



Review

Author(s): Konstantinos Kopanias

Review by: Konstantinos Kopanias

Source: *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. 110, No. 3 (Jul., 2006), pp. 514-516

Published by: Archaeological Institute of America

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40024562>

Accessed: 14-01-2016 04:14 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Archaeological Institute of America is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Journal of Archaeology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

material, and interpretation. The editors have successfully combined this diversity of approach with a variety of topics, including summaries of the most important recent surveys and excavations, analyses of cultural interactions, reconstructions of social dynamics, migrations, and arts and crafts. The book covers the Late Chalcolithic (first half of the fourth millennium B.C.E.) through the Achaemenid period (sixth–fourth centuries).

From the chronological and cultural-historical perspective, the book focuses on two periods: the Kura-Araxes culture of the Early Bronze Age (four chapters); and the Urartian civilization of the Iron Age (four papers), with three papers devoted to the Middle and Late Bronze Age and one discussing post-Urartian data. Among the studies concerning the Kura-Araxes culture (ca. 3500/3300–2500/2300 B.C.E.), the chapter by Kiguradze and Sagona (38–94) attempts to clarify its origins. It presents a comprehensive summary of the Sioni-type (I prefer “Adablur-Sioni Culture”) and earliest Kura-Araxes assemblages from Georgia and northeastern Turkey. Their analysis of the material is thorough, although bringing together these two groups of sites consecutively within the framework of the Chalcolithic (second half of the fifth–fourth millennia B.C.E.) seems premature, since their approach derives from an assumption of cultural continuity that has yet to be demonstrated.

The importance of Caucasian metallurgy for ancient Near Eastern and eastern European Bronze Age civilizations has been the focal point of many studies for more than 100 years. In chapter 1, Kohl discusses (9–21) the catacombs at the Kura-Araxes site of Velikent in Dagestan (Russian Federation) and analyzes the relevance of world system theory to the study of ancient metallurgy of copper and tin. Peterson (22–37) explores the social value of metalwork at Velikent, reappraising technologies in local social contexts. In chapter 4, Rothman (95–110) courageously attempts to construct a migration model for the Kura-Araxes population within the core and on the southwestern periphery of its territory.

Puturidze (111–27) analyzes sociocultural processes reflected in the Middle Bronze Age sites and artifacts of the Trialeti cultural sequence (ca. 2400/2300–1800 B.C.E.). She brings to our attention an important question: why do societies that have had identical technological and economic bases (and presumably similar social organizations) leave us with an unprecedented diachronic and synchronic stylistic variety of its archaeological assemblages within one region? The paper contains some errors; for example, kurgan burials and wagons do not first appear at the beginning of the “Early Kurgan Culture” (122) (i.e., at the beginning of the Trialeti cultural sequence) but rather in the Kura-Araxes. Robinson (128–43) discusses the style and iconography of the silver goblets and bucket from Karashamb and Trialeti. While recent publications stress Mesopotamian and Iranian influences, Robinson persuasively argues in favor of an essentially central Anatolian connection for the imagery presented on the vessels.

The only paper devoted to the Late Bronze Age (ca. 1500–1100 B.C.E.), written by Badalyan, Smith, and Aветisyan (144–66), is, however, significant; it explores the indigenous roots of sociocultural complexity, thus lead-

ing to a new view of the emergence of state in that region. This study serves as a necessary introduction to chapters 8–11, which present the current state of study of the Urartian civilization (ca. 900–550 B.C.E.). Biscione’s comparative analysis (167–84) of detailed surveys in the basins of Lakes Urmia and Sevan reveals the specificity of sociopolitical shifts during the transition from Early Iron Age regional states to the Urartian imperial structures in different ecological zones. Sevin’s chapter (185–96) presents the results of the excavations at the Iron Age cemetery at Karagündüz, important to the study of the formative period of the Urartian state. The two other chapters, by Çilingiroğlu (197–212) and by Stone and Zimansky (213–28), present the ongoing excavations of the imperial city Rusahinili Eiduru-kai (675–650 B.C.E.) at Ayanis on the eastern shore of Lake Van, the most significant field project in Urartian archaeology in the last 15 years.

