debates about sculptors and their products. Like in many other works of this kind, the analysis of the pieces as such focuses on style, interpretation and possible prototypes and *inventores*, whereas the relevance of the sculpture in its context - in our case that of the capital of Mauretania, romanised and changed into a Roman provincial town - gets less attention. However, in some entries the author refers to an installation of the pieces within the palace of Juba II and his wife Cleopatra. This might be true for the relief with a sphinx (cat. 234) that is seen - with due caution; it is a scholarly book - as the sideboard of a throne of the empress (p. 74). Since this volume forms the last in an impressive series, the reader would have wished a sort of conclusion, so far as the set-up of this project makes possible, but I hope Landwehr will write a sort of final conclusion in the form of another small book or large article.

The chosen form, viz. the subdivision of the statues according to their representations, does not facilitate the study of the pieces within their original context. It is sure that in several descriptions and comments remarks are added as to the provenance, but the reader - who will, it is true, mostly consult these volumes for a single piece at a time - has to do a lot of collecting before he gets an overview of, e.g., the sculptures from Juba's residence or from one of the great bath complexes. It must be said that there is also confusion about the find spots of many pieces, now divided between Alger, Cherchell and Paris (Musée du Louvre).

It has been wise to involve some excellent colleagues who are experts in specific genres or types of statuary, so that we have many descriptions of Dionysian objects by Adrian Zimmermann, and other by Rita Amedick and Dagmar Grassinger, but the lion's share is as always Landwehr's.

Some remarks may be made about single items. The first, a Dionysos from the West Baths, cat. 176, is the Roman working out of what Landwehr aptly calls a concept figure, i.e. the free development of a classical type (here possibly by Praxiteles) into a new concept according to local style and taste. The god is a fountain

adornment and pours water instead of wine. For her this very youngish god, without pubes hair, is a typical product of the later 2nd century AD, but I would date it some 100 years earlier: see the very modest drilling and the thin and body-sticking nebris (cf. cat. 213-214). A still later date is proposed for the Dionysos cat. 177, but there is no argumentation for that, and again I would place it earlier, viz. in the Severan time like the Dionysos of cat. 178 dated to that era and showing the same stylistic features. The 'concept figure' of Dionysos cat. 179 is commented on with psychologising words like 'Entrücktsein', which would be valid for a dating to the second quarter of the 2nd century: but is such a characteristic not holding true for the previous items as well and would they, then, not date to the same era?

Cat. 180, head of Dionysos, might indeed be an appliqué for a piece of furniture. Stylistically it is akin to the late-antique sculptures of Chiragan. The Antonine group of Dionysos, a (very small) satyr and a panther looks rather 1st-century like (cf. above, cat. 176). The tiny format of the god's company is also striking in a similar group cat. 185, discussed by Amedick, who is also responsible for the excellent analysis of a copy of the famous genre figure of the Thorn Picker. Amedick makes clear how the Berlin and Cherchell Spinarii show a clear 'Zeitgeschmack' of the middle of the 2nd century. The motif is Hellenistic and despite the charm it has, the topic was seen as improper because of the attitude and the direct view of the genitals, for which reason the boy was a low sort of shepherd. To the head copies, many made separately and seen as independent heads of Daphnis or Endymion, that in the Allard Pierson Museum at Amsterdam (discussed in my *Ancient Sculpture in the Allard Pierson Museum Amsterdam*, Amsterdam 2000, cat. 93) can be added. Amedick's literary and sculptural approach also comes to the fore in her discussion of the groups of Pan and Satyr cat. 190 and Hermaphrodite and Satyr cat. 191, both from the West Baths. In the latter, the movement of the head is preserved, so that we can conclude that it is falsely restored in other replicas. Dagmar Grassinger presents some Pan or Satyr sculptures, among which the high-quality Satyr cat. 200 from the frigidarium of the West Baths. There are three examples of a Satyr playing a traverso, cat. 204-206, two from the same spot as the Satyr, one from a house, that belong to a large group of 50 replicas in the Roman world. Another popular Satyr with a pig's skin (38 exx.) is represented in two pieces cat. 207-208. This strange attribute is seen as a rather obscene allusion to the genitals of a young girl called χοῖρος, a homonym of the object itself.

I put a question mark to the very late, 3rd-century date of the Silen riding on a Panther cat. 210, that shows the small drill holes of the second half of the 1st century. As to the Silvanus of cat. 211 the lack of pubes hair is explained in a rather forced way: could the figure be a reworked Satyr? There is no dating proposal, but I would add him stylistically to the 2nd-century traverso-playing Satyr (see supra).

Among the animals there are a rooster and a hen, cat. 50-251, seen as funerary sculpture, but could they not be garden figures? A relief of a hanging bird cat. 252 likens painted still lifes of the Republican period in Pompeii and therefore is an expensive parallel of sculp-

ture representations rendered in painting, often speculated for other imitations in that medium as well.

Some mystery guests are dealt with in the section 'Nicht benennbare Figuren', the first of which, cat. 256, is a more than lifesize bearded man's head, previously seen as a portrait of a member of Juba's family. Landwehr makes clear that he probably represents a local 'Vatergottheit' like a variation of Saturn.

A pure luxury is the addition of a set of plates with comparisons, both stylistical and iconographical ('Beilagen' 1-32), for catalogues in general lack those; e.g. pictures of other examples in sculpture and paintings of masks to elucidate the colossal mask of a Papposilenos cat. 220. This and other masks and objects stem from the theatre of Juba II and give a glimpse of its wealthy sculptural decoration.

Finally, the French knew what they had to take with them as a souvenir. One of the most wonderful items is a partly preserved relief of Ourania cat. 269, leaning on a krater and pointing at a globe that is supported by telamons. On the background there is a cityscape. The Louvre possesses the second copy of it, from Florence. It represents almost all Christa Landwehr has fulfilled in the past three decades: scholarship, beauty and the art of emulation. In sum, she set a high standard for projects of the kind to follow and may be congratulated for that.

Eric M. Moormann

ANNETTE LUCIA GIESECKE, *The Epic City. Urbanism, Utopia, and the Garden in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, Cambridge, Mass & London: Harvard University Press, 2007. 205 pp., 18 figs.; 22.5 cm. – ISBN 978-0-674-02374-1.

