



Review

Author(s): Konstantinos Kopanias

Review by: Konstantinos Kopanias

Source: *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. 112, No. 4 (Oct., 2008), pp. 775-776

Published by: Archaeological Institute of America

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20627529>

Accessed: 05-11-2015 21:41 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>

and inland to the Bradano River. More important is the fact that the majority of the “theater vases” with a provenance comes from Italic (non-Greek) tombs. Only 38 of the 109 vases discussed have known provenances, but of those, only one is said to come from Greek Taranto. Furthermore, there is no sound archaeological evidence that Apulian vases were made in Taras, and it is almost certain (as Taplin notes) that the Darius Painter (to whom 26 of the vases are attributed) produced vases in the vicinity of the Italic sites of Ruvo di Puglia and Canosa. The plays are Greek, the inscriptions (when they appear) on the vases are in the Attic dialect, and the technique and style of the vases is derived from Attica, but the people who constituted the market for the vases and may, in fact, have produced many of them, were not Greek.

That being said, Taplin is one of few Anglophone scholars to recognize the probability that there were performances of Attic tragedies during the fourth century not just in the Greek colonies but also at Italic settlements such as Ruvo di Puglia and Canosa, 100 km northeast of Taras. Of those sites he rightly warns, “it might be a mistake to assume too easily that we are dealing with rustic warlords, or with ostentatious nouveaux riches” (22).

The discussion of methods for determining whether an image is related to a tragic performance or is simply based on a well-known myth passed on orally or by text is divided into three parts. The first deals with “the narratives” and focuses on a correlation of details between a text and an image. The second is “an index of signals,” of which Taplin gives eight, including costume, boots, porticoes, and the Furies, among others. Of these he writes that while the signals “do not establish a certainty, they can contribute tellingly to the assessment of probabilities and possibilities” (38). The third part, “two extradramatic signals,” deals with the consistent use of Attic dialect for name labels and the occurrence of tripods in scenes.

Of these three methods, the first and third support a painter’s familiarity with the text of a tragedy; only the second, “signals,” might point to the effect of an actual performance, and these are the least convincing points in the argument. For example, most figures in boots and/or “oriental” dress that appear on South Italian vases have nothing to do with scenes related to tragedy, so the argument that a figure in such dress in a scene related to tragedy might hint at a performance strikes me as a kind of special pleading. While an image on a vase may well have been inspired by a performance, the vase painter has translated that experience into his own medium, and we need not expect vestiges from the actual performance to intrude.

The great strength of this remarkable book is in Taplin’s judicious analysis of the relation between text and image, energized as it is by his conviction that the audiences for the vases had been audiences for performances as well. The reader is presented with the evidence, such as it is, and is allowed ultimately to make an independent judgment. This is a welcome book from one of the very few people who could have written it.

T.H. CARPENTER

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS AND WORLD RELIGIONS
OHIO UNIVERSITY
ATHENS, OHIO 45701
CARPENTT@OHIO.EDU

STEINBRUCH, WERKSTATT, SKULPTUR: UNTERSUCHUNGEN ZU AUFBAU UND ORGANISATION GRIECHISCHER BILDHAUERWERKSTÄTTEN, by *Silvia Nolte* (Beihefte zum Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft 18). Pp. xv + 320, b&w pls. 117, color pl. 1. Kerns Verlag, Tübingen 2006. €99. ISBN 3-89744-247-7 (cloth).

Nolte’s book stems from her doctoral thesis at the Freie Universität Berlin, first published on microfiche in 1996, which it effectively reproduces. Later publications and finds have not been included. Nolte’s aim is to study the supply, logistics, and organization of sculptors’ workshops and the stone carving techniques from the Archaic to Hellenistic periods (3).