The last paper, by Tsatskhelidze (229–45), summarizes the archaeological evidence concerning the impact of Urartians, Scythians, and Achaemenids on sociocultural processes in Kartli (eastern Georgia) and Colchis (western Georgia). The author correctly notes a host of theoretical problems related to the interpretation of that evidence.

The book as a whole adequately presents the current state of Caucasian archaeology with its major achievements and multiple unsolved problems. A chapter on the history of archaeology in the region would have been welcome. Besides the variety of approaches and astounding amount of material, the volume is an important milestone for two reasons: first, it introduces contemporary anthropological thinking into the field of Caucasian archaeology; second, it brings the archaeology of Caucasus back to where it belongs—the realm of Near Eastern archaeology. It is a must-read for anybody with a special interest in the Bronze and Iron Age archaeology of the region.

GREGORY E. ARESHIAN

COTSEN INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY
THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90095-1510
SARDURI@CS.COM

ANCIENT GREEK SCULPTURE: OFFERING IN MEMORY OF THE SCULPTOR STELIOS TRIANTES, edited by *D. Damaskos* (Benaki Museum 1). Pp. 332, b&w figs. 301. Benaki Museum, Athens 2002. ISBN 960-8452-97-X (cloth).

This wonderful volume, edited by Damaskos, in collaboration with Deliborrias, Geroulanou, and Mpouras, contains 24 essays on sculpture from the Archaic to the Late Roman period. The superb quality of the contributions, the excellent figures, and the volume’s attractive physical form constitute a valuable gift offered in memory of the worthy sculptor Stelios Triantes, whose comprehensive archaeological work is presented by Despinis (9–16). The essays are written in Greek, German, French, and Italian, all without a résumé in English.

Moustaka discusses in detail a terracotta statuette from the Acropolis of Siphnos (17–29). The author dates the statuette to around 670 B.C. and formulates the convincing proposal that it should be reconstructed according to the Athena Promachos type (fig. 2). She proposes that the original height of this terracotta statuette was about 75 cm.

Sigalas publishes three fragments of Poros statuettes from Thera (31–6): the lower body of a seated figure (figs. 2, 3), the upper body part of a kourotrophos (figs. 4–6), and the head of an infant from another kourotrophos figure (figs. 8–10). The author dates all three to the middle Daedalic period and attributes them to a Cretan workshop. Furthermore, he revises his old opinion that the first two fragments belong together.

Lempesi publishes a fragment of an interesting statuette from Crete, which she dates to the beginning of the second quarter of the seventh century B.C. (37–51). Lempesi identifies this figure with Eileithyia, offering a convincing reconstruction of a kneeling pregnant woman holding her bare breasts. Lempesi also presents a very useful review of other possible seventh-century sculptures that depict the same goddess.

The following essay by Croissant considers kore A4062 found at the Artemision on Delos (53–62). The author dates the statue to around 570 B.C., and based on his own reconstruction (fig. 23), he argues that it was the product of a Parian and not a Naxian workshop.

Walter-Karydi offers an essay on an Archaic sculpture head from Athens (63–72). She proposes that it originated from a grave sphinx, not a kouros as previously suggested, and dates it a little earlier than 570 B.C. Her instructive discussion on the interpretation of sphinxes depicted on grave steles is very illuminating.

In the next essay, Touloupa (73–80) and Korres (81–82) together assemble a compelling argument for the reconstruction of the central acroterion of the Apollo Daphnephoros Temple in Eretria (fig. 7). Touloupa identifies the two missing figures as Herakles fighting Hippolyte or Peirithous/Phorbas/anonymous Athenian against an Amazon.

Despoini publishes a relief anthemion that once decorated a grave stele from Thera (83–92). Despoini dates it to around 470 B.C. and considers it to be Parian in style. In addition, she offers a detailed and very useful review of the iconography and chronology of stele anthemion in general.

Pasquier gives us an informative and equally detailed discussion of the kore Salavin in the Louvre (inv. MA 3685) and dates her at around 480 B.C. (93–107).

Raftopoulou discusses a Roman head of unknown origin, now in the National Museum in Athens (inv. 5694), and presents strong arguments that it is reminiscent of Pheidias sculptures (109–16).