This book tackles the notions of the town as Utopia and the gardens as reflections of Eden from various points of view, esp. ancient literature and art. The prologue announces an exchange between nature and urban culture in ancient Greece: Plato's Academy in the outskirts of Athens combined these indispensable elements, where *polis* and *chora* were in perpetual dialogue. Giesecke compares Plato's Academy and the Garden of Epicurus (*intra muros!*) with Roman peristyle gardens, also used in the pastime for conversation and study. These could be found in Roman urban settings like the Porticus next to Pompey's theatre in Rome, in villas like that of the Papyri at Herculaneum, seen as a reminiscence of the Greek Gymnasium, and in town houses with their walled gardens. As to literature, Giesecke sees in *Iliad* and *Odyssey* the oldest notions of the ideal city (*Eutopia*) which is not existing (*Outopia*) but striven after. When one follows her analysis of the encounters between Greeks and Trojans, the *Iliad* becomes a poem on the conflict between several Dark Age or early Archaic *poleis* (p. 16), whereas the errands of Odysseus bring this hero (and the reader) to pre- and proto-urban societies (Cyclops, Lotus Eaters, Calypso, Circe, etc.), including his own Ithaca, where he cannot settle his case before curing the garden of his father Laertes. The Homeric cities are not yet real monarchies but sequels of chief-directed communities. According to Giesecke, Thomas More's

Utopia might reflect a thorough reading of Homer, but here the wish seems to be father to the thought, parting from her own way of reasoning about the oldest epic poems. In the *Odyssey*, the garden element is striking: Alcinous and his Phaeacians are good gardeners, as is Odysseus' father. The Shield of Achilles is a 'map of Utopia' (p. 42, fig. 2). Borders separate the good (worked) from the bad (wild and undomesticated) land and man has to make walls to ensure safety. Hesiod is adduced to illustrate the beginnings of land management. Whereas this association is clear, I cannot follow why Sappho must be introduced in this section (p. 51-53), notwithstanding her love for flowers standing in *temenè* (pace *temenoi* p. 53; cf. p. 135 *epoi* instead of *epè*).

Another abrupt change is that to images on Greek vases: natural elements are scarce, but Giesecke discusses some interesting cases (with rather poor images) like that of Elpenor, Odysseus and Hermes in the Hades, from where she passes to Crete and Mycenae and the Dark Ages. The use of borders is expressed in the Geometric art, which style (p. 60) 'could be described as one of hysterical control ... obsessive about the establishment of boundaries or limits, thereby reflecting the organizational principles of the nascent polis.' And, almost needless to say, in this period Homer and Hesiod wrote their works. I find this characterisation and this connection challenging, but am not sure whether they are well-founded.

Some remarks are devoted to the development of Orientalising and Attic Black and Red Figure vase painting, in parallel to the demonstration of space. The assumption of the *polis-chora* model of Athens as invented by Peisistratus on the basis of Homer seems strange: is that not the case with other *poleis* as well? Another associative reasoning brings us from this concept to that of the rather *schwärmerisch* description of the Periclean Acropolis and the Parthenon.

At Rome, Giesecke starts with the Odyssey paintings in the Vatican Library: nature is made tame and literally domesticated, being introduced within the domestic walls. She returns to the Garden of Epicurus to discuss Rome again via the sculpture of Scopas' Maenad and the Hellenistic poetry of Theocritus. Some errors comprise the dating of the Nile Mosaic at Palestrina to the 1st century BC (p. 100) and the connection Le Corbusier would have made with the small and unknown Pompeian 'Casa del Noce' (p. 102), which is no other than the huge Casa delle Nozze d'Argento, surely translated by the architect with 'Maison des Noces'. This and other houses become containers of the *rus in urbe* ('country in town') in their already mentioned peristyle, next to urban *horti*. This notion is also expressed in poetry (i.a. Statius), philosophy (Cicero) and other kinds of text (Varro). Giesecke plays here too loosely with time: the 150 years between Cicero and Statius underwent many subtle and gross developments and literature is here used at face value rather than critically. The last chapter circles around Lucretius and Virgil and their utopia: from pastoral life in Epicurean *ataraxeia* to the turmoil of the large town that was Rome. The analysis of the description of Aeneas' shield in *Aeneid* 8 demonstrates the strong ambition of Augustus to become a new Pericles. Landscape and nature are beautiful, but violated by supreme animals, i.e. mankind, and Augustus seems to repair the

Golden Age of Saturnus. As to the arts, wall paintings seem in line with Epicurean ideas; the Ara Pacis Augustae and the Augustus of Prima Porta comprise the essentials of these new politics. The mixture of styles, esp. with Athenian 5th-century quotations underlines Augustus' classicism (p. 139) as the result of mingling Lucretius' nature and Pericles' achievements. These interpretations of Augustus and his predecessors Aeneas and Romulus and Remus are interesting and may be relevant for students of the Augustan era. But I cannot escape the impression that, as a whole, the book does not give a coherent idea of what nature and utopia really had to do together in Antiquity. Giesecke's study addresses scholars of various fields of classical history, reaching from the Dark Ages to the Age of Augustus and highlighting some well-known classical momentums. The combination of literary and artistic sources is sometimes rather forced and the balance turns in favour of the former, apparently in better command than the latter.

Eric M. Moormann

RAINER STUTZ, *Drei Hanghäuser in Thugga. Maison des trois Masques, Maison du Labyrinthe, Maison de Dionysos et d'Ulysse*. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 2007 (THVGGA 2). 94 pp., 14 figs., 36 pls; 34.5 cm. – ISBN 978-3-8053-3758-8.

This beautifully edited volume is the second in a new series on research initiated at Thugga, modern Dougga in Tunisia, by V.M. Strocka from the University of Freiburg. The first gives an introduction and tackles some general questions. In the second book R. Stutz presents three large, prestigious houses located in the very centre of the town (a plan with the location within the urban grid would have been useful). Some 36 more houses are waiting for research and, although the choice is called a good one, this is not explained (p. 12). As in many old excavations - here the French started working at the beginning of the 20th century - Stutz had to reconstruct the excavation records and, if possible, to relocate the mosaics that had been carried to Tunis and gave the French names to the houses. Neither excavation dates are at hand nor is it known for most of the figural mosaics when their removal had taken place. The descriptions are, necessarily, rather dry, but to the point and important for those who want to ascertain the reconstructions Stutz made of these impressive buildings. He describes building materials, preparatory ground works (mainly removal of parts of the living rock to install rooms and drainage). The study fills a gap in Roman Africa studies, since houses have been neglected hitherto in this sector of Roman research.

The remains date from the 2nd to the 4th centuries and some of the most important features can only be dated thanks to the stylistic research of the mosaics. The *floruit* of 138-169 is the starting point for all three houses. The building technique is the aptly called *opus africanum*: sets of lintels of limestone filled in with small irregular stones like *Fachwerkbau*. All wall faces had to be plastered. The question of a second or even third floor is tackled. There must have been parts with two floors, covered with flat roofs.

The ground plan of the 600 m² large House of the three

Masks is not like those of large townhouses in Italian cities, showing long east-west rooms and courtyards along the slope of the hill. There seems to be a single building phase only. The description and reconstruction is followed by a functional analysis of the rooms. The decorations (few paintings, mosaic floors in the main rooms) are of great help to determine hierarchy and function. In the House of the Labyrinth the surface is a little smaller (440 m²) and the terrain was still more determining the elongated shape. The original layout of the name-giving mosaic cannot be established. As to the floors, Stutz gives two alternatives in his reconstruction: one or two floors, in all cases covered with flat roofs. After the rather difficult process of construction (a great deal of rock had to be cut off to obtain a plane area for the construction) and the installation of lavish floor decorations, a later moment saw the installation of a sort of shed for charts. The last house once contained the famous representation of Odysseus listening to the Sirens, while his men are rowing. Its dimensions are 435 m² and, since the house originally possessed two floors, the dimensions must have been double. Here scholars working in Italy recognize a more normal ground plan of rooms around a court yard, with the entrance area along the main street at the north side. At the south-western side there was a colonnade looking onto the street, reconstructed as a courtyard without a roof (see fig. 13), but perhaps a covered portico. In this house the oldest remains go back to the 1st century BC, whereas the main elements date to the 2nd and 3rd centuries. Stutz recognizes several phases on the basis of the mosaics. The book finishes with a well-thought interpretation of the iconographic programme of the mosaics, in which Dionysus plays a major role. The combination of this god and Odysseus in the courtyard, combined with fishermen, is explained as a demonstration of the difficulties they had to go through before arriving at their goal. The water is the common element, symbolizing here the struggle and evil (even the fishermen, I would add, have to work hard). We do not know the owners of this and the other house, not to speak of their mindset, but a certain degree of literacy can be assumed.

