ing and how it might reflect Peisistratos and his sons' influence in the realm of cult. Throughout this section Angiolillo signals and explains points of disagreement with Shapiro about individual pieces. Though the overall conclusion that the Peisistratids, like other tyrants, promoted politically expedient myths and cults is not original, Angiolillo's treatment of some specific examples (Dionysos, Ajax, and Antilochos son of Nestor) proves surprising and insightful. Here and in the section on sculpture, Angiolillo aims to convince the reader that vase painters and sculptors could have been attached to the tyrants' court just as the poets and *chresmologoi* mentioned by the literary sources were. Nevertheless, beyond noting that several Athenian sculptors of the second half of the sixth century emigrated to Athens from Ionia, Angiolillo elicits few convincing connections between freestanding sculpture and Peisistratid cultural patronage. Some of the author's choices in the sculpture section are downright puzzling. Why devote six pages to Antenor? The odds are good that his entire Athenian career dates after the expulsion of Hippias in 510. Why discuss the Rampin rider separately from the other equestrian statues found on the Acropolis? Finally, does not Hipparchos's sculptural dedication to Apollo at the Ptoön (*IG* I^3, 1470) deserve more than half a sentence in a single footnote? Didier Viviers's *Recherches sur les ateliers de sculpteurs et la cité d'Athènes à l'époque archaïque* (Brussels 1992) shows that much more can be done with the surviving sculptural material.

In the end, Angiolillo's control of the literary sources does bring out parallels between the Peisistratids and other tyrants missed by other recent studies of Peisistratid art and architecture. This aspect of the "archaeology of tyranny" could certainly be pursued further, together with Peisistratos and his sons' contribution to the formation of Athenian civic identity before the advent of democracy. The quantity of material available to Angiolillo demonstrates why the second half of the sixth century B.C. in Athens has become an "age of Kronos" for classical archaeologists.

CATHERINE M. KEESLING

CLASSICS DEPARTMENT
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20057-1134
KEESLINC@GUNET.GEORGETOWN.EDU

VORBILDER UND VORLAGEN: STUDIEN ZU KLASSISCHEN FRAUENSTATUEN UND IHRER VERWENDUNG FÜR RELIEFS UND STATUETTEN DES 5. UND 4. JAHRHUNDERTS VOR CHRISTUS, by *Lorenz E. Baumer.* (Acta Bernensia 12.) Pp. 178, pls. 51. Stämpfli, Bern 1997. CHF 128. ISBN 3-7272-0517-2.

Since the 19th century, scholars have readily assumed that many of the figures in votive and document reliefs, as well as many statuettes, copied or in some sense reproduced large-scale works—sculpture in the round, architectural sculpture, or wall painting. From this it has followed that such small-scale works could be used to reconstruct the lost originals they were thought to have copied. Although this approach has met with increasing skepticism in recent scholarship, the view that lost monuments, particularly cult statues, are recoverable in this way is still very widely held. This book, a slightly reworked version of the author's 1994 Bern dissertation, is a systematic investigation of the validity of this approach.

Baumer begins with a brief history of scholarship on the subject and very clearly sets forth the methods and terminology he intends to use, drawing useful distinctions for the discussion of these issues. He distinguishes "type" (a specific original whose physiognomy, pose, drapery, and attributes can be reconstructed through an examination of its large-scale Hellenistic or Roman copies) from "motif" (a broader term characterizing the free variation of characteristics of an original in smaller-scale works, such as votive and document reliefs and statuettes). He further distinquishes "Vorbild" or "model," the original itself, from "Vorlage" or "pattern," a workshop drawing or sketch at least once removed from the original. A relief figure or statuette that reproduces the original in all important respects, in its pose, drapery, and attributes, is a "quotation." A figure that goes back to a large-scale original, but which alters the position of its stance, arms, or attributes, is a "paraphrase." A figure that in stance and drapery resembles a specific type, but about which there is some doubt as to whether it refers to the original, is a "reflection." Finally, a figure that reproduces a specific statue type but is used to represent a different deity is an "Umdeutung," or "new interpretation."

Having defined his terms, Baumer turns to his case studies, a series of approximately 20 originals or copies from which he draws his types, and some 60 reliefs and 25 statuettes that to one degree or another may have reproduced the types. He emphasizes the importance of first arriving at an accurate determination of the type through careful analysis of the original, in the few instances in which it has been preserved, and its large-scale copies, in order to distinguish the various, often similar types. From there it is a matter of determining how closely the smaller-scale work reproduces characteristics of the original. His list of types, which is not meant to be exhaustive, includes both fifth- and fourth-century works, and concentrates on statues and reproductions of Demeter and Persephone, deities whose popularity is reflected in the large number of statues and reliefs depicting them.

From this analysis Baumer concludes that among the types studied, only a few can be certainly recognized in the relief figures or statuettes, and that in general the value of reliefs and statuettes for the reconstruction of lost statues has been overestimated. Those types that appear to have been reproduced are mostly Attic and include, from the second half of the fifth century, the Kore from Eleusis, the Capitoline Demeter, the unidentified statue type Terme-Sacchetti, the "Hera" Borghese, the Aphrodite Daphni, the Nemesis of Rhamnous, the Athena Parthenos, and a veiled Hygieia; and, from the fourth century, the Florentine Kore, the types Kyparissi-Knidos, Kos-Kyrene, and Venice-Vienna-Heraklion, and the Artemis Beirut-Berlin. Moreover, Baumer convincingly argues that in most cases the small-scale figures are not dependent upon knowledge of the originals but are instead the result of their sculptors' use of workshop patterns loosely based upon them. He finds some support for the view that the statues most frequently

reproduced were cult statues, but reflections of the noncultic Erechtheion korai and the Athena Parthenos indicate that this was not exclusively the case. The reason for the use of a statue type was apparently above all practical; the sculptors used types that were appropriate for the deity or hero in question and did not hesitate to use a single type for more than one deity.