Mantis demonstrates convincingly that three sculpture fragments in the Acropolis Museum (invs. 922, 9331, 9200) belong together and attributes them to figure F from the west pediment of the Parthenon (117–28). The proposed reconstruction is best illustrated in a plaster cast (fig. 7) and a drawing (fig. 8). Of great interest is the author's proposal that south metope 14 depicts one of Erysichthon's daughters.

Beschi's essay reflects upon the sculptured head of a man (inv. 2210) and a woman (inv. 2207) in Lapidario, Trieste (129–42). He proposes that both originally belonged to the same Attic grave stele, dates them to the end of the fifth century B.C., and suggests that the lost bronze statue of Artemon by Polykleitos influenced the style of the man's head. It is, however, unfortunate that no copies are preserved that would confirm the author's hypothesis.

Vlassopoulou offers a detailed essay on four interesting sculpture fragments of the late fifth-century from the Acropolis and attributes them to various monuments (143–55).

Trianti publishes a portrait of Plato found in 1994 out of context in the Makrygianni estate, south of the Acropolis (157–69). She posits that the portrait belonged to a standing statue depicting the philosopher and she dates the copy to the first century A.D.

Palagia offers an essay on the relations between Athens and Dodona during the fourth century B.C. (171–80). She discusses in depth a marble relief fragment from the Acropolis with the inscribed names of Dione and Zeus Naios (fig. 1) and builds the case that it belonged to a decree concerning either the Dodona sanctuary or the cult of Zeus Naios and Dione on the Acropolis. She further discusses the marble throne fragment from the Acropolis dedicated to Dione (fig. 10), dated ca. 330 B.C., and suggests that it is probably iconographically influenced by the throne of her statue in Dodona.

Deliborrias' essay ventures into the thorny field of Scopadic research, and in a careful manner he brings new stimulation to an already turbulent discussion (181–93). He proposes that an Apollo statuette in the Archaeological Museum in Sparta (figs. 3–6, inv. 952), which he dates to the end of the fourth or beginning of the third century B.C., could be in some way influenced by the lost statue of Apollo by Scopas in the Palatine temple of the same god in Rome.

Pologiorgi contributes an essay on a grave stele that names Euboulos of Euboulides as the deceased, and states that it probably originated from the cemetery of Merenta in the ancient Attic Demos of Myrrhinous (195–208). Her observation that two fragments in the Brauron museum (inv. BE 87 and BE 2676) belong together with a fragment in Museo Nazionale Romano in Rome (inv. 125589) permit the restoration of the whole monument (fig. 6). The restored stele, dated 350–340 B.C., shows a loutrophoros, which in turn bears the depiction of an older man leaning on his staff and a young slave opposite him.

Despinis offers an essay on Attic naiskoi stelai of the fourth century B.C. (209–31). The author discusses numerous sculptures scattered in various museums and demonstrates that they originally belonged to naiskos monuments. His contribution is certain to become an important reference point to all studies on the sculpture of the fourth century.

Schmaltz delivers an essay on the well-known statue of Tyche from Antioch, by Eutychides from Sikyon (233–40). The author distinguishes the side from which the statue should best be viewed, and believes that the angle from which most published pictures are taken has a misleading influence on our analyses.

Tzanavari publishes seven fragments of locally produced Hellenistic marble statuettes found in the area of Derveni, ancient Lete (241–61), five of which depict Artemis (nos. 1–5).

Kyrieleis discusses in detail an interesting portrait of a young man with Ammon horns, which can be found in the Archaeological Museum of Istanbul (263–68). He demonstrates persuasively that it is the portrait of Ptolemy XIII, XIV, or XV, dated to the first century B.C.

La Rocca submits a comprehensive essay on the iconography of Ara Pacis (269–313). He reasons that figure south 36 (fig. 3) does not depict a *silenziarius*, since its gesture is rather more indicative of thoughtfulness and mourning. He also proposes that the figures north 35 (fig. 17) and south 31 (fig. 18) in fact portray children of Augustus' family.

Romiopoulou publishes three portraits from the National Archaeological Museum of Athens (315–21). She suggests that the first depicts Polydeukion and dates it to 140–160 A.D. (inv. EAM 14604), the second an unidentified mature woman dated 160–170 A.D. (inv. EAM 14603), and the third possibly Julia Domna from 194–205 A.D. (inv. EAM 14602).