Her book consists of two parts: the catalogue (ch. 2) and an extensive discussion and interpretation (chs. 3–4). Nolte’s catalogue offers a “representative selection” (9) of unfinished sculptures or sculpture groups from the above-mentioned periods, all published before 1996 (5 n. 24). It gives the impression of a more or less random selection of works, regarding both their place of discovery (110 pieces from Greece, 11 from Anatolia, 4 from Italy) and the material (only 7 pieces are made from stone other than marble). Nevertheless, it is the most complete catalogue currently available, so it presents a useful tool for all scholars interested in ancient carving techniques. The author describes in detail the visible tool traces on every sculpture in her catalogue, based either on her own observations or on other publications (as in 48 out of 125 catalogue entries). Unfortunately, the quality of the published photographs is not always sufficient.

Of particular interest is Nolte’s detailed discussion of the Telephos frieze on the Pergamon altar in Berlin (122–36) and her conclusion, against the *opinio communis*, that its sculptures were almost completely finished before they were mounted onto the monument (124). In her catalogue, Nolte tends to accept established dates for sculptures, although without always naming her sources. When a new date (e.g., 17 n. 45, 24 n. 54) or interpretation (e.g., 82 n. 143) is proposed, it is usually not supported by detailed arguments. Furthermore, the author sometimes seems to misunderstand the arguments of other scholars, as in the case of the dating of the colossal statue from the Apollonas quarry in Naxos (25 n. 56), which plays an important role in her study. Moreover, there is a tendency to criticize older opinions, even when the author herself has not studied the pieces in question (e.g., 26 n. 57, 29 n. 60).

In the next part of her study, Nolte discusses the sculptor’s carving techniques (138–52) and the use of tools (153–66); she summarizes and supplements important older studies (e.g., C. Blümel, *Griechische Bildhauer an der Arbeit*. 3rd ed. [Berlin 1943]; S. Adam, *The Technique of Greek Sculpture in the Archaic and Classical Periods* [Oxford 1966]). Nolte then addresses the problem of the sculptors’ use of models (167–84). She tries to compensate for the lack of ancient sources on the subject with several examples from the Renaissance, an effort that is noteworthy but also speculative and methodologically questionable. In the next chapter follows a synoptic presentation of the quarries of Naxos (189–200), Penteli (200–3), and Thasos (203–6) and of tool traces still visible in situ. The reason for

choosing these quarries and omitting other significant ones (e.g., the quarries of Paros, Samos, Ephesos) is the author's decision to discuss only those with actual finds of unfinished sculptures from the Archaic to Hellenistic periods (188). Especially notable is her detailed and informative discussion of the Naxos quarries. Nevertheless, in some cases, the author repeats opinions expressed in older works without any reference to them, as in the case of the use of the so-called *pointillé* technique in Melanes already during the Archaic period (198; cf. G. Kokkorou-Alevras, *ArchEph* [1992] 112).

Next comes a detailed discussion of the sculptor's work in the quarry, the workshops' organization, the administration of the quarries, and the transportation of marble blocks and unfinished sculptures (207–37). The author relies mainly on archaeological testimonia but also refers briefly to the available epigraphic sources (e.g., 207 n. 504).

In the last section, Nolte details the problem of the identification of ancient buildings as sculptors' workshops according to a series of carefully defined, albeit somewhat strict, criteria (239–41). From the Archaic period, there are no securely identified workshops (242–43). From the Classical period, the author presents some workshops from the Athenian Agora (252–73) but not those from other cities such as Eretria and Paros (243 n. 702). From the Hellenistic period, she only discusses workshops from Delos (274–89) and not from Athens or other cities (274 nn. 895–96). A comparison to workshops that specialized in the production of bronze and architectural sculptures would have been very useful. Furthermore, if we apply Nolte's strict criteria, the House of Kedron and the House of Diadoumenos on Delos could not have been identified as workshops, as proposed by the author (S. Vogt, rev. of Nolte [2006], *H-Soz-u-Kult* 23.04.2007).