Baumer further concludes that in most cases the origin of the reproduction says nothing about the location of the original. The few types that can perhaps be localized are the Kore of Eleusis, which is possibly part of the original cult group created shortly before the Peloponnesian War for the Temple of Triptolemos at Eleusis, the original of the Kyparissi-Knidos type, which was perhaps the cult statue in the temple of the Eleusinian goddesses at Knidos, and the original of the Artemis-Bendis type, which may have been her late fourth-century cult statue in Piraeus.

Baumer's book is beautifully produced, with excellent photographs of virtually every work discussed in any detail, and with multiple views of many of the large-scale works. The text is well organized, with brief and useful summaries following each section of detailed analysis. The documentation of the book is exemplary. Baumer autopsied most of the works he discusses and he provides a detailed catalogue for each original, copy, relief, or statuette discussed, with exhaustive bibliography for each entry. For this reason the book will stand as an important reference work for the sculpture it treats, as well as essential reading for anyone interested in the problems of Kopienkritik.

CAROL L. LAWTON

ART DEPARTMENT
LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY
APPLETON, WISCONSIN 54912-0599
CAROL.L.LAWTON@LAWRENCE.EDU

ANCIENT NAUKRATIS II, Pt. 1: THE SURVEY AT NAUKRATIS, by *William D.E. Coulson.* Oxbow Monograph 60. Pp. xvi + 202, pls. 21, figs. 57, plans 6, maps 3, tables 4. Oxbow Books, Oxford 1996. $48. ISBN 1-900188-22-8.

The site of Naukratis, some 85 km southeast of Alexandria in the Delta of Egypt, is of special interest to classical historians as the only Archaic Greek settlement in Egypt, but it is of equal, if not greater, importance for its potential contribution to the complex history of Egypt from the Late Dynastic into the Ptolemaic era. Indeed, the general area, which includes the Middle to New Kingdom site of Kom el-Hisn, the Late Dynastic capital of Sais, and other koms dating through to the Coptic period, could make a very valuable regional case study of long-term settlement history in the northwestern Delta. Between 1884 and 1903 Petrie and others carried out four seasons of excavations at Naukratis intended to reveal the Greek settlement described by Herodotos, with interesting but disputed results. The center of the site, already then dug out by locals and waterlogged, now is a small lake, leaving only the margins for the investigations in 1980 to 1983 of the Naukratis Project, directed by Coulson and Leonard.

This volume, long delayed in publication (but nicely produced at a reasonable price), presents the results of a surface survey in 1980 and 1981 of the fields around the lake. Most of it deals with the pottery, the main class of find, but there are separately authored chapters on the geological bores and some stamped amphora handles, and a historical chapter on the foundation of Naukratis. The forthcoming volume I will present the 1982 excavation of two small mounds at the site, and volume II.2 the survey, including some trial trenching, of sites in the area up to 30 km west of Naukratis. Meanwhile, several preliminary reports of work have already been published, as well as other related pieces of research (vols. III and VI). While some sympathy is due for problems of publication, this degree of fragmentation interferes with the presentation and interpretation of results.

The discussion and catalogue of the pottery, which takes up most of the volume, is full and well illustrated, and potentially valuable for the interpretation of the site. But surely, since the sherds are unstratified and mostly of local production, it would have been worth waiting for, or referring to, the stratigraphic evidence for dating pottery, which the trial trenching at three sites in the regional survey was designed to produce? In dating the Roman wares, a different problem is the frequent reliance on comparanda from Karanis, because the simple "stratigraphy" of its excavators and their assumption of a fifth-century A.D. terminus are now not trusted, and much pottery that their scheme assigned to the fourth or fifth century would now be dated through to the seventh century. Two further curiosities of the survey finds at Naukratis are the iack of faience (one rim) and glass (none), and the apparent lack of imported wares in the Roman period, despite local production of imitations, as compared, for example, with the commonness of late North African wares on Fayum village sites. These problems make one wary of drawing too precise historical inferences from the surviving surface pottery, which may reflect the modern process of destruction more than the ancient pattern of settlement. The survey areas to the immediate northeast, east and south of the lake (where the new excavations took place), produced pottery predominantly of the Ptolemaic period, with some of earlier date, while the west side was dominated by Roman-period wares. But some Ptolemaic and earlier sherds were found to the west, and the outer areas on the east produced Roman material through to the sixth century. The evidence allows Coulson's suggestion of a westward shift or expansion of settlement in the Roman period; it says nothing against, or indeed for, a southern "native quarter," or the location of the Hellenion (here, as elsewhere, old hypotheses are too trustingly followed); it could support the idea that the "Great Temenos" was a Ptolemaic construction. We may note that Greek fine wares were imported from the Archaic through the Hellenistic periods, though amphoras were the main imports of the latter period. The publication of 42 stamps, incidentally, from the survey and new and old excavations is useful, except that over 700 examples in the British Museum remain unpublished. Yes, Naukratis seems to have "flourished" in the Ptolemaic period, but as what? And whether the apparent lack of Roman-period imported wares indicates a subsequent decline is an open question.