Last but not least, Boutyras suggests (323–32) that the portrait of a bearded man in the Uffizi in Florence (inv. 112119) is identical to another located in the Archaeological Museum in Herakleion (inv. 230). He deems it likely that both sculptures, dated 150–170 A.D., were produced by the same Attic sculptor and stood originally in Lytto on Crete.

In conclusion, this volume offered in memory to Stelios Triantes presents a collection of first-class essays from distinguished experts on sculpture that covers a wide chronological and thematic range. It is replete with first published sculptures and new ideas, so it will indeed be a very useful addition to every archaeological library. One cannot but congratulate all authors and editors for this excellent publication.

KONSTANTINOS KOPANIAS

DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORY OF ART
UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS
15784 ATHENS
GREECE
KONKOP@ARCH.UOA.GR

LA CERAMICA FIGURATA A SOGGETTO TRAGICO IN MAGNA GRECIA E IN SICILIA, edited by *Luigi Todisco* (Archaeologica 140). Pp. xx + 810, pls. 156. Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, Rome 2003. €380. ISBN 88-7689-195-1 (cloth).

This long book is in fact a collection of the revised dissertations of four of Todisco's students. He begins his short introduction by contrasting the approaches of Robert and Séchan, noting the debate over the relation between vase paintings and the performance of tragedy, although he does not attempt a standpoint, nor does he give a clear history of the terms of the debate. He points out instead the need for a collection of relevant material

such as is presented here, and he notes that it is the most exhaustive available (Webster's *Monuments Illustrating Tragedy and Satyr-Play* [2nd ed.] dates to 1967; a major revision is under way).

For the most part, Todisco gives a summary of the contents and then goes on to question the extent of the performance of tragedy in southern Italy and Sicily, at least in the late fifth and fourth centuries. His argument is complicated by the presence of messenger scenes (e.g., the Sicilian krater by the Capodarso Painter, which seems to show Oedipus Tyrannus) and by the phlyax vases that reflect the performance of comedy. On these last he seems reluctant to accept the arguments of scholars such as Webster, Green, Csapo, and Taplin that they (and the parallel terracottas) show Athenian comedy as performed in the West. The notion of local comedy dies hard in Italy.

Catucci comes first with "Tempi e modi di diffusione di temi teatrali in Italia attraverso la ceramica di importazione" (1–97). She discusses the recent studies of the reception of Attic vases (and especially the scenes on them) carried out over the last two decades by Giudice and his colleagues, and is careful to note the problems caused by the loss of precise contexts. She reckons that imported vases with theatrical subjects (including "padded dancers") number 498, of which 334 have a provenience though normally not a context. This excludes vases that are no longer certainly known to come from Italy. It also begs the question of whether the decoration of vases was a major issue in their choice as imports.

One could quibble about a number of details. For example, she claims that the figures of padded dancers are "spesso itifalliche" (5), which is hardly true; there is no mention of the work of Tyler Jo Smith on padded dancers, nor does her name appear in the bibliography. In the discussion of Attic black-figure vases with comic choruses, it is strange that there is no mention of the cup skyphos in the Guarini collection, which is said to have been found between Pulsano and Lizzano (Taranto) (B. Fedele et al., *Antichità della collezione Guarini* [Galatina 1984] 45–6, no. 14, pl. 43).

In one of the better-presented chapters, Sisto (99–132) looks at the shapes of southern Italian and Sicilian vases decorated with subjects derived from tragedy. She uses some 400 items and quotes authorities in the catalogue for their association with theater. Her figure 11 usefully charts the numbers of vases with supposed tragic subjects. Gadaleta (133–221) examines the archaeological contexts of these vases in the colonies and indigenous centers. After pointing out the loss of contexts for the earlier finds (though not the more modern sin of withholding such information through failure to publish and denial of access), she charts findspots in relation to chronology. The results are hardly startling, but it is very good to have them tabulated. In large part they reflect what may be read as the economic upswing in southern Italy (as distinct from Sicily) in the mid fourth century. For this purpose she accepts the traditional chronology of Trendall and others that may in any case need only the slightest of downward adjustments. She then goes on to look at finds from the main regions. Along the way she brings together a number of valuable observations of her own and from others on the validity of the stated prove-