In sum, this is an attractive study about houses and a town that deserve a greater attention in the discussion about living and working in ancient towns. Stutz does not deliver general conclusions or observations. Waiting for the analysis of some more houses seems to be the reason for that, but it is rather deceptive not to find some sort of outcome and prospect of future research.

Eric M. Moormann

BRIGITTE RUCK, *Die Grossen dieser Welt. Kolossalporträts im antiken Rom*. Heidelberg: Verlag Archäologie und Geschichte, 2007 (Archäologie und Geschichte 11). 343 pp., 3 figs., 50 pls; 30.5 cm. – ISBN 978-3-935289-32-0.

Ruck's Heidelberg PhD has become a mature work of scholarship in this impressive publication that will be used by many scholars working on portraits and on the topography of ancient Rome. The material discussed consists of (fragments of) statues, inscriptions (especially those on the bases of lost monuments), topographic indi-

cations and ancient texts. A strong point is the relocation of statues in their original setting and, hence, the reconstruction of their function within the ancient context. Of course, this is possible in few cases only, but the careful analysis of the data available about statues, bases and inscriptions as well as textual evidence yields brilliant results.

First of all, Ruck tries to define the phenomenon of colossality and it must be said that she formulates clearer definitions than Detlev Kreikenbom did in his *Griechische und römische Kolossalporträts bis zum späten ersten Jahrhundert n. Chr.* (Berlin 1992), who covers a longer period, including Greek and Hellenistic monuments, but does not go further than AD 100, when dealing with Roman examples. Ruck assumes a minimal height of one and a half bigger than life size, so that a complete standing male figure would reach at least 2.50 m and a female one 2.30 m. These measurements also matter, when Ruck tries to calculate the sizes of statues on the bases she discusses. So she reconstructs a statue of 2.70-3.00 m of Trajan on a basis of circa 1 m, with indents for the feet (p. 47, pl. 32).

Ruck uses the inscriptions of lost statues scattered over Rome as precious testimonies for the reconstruction of images: she can ascertain the presence of many monuments otherwise not taken into account. The original shape of lost figures evinces from the inscription's format or from the marks on the top of the base. Beginning in the 1st century BC, colossi were made throughout the Empire; the last one must have been a statue for the mother of Theodosius, Thermantia, erected along the Sacra Via on the Forum Romanum. These inscriptions tell a lot thanks to their formulations and their format. However, the speculations about the shape of the statues in question are sometimes rather academic and - necessarily - too speculative to keep the reader's concentration alive while reading. These data are often combined with those of statue bases (a subject tackled recently in a masterly way by J.M. Højte in his *Roman Imperial Statue Bases*, Aarhus 2005). The bases as such do not provide a basis firm enough to come to sound conclusions unless in several clear cases. All in all, the two categories are instructive, despite my scepticism, in that they illustrate the wide range of possibilities, varying from single standing or seated persons to chariots and group portraits. Some are nicely illustrated in clear drawings.

The structure of the book is well defined and this makes it easy to consult chapters or sections for those who cannot read the long entire work. After the mentioned chapter defining colossality, we find chapters on the context (cult statues, public status, portraits in private realms like houses and tombs), the development of colossal portraits from the late Republic up to the Soldier Emperors, whereas late Antiquity (Tetrarchs-5th century) has a chapter of its own. A summary, the catalogue, bibliography and indices complete the study. Especially chapter Three ('Entwicklung') deserves attentive reading, since it contains the summa of Ruck's work. She sketches the increasing use of colossal statues from the 1st century BC into the Principate and the partial dependence of Hellenistic predecessors. In the discussion about religious contexts, Ruck warns for the assumption that the colossus of an emperor should reveal a divine status, since it may refer to divine qualities rather than the self-iden-

tification as a god. No living emperor seems to have erected such a statue as cult statue; those we know were set up by successors. The dimensions show that the emperor rises above ordinary people and is capable of reaching the divine realm more easily. Most statues were destined for a public or sacral context. The few instances of emperor's statues within private areas do not really convince, as Ruck admits implicitly: the colossus of Nero stood in the *vestibulum* of the Golden House, part of the palace complex that must have been open like the vestibule of a *domus* and accessible for the subjects. Likewise, the large figure of Domitian of which part has been preserved, stems from one of the *aulae* of his Domus Augustana, again a public part of the palace. Private persons seldom got statues of large size and they all were related narrowly to the emperor and his family, so that for them the same conclusions can be made as for the large category of imperial portraits.

As to late antiquity, one immediately thinks of the Constantine in the courtyard of the Palazzo dei Conservatori and some other large heads. Ruck makes clear that this colossus, a seated figure of some 10 metres, formed the *nec plus ultra*: indeed, very few colossi were made afterwards and at the end of the 4th century it is a phenomenon of the past at Rome, whereas elsewhere the production continued. The Constantine from the Basilica can be seen as a reminiscence of Sol, when we take into account the nearby Colossus of Nero, but also - as has been made clear almost simultaneously with this study by Claudio Parisi Presicce (*BullCom* 107, 2006, 127-162) - as a Jupiter. Both are right in rejecting the long-standing interpretation of H.P. L'Orange to see Constantine as a new Christ: a blunt christianisation was not in time in the years 312-325, when the statue must have been erected.

Almost all statues and bases were published in scholarly works. Therefore, the catalogue is not what one would expect from the traditional German format of similar studies: it consists of a long, clear table, without longish and dull descriptions, and is articulated according to sure or not sure Roman provenance for portraits (subdivided into male/female sitters) and bases with inscriptions in Rome. The bibliographical information in the last column of the statue section provides the reader with a key to deepen his or her research, whereas for the inscriptions a reference to *CIL* must suffice, so that one has to go through the notes in the text and Højte to find more information. Ruck shows her skills as an archaeologist and an epigraphist alike. In both fields she feels at home and demonstrates a great knowledge of the common practices and the pertaining bibliography.

Eric M. Moormann

JOHANN JOACHIM WINCKELMANN, *Schriften und Nachlaß* 4,1-3. *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums*. Herausgegeben von Adolf H. Borbein, Thomas W. Gaethgens, Johannes Irmscher (†) und Max Kunze. Band 4,1: Text. Band 4,2: Katalog der antiken Denkmäler, bearbeitet von Mathias René Hofter, Axel Rügler, Adolf H. Borbein u.a. Band 4,3: Allgemeiner Kommentar, bearbeitet von Max Kunze, Marianne Kreikenbom, Brice Macaulin und Axel Rügler. Mainz

am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 2002, 2006, 2007. Band 4,1: CXI, 859 pp., 42 figs.; Band 4,2: 614 pp., 1402 figs.; Band 4,3: 574 pp.; 27 cm. – ISBN 978-3-8053-2935-0, 978-3-8053-3745-8, 978-3-8053-3746-5.

Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717-1768) remains hot, as becomes clear from an incessant stream of publications about this pioneer of ancient history of art in the last decades. The study of his works can still produce fascinating results and remains relevant for modern interpretations of antique monuments (cf. my review of some publications in *BABesch* 81, 2006, 246-248). But these original books are often not easily accessible, both *in re* and in the sense of understanding, as many of his observations are strangely formulated and in many senses outdated. The series of editions of his published works and *inedita*, fostered by the Winckelmann-Gesellschaft in his birth place Stendal in Germany, solves many of these problems. It has a very high standard of quality and is now a large end on its way to completion. The three imposing volumes under review are together 16 cm thick and display in all their richness Winckelmann's main - and I think master - work, the famous *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* in which his ideas on the development of Greek art came together. As in the other six volumes at hand, first the text is given according to the first edition, which is followed by a commentary. Here, however, the editors also print the second edition, worked on by the author from 1765 onwards, but only posthumously edited at Vienna. The new text edition is very welcome, since most available prints reproduce abbreviated and/or re-spelled texts, mostly based on the 1764 edition, but also on the second edition, like the well-known Vienna edition of 1934, reprinted several times until recently, which is also true for all translations, from Winckelmann's own time onwards. A new English translation by Harry Francis Mallgrave and edited by Alex Potts (Los Angeles) could already be based on the new scientific edition. The differences between 1764 and 1776 are big, not only because of the additions to the double-so-large 1776 version, but also thanks to new insights originated from the evolution of Winckelmann's own development. In their preface the editors make clear that the genesis of the latter version, edited by Friedrich Julius Riedel, cannot be reconstructed, since Winckelmann's and Riedel's manuscripts are lost. Remarkably, for almost two centuries German scholars have discussed the edition of a scientific version, but discarded it, for Winckelmann would no longer be read and was hopelessly out of date. The contacts between BRD and DDR scholars in the international Winckelmann-Gesellschaft created an opportunity to launch the edition project in 1988.

As to the two commentary volumes, the editors have done everything to help the modern reader. Volume 4.2 is dedicated to the 'Denkmäler', as Winckelmann already called the architectural monuments and objects, that are referred to and discussed in the *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums*. In the text volume 4.1 numbers in the margins give the key to these 1365 monuments in 4.2, in which the comment does not - and, because of repeated mentioning of important objects, cannot - follow the sequence of the text. There is a rigid, Winckelmann-like classification into the chronological periods (Egyptian/Egyptian-

ising, Oriental, Etrusco-Italic, Greco-Roman) and, within these parts, Denkmäler (cf. Winckelmann's tables of contents in 4.1). Statuary - the largest group of objects studied - has a subdivision into iconographical and schematic formulae like gods/men, male/female, standing/seated, nude/clothed/harnessed, etc. According to A. Borbein this articulation corresponds to the 'übliche Klassifikation antiker Denkmäler' and, indeed, one finds this framework in repertories, museum catalogues and the like from German origin. The classification is made after modern insights, i.e. not following Winckelmann's own dating. This means that we can consult the catalogue as a sort of modern history of art, in which the 'ideal' statues (to take one group only; e.g. Torso Belvedere, pp. 261-262 cat. 573), are classed from archaic to Roman. However, there are other classifications as well. The first section has gods, from Apollo (e.g. Belvedere, pp. 144-145 cat. 295) to Zeus, in which figures seen as such are included as well, e.g. a third-century youth in the guise of Apollo from Villa Negroni in Kansas City (4.2, pp. 153-154 cat. 309a), that evidently lacks in the portrait section, where we, nowadays, would have put it. Among the mythical themes Laocoon takes a place of pride (pp. 222-224 cat. 486). All Denkmäler seen by Winckelmann either in real or in engravings have an illustration, mostly of good quality despite the small format, so that it is easy to ascertain Winckelmann's text with the piece, having it immediately at hand. Each item contains references to other works of Winckelmann and, possibly, an explanation of Winckelmann's changing insights. The modern comment stands in Winckelmann's tradition, when its authors do not bother about original and copy (or whatever Roman pieces 'after' a great sculptor), so that many Roman objects are labelled 'Kopie', 'Umbildung' and the like of Praxiteles, Lysippos etc. I observe this without blaming them for that! These books are not there to make modern statements about Greek and Roman art as such, but to illustrate an old reference text. And I can only say that they are more than sufficient. Detailed use of the works will deliver mistakes and omission, but that is not the aim of this brief review. Borbein is right in concluding that Winckelmann had an enormous knowledge of monuments indeed and was not the bookish scholar only basing his research on ancient text, as some scholars have argued. Winckelmann was a real 'Augenmensch', working on the monuments themselves (cf. remarks on sight volume 4.3, pp. 95-96).

Volume 4.3 is a line-by-line commentary, in which the user finds explanations about the references Winckelmann makes to previous or simultaneous research and gives comparanda of reasoning in his own works. Important are the analyses of key words (e.g. Einfalt, Geschmack, erhaben, Gelehrsamkeit, Stand etc.; Denkmal lacks!) in Winckelmann's work that illustrate his working process and his evaluation from a critical reader and author of common place books to an independent scholar (É. Décultaut, *Untersuchungen zu Winckelmanns Exzerptheften*, Rühpolding 2003; cf. my review quoted). The 'Allgemeines Register' is of eminent importance and quality, since the reader can look for these words and immediately spot them in the way of an *index locorum*, whereas all other names and sources are also listed. The explanations of linguistic oddities, phrasing and word significances will be illuminating for German and non-

German readers alike. As to Winckelmann's opinions, the commentary tries to give his sources and reasoning as well as the later developments in so far they rely on the Stendal-born scholar. Researchers of Baroque and Enlightenment will be grateful for the full references to scientific and literary works Winckelmann quotes in an abbreviated form in his footnotes. As they are, their meaning is often difficult to understand.

Winckelmann also was an archaeologist recording discoveries in Rome that still are useful. So we can put on the test the work under review by linking it to a description of the find of granite columns under Palazzo Valentini at Rome, on the spot where the Temple of Divus Traianus would have been located according to Amanda Claridge (*JRA* 20, 2007, 54-94). Her quotation from the 1776 edition (p. 64, note 48; Winckelmann 1776, 829; here vol. 4.1, p. 793) has no counterpart in the 1764 version, since he speaks about 1765. In volume 4.2, p. 114 cat. 220 the reader can find the inventory number of the column brought to Villa Albani and some notes on the Forum of Trajan, whereas in vol. 4.3, p. 485 he finds an explanation about the modern setting. The comment does not enter into the topography discussed by Claridge in her contribution, but she could have had profit from this work, avoiding too much cumbersome searching after the old references.

In sum, we have a precious set of volumes that disclose Winckelmann's masterly pioneering work on antique art. It contains innumerable data for archaeologists, art historians, historians of mentality and history of research. And let us hope that this huge bulk of text will stimulate further research on archaeology in the 18th century.