In conclusion, despite some minor editorial problems (frequent misspellings in almost all ancient and modern Greek citations and poor-quality photographs), Nolte's study offers a useful catalogue of unfinished sculptures from the Archaic to Hellenistic periods and a summary of the research up to 1996 on various subjects, such as the techniques and tools of sculptors, their workshops, some ancient quarries (Naxos, Penteli, Thasos), and the extraction of marble and its transportation. She successfully assembled a great amount of information scattered in various publications, as shown by her numerous and comprehensive footnotes, and has added interesting new observations on the above-mentioned subjects.

KONSTANTINOS KOPANIAS

DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORY OF ART
UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS
157 84 ATHENS
GREECE
KONKOP@ARCH.UOA.GR

OLD POTTERY IN A NEW CENTURY: INNOVATING PERSPECTIVES ON ROMAN POTTERY STUDIES. *ATTI DEL CONVEGNO INTERNAZIONALE DI STUDI, CATANIA, 22–24 APRILE 2004*, edited by D. Malfitana, J. Polblome, and J. Lund. Pp. 589, b&w figs. 188, tables 31. Monografie dell'Istituto per i Beni Archeologici e Monumentali, Catania 2006. €100. ISBN 88-89375-03-5.

This book is the result of an international colloquium held at Catania in 2004. The stated objective of this publication—and on which this review places emphasis—is to propose new perspectives for developing research dedicated to Roman pottery in the Mediterranean basin, even as it serves also to review Roman pottery studies in Sicily. In browsing the table of contents, one notes a diversity and richness of approaches but also the difficulties encountered in organizing the papers in a coherent fashion. The general organization of the work is sometimes puzzling, and certain papers do not seem to have a logical place; likewise, the citation of work in archaeometry is curiously relegated to after the chapter devoted to Sicilian ceramics, whereas it concerns all the geographical areas and comprises an important methodological component.

In the first section, the editors privilege an interpretative approach that underlines the contributions Roman ceramics can make to our knowledge of everyday life in antiquity, particularly our understanding of the phenomena of acculturation. Unfortunately, the papers hardly tackle the problem of “function,” which is brought up too rarely and then often in a confusing way: for example, in connection with thin-walled goblets (Roth-Rubi) or *unguentaria* (Hübner). It would have made sense to group with the latter paper two articles dedicated to ceramics in a funerary context (Slane and Walbank for Corinth and Jacobsen for Cyprus), which brilliantly demonstrate how crucial it is (beyond ceramicists' interest in chronology and typology) to associate ceramics with their contexts to generate their full significance. Only one paper (Principal) brings up what should have constituted one of the strengths of this work. In connection with black-gloss wares from the end of the Hellenistic period found in the northeast Iberian Peninsula, the author determines those forms of Greek inspiration and those, influenced by metal wares, that can be regarded as Roman. Particularly (and this is what makes the paper remarkable), it establishes a parallel between the evolution of fine ware and cooking ware forms, thus underlining an obvious point that unfortunately escapes most ceramicists: these shapes had previously been used for eating. Their form is adapted to dining practices; to the nature, texture, and manner of preparing dishes. One cannot study these table ceramics, from the angle of “acculturation,” by dissociating them from cooking wares. Yet this last category of ceramics is strangely quasi-absent from the publication, as is current (and very promising) work on residue analysis.

Emphasis is placed on methodological approaches to permit a reliable historical account of Roman ceramics. The papers aligned to this theme are heterogeneous. Some offer new research directions (e.g., Schindler-Kaudelka and Fastner for applied decoration on Italian sigillata), which must still be proved reliable. Malfitana uses the few decorated vases available, in particular of Corinthian production, to show, astutely (but not unexpectedly), that these images reflect beliefs of the time. Mackensen points out the importance of research into workshops, as well as the chemical analysis of fabric, in connection with African Red Slip Wares of the third century C.E.; Schneider and Daszkiewicz do the same for Italian sigillata. Continuing with methodological questions, one ought also mention the contributions of Bes and colleagues and of Rauh and Rothaus, who stress the difficulty in interpreting data provided by surveys. Finally, the notable paper by De Sena and Rivello defines criteria for reading ceramics found in the contexts of dumps or fills, even if it