supposed to have been pictured in the third photo of plate 3; and the small, cut piece of silver, no. 472, although inscribed *DIOS* and regarded by Hitzl as a unique silver weight, should probably be identified as just a small, cut ingot.

JOHN H. KROLL

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78712
JKROLL@UTXVMS.CC.UTEXAS.EDU

ARTE E CULTURA NELL'ATENE DI PISISTRATO E DEI PISISTRATIDI: Ο ΕΠΙ ΚΡΟΝΟΥ ΒΙΟΣ, by *Simonetta Angiolillo.* (Bibliotheca archeologica 4.) Pp. 275, color pls. 8, figs. 127, tables 3. Edipuglia, Bari 1997. Lit. 90,000. ISBN 88-7228-152-0.

Angiolillo, already the author of several short articles on the subject, has here produced an exhaustive archaeological survey of the 50-year period in Athenian history between the first tyranny of Peisistratos in 561/0 and the expulsion of his son Hippias from Athens in 510 B.C. What is most remarkable about this book is the fact that Angiolillo cites (and usually summarizes) the scholarly contributions of 555 modern authors, all listed in a separate index provided in addition to the thorough scholarly bibliography. This bibliographic outpouring documented by Angiolillo dates largely since the publication of John Boardman's "Herakles, Peisistratos and Sons" (*RA* 1972, 57–72). All the same, reading this book makes one realize that the study of Peisistratid archaeology still remains dependent upon some of the earliest Athenian archaeological discoveries, namely the pre-Periclean architecture and sculpture from the Acropolis, and upon the stylistic chronologies of Athenian vase painting and sculpture.

Angiolillo has divided her book into four sections. The first deals with what Angiolillo terms "la politica urbanistica," or Peisistratid building programs organized topographically and encompassing discussions of the style and content of architectural sculptures, including all of the poros pediments from the Acropolis. The second and third sections treat vase painting (Athenian black- and red-figure) and freestanding marble sculpture (funerary and votive). The fourth and shortest section takes up the subtitle of the volume ('Ο ἐπὶ Κρόνου βίος, quoting *Ath. Pol.* 16.7) for a well-referenced discussion of the chronology and cultural significance of the Peisistratid period.

The placement of this discussion at the end rather than the beginning of the book reveals the book's most serious methodological problem. The disputed chronology of Peisistratos's three periods of tyranny, combined with ancient testimonia that provide little information about what exactly Peisistratos and his sons did in Athens, makes it difficult to decide which buildings, vases, and sculptures can authoritatively be called Peisistratid and which cannot. It seems to me that anyone who would systematically treat Peisistratos and his sons' legacy in Athenian art and architecture needs to decide whether to build a picture from the literary sources and sift the archaeological evidence thematically, or to limit him- or herself to monuments dated stylistically within the chronological range of Peisistratos's third tyranny (the third quarter of the sixth century B.C.), the only archaeological period it is safe to call "Peisistratid." In the course of the earlier sections, Angiolillo consistently settles for stylistic dates of ca. 550–540 or ca. 520 when discussing monuments that she considers to be Peisistratid; the dates 15 years up or down preferred by other scholars would knock some thematically important contenders, such as the poros Herakles pediment and Old Athena Temple on the Acropolis, off the list. Angiolillo determines throughout the book that some monuments should be Peisistratid and others should not, but the book's structure makes it difficult to discern the reasons governing her choices.

Angiolillo presents an encyclopedic collection not only of the buildings, vases, and sculptures that might date to the tyranny, but also of scholarly opinions about them. For this reason, too, a methodology and historiography section at the beginning of the book would be helpful. Readers not already familiar with archaeological scholarship on Peisistratid Athens will not be able to find the real milestones (Boardman's articles on Herakles and Peisistratos (supra), and Frank Kolb's article on "Die Bau-, Religions- und Kulturpolitik der Peisistratiden," *JdI* 92 [1977] 99–138) amid references to every published theory about the art and architecture of Athens in the second half of the sixth century B.C. The feeling of abundance extends to the numerous high-quality illustrations included in this volume. The color plates are especially fine, though they are not referenced in the text, and at least one of them reproduces in color an object shown in an identical black-and-white figure.

The longest part of the first section on building programs deals with the Archaic Acropolis. In the midst of a thorough presentation of arguments and counterarguments, Angiolillo reaches the following conclusions. Peisistratos probably had a residence on the Acropolis by analogy with Polykrates, tyrant of Samos (30); Peisistratos or his sons must have established the sanctuary of Brauronian Artemis on the Acropolis because krateriskoi characteristic of the cult appear there by the end of the sixth century (68–69); a passage from Photios's *Lexicon* attributes construction of the *hieron* at Brauron to Peisistratos, strengthening the supposition that Peisistratos installed his family's neighborhood cult on the Acropolis (85–86); the H-architecture and associated poros pediments belong to a Peisistratid temple of ca. 550 B.C. connected with Peisistratos's foundation of the Greater Panathenaia and located under the Parthenon; the Old Athena temple on the Doerpfeld foundations was then built by Hippias and Hipparchos ca. 520 B.C. (66–68). The worrisome fact (duly noted by Angiolillo) remains that no ancient source attributes any buildings on the Acropolis to either Peisistratos or his sons. Nor do the sources agree that Peisistratos had anything to do with the foundation of the Greater Panathenaia, despite his sons' memorable participation in the 514 B.C. festival.

It is no accident that the title of Angiolillo's book echoes that of H.A. Shapiro's *Art and Cult under the Tyrants in Athens* (Mainz 1989). Like Shapiro's book, Angiolillo's substantial second section focuses on the iconography of vase paint-

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