Eric M. Moormann

Johann Joachim Winckelmann, *Schriften und Nachlaß* 4.4. *Anmerkungen über die Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums*. Herausgegeben von Adolf H. Borbein und Max Kunze. Bearbeitet von Eva Hofstetter, Max Kunze, Brice Maucolin und Axel Rügler. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 2008. XXVI, 280 pp., 86 figs.; 27 cm. – ISBN 978-3-8053-3844-8.

The *Anmerkungen* were conceived as a supplementary volume to the *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* from 1764. As early as 1766 Winckelmann hoped to compile a second German edition of this master work, when he had heard about the plans of a new French translation. Since his publisher Walter still had many copies of the 1764 book in stock, this would not succeed during his lifetime. Therefore, the *Anmerkungen* forms a publication of its own, when put next to the *Geschichte* of 1764. This book as well as a set of notes in one of Winckelmann's manuscripts at Paris contains many passages that would be inserted in the 1776 edition printed at Vienna. Winckelmann argues in the 'Vorrede' that a lot of errors had been made by him and other 'Scribenten' alike and these originate from false observations, misinterpretations of texts and stupidity or short-sightedness. The reader gets a sort of thinned version of the original book, with the same articulation and questions posed, often in reference to works discussed before in

the *opus magnum*. That inevitably does not produce a very fascinating reading, but when compared to the 1764 edition, there are many new and important judgements. The editors record in the comment which of these supplementary remarks returns in the 1776 edition, but it would have been easier for the reader to understand these changes, if these parts of the text were printed in another type. Now, one needs to have the excellent simultaneous 1764 and 1776 editions at hand, edited in the same series as vols. 4.1-3 (reviewed supra, pp. 240-242). That handling of these volumes simultaneously also pertains the commentary: the editors do not repeat data and add only, if there are novelties. In some cases it is unclear why a new remark featuring in these *Anmerkungen* did not show up in the final work in which, as we know, Winckelmann probably did not have a final say due to his sudden death in 1768.

Like in the previous volumes of the series, the commentary is extremely informative and rich of data hard to find elsewhere. Especially the identification of the monuments must have been difficult. Almost all pieces described here and not in the *Geschichte* are illustrated except for post-antique works of art. One addition comes from my own work. When Winckelmann speaks about 'zwo Begräbnis-Urnen, von denen die eine in dem Garten der Farnesina stehet' (p. 85), he describes the large Dionysian sarcophagus that is now in the Allard Pierson Museum at Amsterdam and formerly at Hever Castle (as said on p. 213; see E.M. Moormann, *Ancient Sculpture in the Allard Pierson Museum Amsterdam*, Amsterdam 2000, 161-164 cat. 221). This volume is not Winckelmann's most attractive work, when read independently, but it clearly illustrates Winckelmann's ongoing personal development and research.

Eric M. Moormann

D. BERGES, *Knidos. Beiträge zur Geschichte der archaischen Stadt*. Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 2006. 211 S., 36 Abb. im Text, 8 Farb-, 131 SW-Taf.; 31,5 cm – ISBN 3-8053-3457-5.

With characteristic German 'Gründlichkeit' D. Berges, assisted by a group of eight specialists, presents in this volume the results of the excavation of what appear to be the poor remains of the temple of Apollo Karneios at Emecik, part of the territory of Old Knidos and situated ca 12 km east of the urban centre (Datça-Burgaz, well to be distinguished from the site of New Knidos at Tekir). The architectural reconstruction of the temple and temenos, from the late Bronze to the Byzantine period, will be presented by the Turkish scholar N. Tuna in a separate volume.

In a succinct introduction B. discusses the topography of the Knidian peninsula. He subscribes to the now current view that Old Knidos is to be located at the site of Burgaz / Datça and through *metoikismos* has been moved to Tepir at the western tip of the peninsula sometime in the 4th century BC. He offers no solution for the problem of the Triopion, i.e., the federal sanctuary of Apollo Triopios of the Doric Pentapolis. According to Thucydides (8.35.3) it was situated on the *akra tes Knidias prouchousa* ('on the tip of the Knidian promontory'). This excludes Emecik a priori; moreover, inscriptions from the site show

that the Emecik-temple belonged to Apollo Karneios, not to Apollo Triopios. The Apollo-temple in New Knidos also is dedicated to Apollo Karneios. So far no archaeological remains have been found which could substantiate the claim that the Triopion is to be located in or near Tekir. B. is rightly skeptical about A. Bresson's suggestion (see *SEG XLIX 1430*) that at the tip of the peninsula a small harbor-city called Triopion established itself round the sanctuary and became part of the newly built city of New Knidos (see B. 30 note 103). Archaeological, epigraphical and literary sources supporting this view are simply lacking. Incidentally, in the section on the 30 (parts of) statuettes of lions found at Emecik B. writes that in Knidos the lion is to be interpreted as the symbol of Apollo Triopios (92-94, where B. accepts Th. Homolle's verdict: 'le lion est le symbole d'Apollon triopien'). How does B. reconcile this with his otherwise fully justified emphasis on Apollo Karneios being the main deity of Emecik?

B. interestingly suggests ascribing the initiative to build a new city in Tekir to Mausollos of Caria and dating this operation to the late 60s/early 50s of the 4th century BC.

The report about the excavation of the Apollo sanctuary at Emecik is preceded by a brief survey of the 'Forschungsgeschichte'. This survey focuses on the amusing story of the excavations (legal and illegal) at Datça itself in the early 20th century, when permits were easy to obtain and findings were shamelessly traded to various European museums and collections. B. even goes so far as to publish the correspondence of the Director of the British School at Athens (R.M. Dawkins) with the Greek excavator P.G. Polemikou and the Turkish Ministry of Education: interesting enough but hardly relevant for a publication on Emecik. The 'prehistory' of research on the latter is very brief. It is not until the 80s of the 20th century that B. and the Turkish archaeologist N. Tuna began the first excavations. Prior to that operation the site had been visited, with a varying degree of intensity, by various travellers (Maiuri, Bean and Cook).

The temenos at Emecik consists of two terraces: on the lower one (constructed ca 560 BC) one finds the poor remains of a Doric temple plus altar, on the upper one a vaulted chamber and a Byzantine church. Remains of an archaic stone wall which supported the lower terrace, are still visible. The site has suffered from illegal digs and modern road-building: a common phenomenon in contemporary Turkey, alas! As pointed out before, a full report on the architecture of the site is to be expected from B.'s colleague N. Tuna; B., however, already now points out that initially there was no temple but just a large square, serving as a meeting-place, with an altar, comparable to what in Anglo-Saxon circles is called an 'Open Air Sanctuary'. The temple dates from the late-Hellenistic period and has been severely damaged by 'Steinraub' and lime-kilns, three of which were established on the site itself!

In an epigraphic section (60-62) J. Nollé competently and briefly publishes eight inscriptions: one old text (*I. Knidos 701*) and seven new ones: three archaic graffiti on ceramic fragments (one dedication with *anethēke*) and four inscribed stones: a fragmentary Hellenistic lex sacra mentioning Apollo, a dedication to Apollo Karneios by an ex-prophet (*prophateusas*) and a fragmentary list of

names. The inscriptions unequivocally show that the temple belonged to Apollo Karneios and had an oracular function. B. convincingly argues (28/29) that, on the analogy of the subterranean chamber under the Apollo temple in Klaros, the subterranean vaulted chamber on the upper terrace at Emecik played a role in that context. In the section on statuettes of falcons found in Emecik he points out that falcons are known as the 'mantisches Tier Apollons' (98, where B. at the same time plays with the idea that the falcon in its capacity of bird of prey symbolizes the power of the god; perhaps we have once more a 'thoughtless' (see *infra* my quotation from 89) adoption of an existing repertoire?).

From 63 onwards the lavishly illustrated catalogue of the finds begins. Most of them date from the 7th/6th century BC and testify to the importance of Old Knidos in that era. Berges takes care of the limestone and the otherwise very rare marble objects (statuettes of lions, rams (related to Karneios), bulls and falcons). According to B. petrological analysis showed that the limestone was imported from Cyprus. B. suggests (67, 69, 72, 91) that Cypriote itinerant craftsmen introduced the manufacturing of such statuettes in Asia Minor and that local apprentices adopted and continued this tradition (cf. also 94 and 99, where B. opts for craftsmen domiciled in Eastern Greece). This is the sort of hypothesis which can neither be proved nor disproved. Apart from that, Thomas Fockenberg, who on 195-198 reports on the chemical analysis of the statuettes, is considerably more cautious than B. He points out that the raw material used for these objects admittedly is similar to that found on Cyprus, but he adds that such material 'auf einer recht grossen Fläche im Bereich des östlichen Mittelmeers sedimentiert worden (ist)' (197); he concludes that for the Emecik statuettes Cypriote limestone 'kann als Rohstoff gedient haben' (italics are mine, HWP). Possibilities, however, are no certainties; unfortunately B. seems to think in terms of the latter! It is perhaps not inappropriate to point out here that in the pottery catalogue only one Cypriote sherd is documented (112). On 145 the pottery expert concludes that Cypriote influence on local Knidian pottery workshops can possibly be discerned in *isolated items* (italics are mine, HWP). This is hardly comforting for those who cherish hypotheses concerning Cypriote influence on finds in general from Emecik.

Instead of a general orientalizing style B. prefers to think in terms of a more specific egyptianizing style (74), in which Naukratis played an essential role (72). This may be true but I do not see why local Greek craftsmen would have been unable to develop their craft independently from itinerant Cypriote 'teachers'; the more so, since B. himself, from a stylistical point of view, argues against a 'zyprozentrische Betrachtungsweise' (67; cf. also 87 where B. for statuettes representing 'Thronende Widdergottheiten' argues against a Cypriote provenance). That the ideology, lurking behind Egyptian statues and implying that they were animated with the Ka of the dedicator (74), was adopted together with an egyptianizing style, is once more a gratuitous assumption. 'Dauerhafte Stellvertretung des Stifters im Dienst der Gottheit' (74) as objective of the dedication of the statuette is a product of learned fantasy or, better, of wishful thinking of archaeologists who want to build profound theories on an infrastructure of slender evidence. In this connec-

tion it is appropriate to refer to B.'s brief section on statuettes representing a deity taming a lion. There B. suggests thinking in terms of a 'gedankenlose' adoption of a Rhodian tradition! (89; italics are mine; cf. above my comment on 98, HWP).

R. Attula signs for the publication of the almost exclusively fragmentary pottery (101-153). In addition to import of Corinthian (42 pieces), Attic (4 pieces) and Etruscan (10 pieces of Bucchero) pottery, A. discerns pottery manufactured in Ionian, Rhodian and local Knidian workshops. Neutron analysis (NAA) enabled A. to distinguish the latter from other East Greek centres and to identify quite a few centres in Ionia. Most fragments date from ca 650-550/500 BC. On the whole the number of vases, plates and dishes is small; A.'s main contribution is a further refinement in typology and in the attribution of specific fragments to specific production-centres. For the economic historian there remains not much more than the observation that there were somehow contacts between Old Knidos and other maritime centres. But what can one do with four fragments of Attic pottery?

K. Kleibl (153-182) publishes a selection of the terracotta votives: 116 anthropomorphic pieces (7th/6th century BC) and 328 animal votives, almost exclusively bulls (geometrical period). Neutron analysis points to a dominant Cypriote provenance (and thus import) of nearly all anthropomorphic items; the latter's popularity had a both mercantile and aesthetic background (157). On the other hand the animal votives in majority were produced locally.

On 157 K. suddenly points out that in many cases it remains unclear whether we have Cypriote import or local production imitating Cypriote models by means of Cypriote matrices. Unless this passage concerns the larger terracotta's, which she holds to have been produced locally, or the animal votives which almost exclusively were manufactured in Knidos itself but are referred to by the author further down, this remark does not square with earlier views about a Cypriote provenance. Whatever the truth, the predominance of the bull among the animal votives is related by K. to the following function of the animal: indicator of wealth of the cattle-owning elite and sacrificial animal. Ultimately, the terracotta bull may have been a poor man's substitute for a real sacrifice.

The catalogue is concluded with brief sections on glazed objects, especially falcon-amulets, and 'Strausseis-schalen' mostly imported from Carthage (B.), shells probably used as containers for unguents (B.), glass objects (B.), metal objects ('Slawisch') and coins (B.).

The photos are all excellent; the same is true for the lay-out and the paper: the publisher has done a truly magnificent job. Berges deserves our admiration for having published the results of the excavation relatively rapidly after its conclusion. From an organizing point of view it surely is also quite an achievement to compose such an excellent team of collaborators and to mobilize the archaeometrists for this project. For archaeologists specialized in pottery and other small finds the book is a welcome addition to their armory; for other students of antiquity there surely are more exciting volumes; but Berges *cum suis* cannot be blamed for that!

H.W. Pleket

PH.P. BETANCOURT et al., *The Chrysokamino Metallurgy Workshop and its Territory*. Princeton New Jersey: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 2006. XVIII+462 pp., figs.; 28 cm (Hesperia suppl. 36). – ISBN 978-0-87661-536-2.

On the eastern side of the Mirabello Bay (Eastern Crete, Greece), the site of Chrysokamino presented the archaeologists with an exceptional challenge. The so-called 'golden furnace', a Final Neolithic/Early Bronze Age metallurgy workshop, is a unique source of information on the origin of metallurgical production, though its poor preservation required an in-depth investigation of every available detail. The book represents a state-of-the-art piece of archaeological research and placed the workshop in a wider natural and culture landscape. It is composed of three parts and a large number of appendices including archaeometric and archaeo-environmental reports.

In Part I 'The Chrysokamino territory', the natural and cultural setting of the region is described in full detail, including the history of local research, location, toponyms, climate, geology and natural sources.

Part II, 'The metallurgy workshop' forms the final report of the excavation of the metallurgical workshop and consists of several chapters. The first ones describe the settings and methodology of the excavation in detail. Within the workshop a unique apsidal structure was discovered. Documentation was complete in such a degree that only few hypotheses and arguments on the function of this apsidal structure could be suggested. Residue analysis of pottery content retrieved within the structure provided strong evidence that medicinal herbs were processed here. This suggests that the apsidal structure was most probably an on-site prehistoric pharmacy, which, within the context of an arsenic copper workshop, seems to make good sense. Such an apsidal structure is unique, both in construction technique as in function. A detailed catalogue of retrieved pottery offered the basis for a chronological sequence as well as the function of different spatial entities based on pottery shapes. Detailed catalogues and analysis of stone tools, furnace chimney fragments, pot bellows, faunal and floral remains, slag, ores and prills provided solid material evidence on the workshop's technology and its fuel. Following, Muhly interprets the Chrysokamino workshop data and rewrites the history of early metallurgy in view of the new evidence. Betancourt closes part II with a reconstruction of the smelting practices. The highly interdisciplinary approach on the totality of this project is justified by the absence/incompatibility of raw material of copper in the wider region, indicating long-distance transport of the Chrysokamino copper material from the Lavrion mines in Attica and the Cycladic islands of Kythnos and Seriphos. This was shown by lead isotope analysis of slag. Both Lavrion and the Cyclades have been shown to be the main source of copper for the entire Bronze Age on Crete.

Chrysokamino also represents an evolutionary threshold in the development of metallurgical technology. It is a precedent of the later shaft furnaces and the use of pot-bellows, while its use of arsenic copper is rather old fashioned, going back to the final Neolithic for Crete.

Chrysokamino is the first example of a site with metallurgy as its main activity in this period.

Part III, 'The surface survey': Intensive surface survey offered the chance to place this workshop within its local setting. This was accomplished by a detailed description and mapping of the region's topography, a short report on the Chrysokamino-Chomatias habitation site nearby, a brief study of the Theriospilio cave material of Edith Hall's excavation of 1910 and the wider archaeological context provided by Haggis' Kavousi survey. A brief study of local geography and land use defined the spatial configuration of local agricultural activities. Summarizing the survey data with a focus on the main sites, a diachronic regional history of the Chrysokamino region is presented.

This book contains a wealth in new archaeological data, a rewriting of technological history on the early phases of metallurgy, and a careful and detailed construction of a wider spatial and cultural context of the new data. It would, however, not have been half as valuable without its appendices that provide detailed reports on the archaeometric analyses, including actual laboratory data. The interdisciplinarity of this project and focus on the aims with any necessary means is exemplary and for that reason, I highly recommend this book to all interested in early technology, the transition of Neolithic to Early Bronze Age and interdisciplinary archaeometric investigation.

Steven Soetens

P.J. GOODMAN, *The Roman City and its Periphery. From Rome to Gaul*. London/New York: Routledge, 2007. XVI + 309 pp., 4 tables, 12 pls, 33 figs.; 24 cm. – ISBN 978-0-415-33865-3.

Penelope J. Goodman's book presents the publication of a revised 2002 Oxford PhD thesis. G. explores the organisation and use of the urban periphery as a means of better understanding the nature and workings of Roman urban society. The case studies employed cover a broad geographic area, ranging from Rome to the cities in the western provinces. Equally impressive is the vast chronological scope, taking the discussion of the Roman city and its periphery into late antiquity. However, the real core of the book is a detailed study of periurban areas of Roman cities in Gaul in the high empire. The book makes a valid contribution to the literature on the Roman city, not only enriching the wider town and country debate, but also contributing to the discussion of the relationship between Rome and her provinces.

The introductory chapter starts with G.'s working definition of urban periphery and proceeds by clarifying the terminology applied. It further provides a brief layout of the chapters presented in the book. G. defines urban periphery as an area distinct from the urban centre as well as from the rural areas surrounding the city, thus referring to any occupation and land-use in the environs of a city, which are neither entirely urban nor fully rural in character. G. opts for the terms *periurban* and *urban periphery* since *suburban* or *suburbs* might invoke associations with either ancient metropolitan Rome or medieval and modern cities.

Chapter 2 discusses the concepts of urban periphery

in Roman ideology explored through legal, literary and visual evidence, while the archaeological evidence for urban boundaries and periurban activity is considered in Chapter 3. The conclusions drawn from the assessment of sources underpin the interpretation of archaeological evidence. From these findings it emerges that periurban activity can never be securely identified from its geographic position only, moreover 'periurban identity' remains subjective and contestable. G. systematically considers the archaeological evidence of urban boundaries and peripheral zones, from Rome outwards to the provinces, highlighting the differences between literary construction and archaeological reality. At Rome, 'suburban villa-lifestyle' is revealed by literary sources, whereas the archaeological evidence does not support a distinction between suburban villas and any other luxury property elsewhere in Italy. G. asserts that what makes and breaks the Roman suburban villa are behavioural patterns. These are characterised by activities such as regular journeys between villa and city, philosophical debates, neighbourly visits, all forming part of the metropolitan elite lifestyle and its self-perception (p. 77). G. suggests that comparable patterns can be assumed for the provinces where lavish villas occur in close topographic relationship with cities; still it remains difficult to identify the Roman model of elite suburban living in the provinces, since textual evidence is largely lacking.

Chapter 4, the largest section of the book, concentrates on the main administrative Roman cities in Gaul in the high empire. G. methodically examines the archaeological evidence related to periurban development, with 49 out of 84 cities yielding positive evidence for such activities (p. 158), notwithstanding the hazards of the archaeological record. G. explores different uses of periurban space, grouped into categories of activities on one hand, and building types on the other (commerce, industry, domestic occupation, baths, temples, spectacle buildings, festivals and shows, cemetery and tombs, villas and farms). Applying a simpler, yet more consistent set of land-use categories might have been equally sufficient and would have allowed one to account for overlaps between different building-types with similar or multiple functions. G. aims at detecting patterning in the distribution of specific land-uses and building-types within the urban periphery, as well as identifying regional variation in distribution patterns. Next to commonly found mixed land use, she is able to identify clear patterning in the distribution of specific buildings. While classical temples and theatres are confined to the city centres, Romano-Celtic temples and Gallic theatres, as well as local types of spectacle buildings seem relegated to periurban and rural areas, so as not to compromise the Roman-ness of the urban centres (p. 161-162).

Chapter 5 follows suit by investigating Gaul's secondary agglomerations located within the territories of the administrative cities. In terms of their legal status, being subordinated to the administrative cities, these secondary settlements form a coherent group. In contrast, their physical appearance varies widely regarding size, function and level of urban aspiration. In fact, G. uses their degree of urban personality to subdivide them into settlements with distinct urban aspiration and those with little signs of it. The first group demonstrates that periurban growth occurs along similar patterns as those

found at administrative cities, provided that there was a closely defined urban centre holding some socio-economic local significance. Hence their lesser legal status seemed inconsequential for peripheral growth. The second group reconfirms the importance of defined urban centres against which peripheral activities develop, since sites lacking urban attitude also lack periurban activities. Then again, as G. observes, there is a close relationship between secondary non-urban agglomerations and villas. Rather than emulating the Roman model of suburban villas, according to G., these villas reflect local social hierarchies. As such they would have functioned as residences of elite families which possibly dominated the near-by local settlement (p. 195-196).

Chapter 6 examines changes in the character and function of the urban periphery in late antiquity. For G. the persistence of the centre-periphery divide and the little altered character of periurban land-use make a case for continuity between the high imperial and the late antique Gallo-Roman city. Still, G. identifies some significant changes indicated by the construction of new defensive walls. The earlier Gallo-Roman cities had remained largely unwallled, though their boundaries were conceptually well-defined. The new city-walls, often inconsistent with former boundaries and even enclosing smaller territories than the earlier urban centres, represent a rupture in the urban fabric and inverse the trend towards expansion, consequently displacing activities outside the walls. In contrast to traditional scholarly opinion, G. disagrees with attributing specific importance to extra-mural churches by stressing their unique directional pull; instead she values their extra-mural location as an expression of continuous attention given to peripheral activity. On a functional and social level G. compares extra-mural churches to peripheral public buildings of the imperial period (theatres, baths). These buildings represented foci for social interaction and participation in the wider Roman world to be later substituted by churches offering participation in a wider Christian world (p. 210).

Finally, Chapter 7 considers the urban periphery within the broader context of Gallo-Roman urbanism. G. illustrates the challenges posed by the conflicting dynamics between the 'display city of the provincial elite' and the socio-economic city. Local elites created showcases of *urbanitas* and Roman-ness, whereby the emphasis on the urban centre and its distinct boundary markers rendered urban space inflexible and thus negatively affected the city's economic function. According to G. the urban periphery was able to solve this conflict of interest. It reconciled both needs, allowing the elite city and the socio-economic city to occupy the same space without having a negative impact on one another (p. 234). Thus, the urban periphery not only created space for industrial, commercial and domestic activities, but also extended the elite's display function, offering new settings for monumental public buildings (circuses, amphitheatres). It seems all about realising the urban periphery's potential for negotiation between local needs and Roman principles. G. eventually declares that her model contributes to resolve the tension between scholarly opinions either emphasising the political/cultural role or the economic one (p. 234). Without doubt it makes a valid and interesting contribution, but G. is also careful to suggest that

her model has validity for all Roman cities and their peripheries. Hopefully more studies, examining other Roman provinces, will follow in this direction.

Goodman's book is a coherent and very detailed treatment of Roman cities and their periphery. The case studies are well referenced and clearly illustrated, providing the reader with detailed maps to follow the archaeological explanations. While the systematic approach is the only way to go and the book proves her right, her arguments and conclusions appear at times repetitive and slightly cumbersome, making her investigation and way of presenting her arguments at once a strength and weakness of the book. Nevertheless, by its very value it is highly recommended to anyone interested in Roman urbanism and Roman urban space.

Hanna Stöger

NESLIHAN ASUTAY-EFFENBERGER / ARNE EFFENBERGER, *Die Porphyrsarkophage der öströmischen Kaiser. Versuch einer Bestandserfassung, Zeitbestimmung und Zuordnung*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2006. 138 S., 22 Abb., 28 Taf., 6 Tab.; 24,5 cm (Spätantike-Frühes Christentum-Byzanz; Kunst im ersten Jahrtausend 15). – ISBN 3-89500-353-0.

In this interesting study two different, but connected subjects are treated in a very richly documented way. The first part is devoted to the porphyry sarcophagi of the eastern Roman emperors from Constantine I onwards; in the second part - in fact a large excursus - special attention is given to the mausoleum of Constantine and the Hagii Apostoli church in Constantinople, both in its original Constantinian and its later Justinian appearance.

After the death of Constantine I in 337 most emperors, empresses, princes and princesses of the eastern Roman empire, and some of their counterparts in the western part of the empire as well, were buried in or near the Hagii Apostoli Church in Constantinople. This royal graveyard of Roman and Byzantine rulers remained in use till Constantine VIII, who died in 1028.

Porphyry objects were very rare in the ancient world, because of the high price of the material, but between ca 305 and 450 (closure of the mines in Egypt) a small number of porphyry sarcophagi was used for members of the imperial family. According to literary sources the mausoleum of the emperors contained in the mid-6th century 23 sarcophagi; only 10 of them were made of porphyry.

The authors present in this study a combination of a wide range of literary sources, dating from Roman Antiquity, Byzantine Middle Ages and the later Ottoman period, with the remains that still can be seen now in the museums, mosques and streets of Istanbul. At the moment eight more or less complete, but badly damaged, porphyry sarcophagi are still to be found; a fragment of a cover slab and a lot of fragments of other sarcophagi that have disappeared during the late-Byzantine and Ottoman periods are a sad testimony of the splendour of long ago. Evaluating all available information the authors conclude that at most 20 porphyry sarcophagi must have been present in the royal cemetery.

Much has been written about the Hagii Apostoli Church and its imperial tombs, by Roman and Byzantine

authors and by visitors of later centuries as well. Very problematic is that often this information is incomplete or contradictory. In fact, we have knowledge of an enormous amount of details, but in spite of all that a coherent overall view is not possible. For that reason there is no possibility to ascribe with certainty the remaining sarcophagi to individual emperors or empresses. The hypotheses by the authors - in tables I and VI - are, in my opinion, very plausible and founded on a sound interpretation of very heterogeneous sources.

Most porphyry sarcophagi do not have any decoration; only one fragment shows grapes collecting putti and acanthus leaves. On some other coffins only an Egyptian ankh-sign or a cross in a wreath can be seen. Therefore, dating by stylistic criteria will be difficult. The authors have chosen another criterium for differentiation and dating: the measures of the sarcophagi are very divergent (tables II-V). The largest one seems to be the oldest and is ascribed to Constantine I, the tomb with putti and acanthus leaves to his son Constantius II; in later periods the dimensions have a tendency to grow smaller. A similar development may be discerned in the bases of the sarcophagi: they are growing higher during the 4th and 5th centuries.

Constantine's mausoleum concept, in which he was surrounded by cistae with the remains of the Twelve Apostles, was not of long duration. In 358/359 the urns of the Apostles were removed by Constantius II to the Hagii Apostoli Church, still under construction at the moment. He placed his own richly decorated porphyry sarcophagus near his father's tomb, and during the eighties Theodosius I added a third porphyry one for his own use. Other imperial burials were located in the near-by Apostoli Church in marble or porphyry tombs.

These large tombs sometimes were used for more than one burial; for that reason many princes, princesses and other members of the imperial family could find their resting places in the mausoleum or the church.

The long excursus is in fact a fierce rejection of an old thesis, put forward again by Paul Speck in 2000. Speck, and many scholars in earlier years, pretend that there did never exist a special mausoleum built by Constantine I; his tomb was placed in the eastern section of the cruciform Hagii Apostoli Church, that in this theory was already begun by Constantine himself. I think that the arguments of the authors in favour of a round Constantinian mausoleum like the Santa Costanza in Rome as original grave monument, followed by the cruciform church built by his son Constantius II during the fifties, are more convincing. The testimony (cited on p. 148) of a western anonymous traveller, who lived in Constantinople for some time during the later 11th century, is quite clear: '*in capite ipsius ecclesiae (i.e. Hagii Apostoli) est rotunda ecclesiola marmorea que dicitur fuisse capella Constantini imperatoris, in qua requiescit idem Constantinus cum sua matre Helena in tapho porfiretico maximo et preciosissimo. Cerneret in eadem ecclesia Apostolorum quamplurima sepulcra non ignobilia imperatorum et patriarcharum.*' Will this testimony suffice to end a long discussion, based in most cases on corrupted and incomplete texts?

The book contains a limited number of beautiful colour plates and a great number of fine black and white photographs and ground-plans. Everybody interested in late-Roman architecture, Constantinople, Constantine and his family, or imperial porphyry tombs will find a lot of interesting information in this richly documented study.

Jos P.A. van der Vin