early modern racist theory, is impressive and enlightening, but his analyses of the 'patterns' of proto-racist thinking in antiquity and their relationship to imperialism require deeper theoretical grounding.

There are many typographical errors, chiefly in the extensively quoted passages of Greek and Latin, too numerous to cite here. Many of these involve misplaced Greek breathings (e.g. p. 65 n. 41, p. 212 n. 176, p. 300 n. 176) and/or accents (e.g. p. 154 n. 394, p. 343 n. 92, p. 363 n. 64) and the detachment of the Latin suffix *-que* (p. 235 n. 36, p. 377 n. 37). French and Spanish spelling and accentuation also suffer (e.g. p. 22 n. 51, p. 23, p. 226 n. 6, p. 466 n. 120, p. 477 n. 186). There are some stylistic lapses which result in gobbledegook of the following kind: 'A consequence of the existence of such theories is therefore that ideas of concerning group characteristics which are based on them can in some cases resemble racist ideas even by the narrow definitions cited in the Introduction, for instance Memmi's original proposal . . .' (p. 78). To add insult to injury, the list of illustrations (p. ix) mixes up Figures 3 and 4. One expects better of Princeton University Press.

University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg M. LAMBERT
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni359

STATUE BASES

A. KOSMOPOULOU: *The Iconography of Sculptured Statue Bases in the Archaic and Classical Periods*. Pp. xxxii + 259, ills. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2002. Cased. ISBN: 0-299-17640-1.

The aim of this book is the collection of Greek bases with sculpted figural reliefs and the examination and analysis of their iconography. Half of the book is devoted to a catalogue of sixty-four examples of statue bases, which constitutes the currently extant corpus of this type of sculpture of the archaic and classical periods of Greek art. Preceding the catalogue are eight chapters discussing forms and types of relief bases, and the three primary functions of these bases for the two artistic periods under consideration: as dedications; as supports for funerary monuments; and as supports for cult statues.

The base as a separately worked element first appeared in Greek sculpture in the mid-seventh century B.C. Their origin is explained by two primary theories, one derivative of Neo-Hittite or North Syrian prototypes; the other autochthonous, coinciding with the appearance of monumental sculptures in Greece. Kosmopoulou favors the latter explanation, stating that the addition of a base between a statue and the ground emphasizes the artificial conception of the sculpted figures. K. overstates the significance of the relief bases, however, when she declares that they became almost as important as the statues they supported (p. 5). Surely, their significance to ancient viewers is impossible to reconstruct given the low number of bases that can actually be securely associated with their intended statues.

Relief bases are either solid blocks of stone with cuttings on the top for the insertion of the sculpted monument they supported or are architectural constructions composed of orthostates, a type introduced in the second half of the fifth century B.C. The orthostatic type is believed to have been the invention of Pheidias, devised to

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni360 Published online by Cambridge University Press

support the statue of Athena Promachos *c.* 460–450 B.C. This type was then used in the fourth century to support funerary and votive monuments.

Most relief statue bases are decorated on the front only; the backs are usually unfinished, suggesting their original placement against walls and structures. This is an intriguing observation, because it implies that even though a statue might be carved fully in the round it was intended to be viewed from only from the front. Inscriptions are rare on relief bases and seem exclusive to bases for votive dedications. Relief bases conform to the evolution of relief sculpture in general following current trends, lacking only special borders and landscape elements.

There is a useful section on differentiating relief bases from related monuments also decorated in relief, such as altars and tables. The differentiating criteria may be usefully employed by those working in sculpture storerooms of excavated material from sites like the Athenian Agora, where most of the sculptural finds are fragments that were re-used in later periods to construct walls, houses and other buildings. A significant factor in determining the original form of a fragment of relief sculpture is the type of framing moldings; relief bases are characterized by consistency in their profiles, framed at the bottom by fascia and cyma reversa, and crowned by an ovolo. In addition to technical features, compositional elements such as the widely spaced figures favored on relief bases aide in the identification of reliefs that belong to bases.

Six chapters are devoted to the discussion and analysis of the function of the bases at different periods, i.e. as dedications and funerary monuments in the Archaic and Classical periods, and as cult statue bases in the Classical and Late Classical periods. Dedicatory bases, though few in number, seem to have varied according to the types of monuments they supported as well as the specific intent of the dedicant. The imagery on these bases often illuminates the type of offerings they supported. For example, in the Classical period a large number of relief bases supported victory and athletic monuments, and therefore include Nike figures in their iconography. The iconography of funerary relief bases, on the other hand, illustrates the lifestyles and social rank of the deceased. The bases, along with the monuments themselves, served a commemorative function in order to preserve the memory of the dead by emphasizing their exploits and valor in life.

Cult statue relief bases first appear in Athens in the second half of the fifth century B.C., at a time when an increasing number of cult statues were produced. The often colossal scale of these cult images and their construction from various precious materials necessitated broad, well-built supporting structures that lent themselves to elaborate figural decoration. Because of the fragmentary and limited number of cult statue bases to have survived, however, it seems risky to make too many generalizations on the nature of the iconography for cult statues in general. Based on the iconography of the few survivors, it seems that mythological narratives involving divine births and related themes were favored.

The catalogue entries for each of the sixty-three bases are fulsome, giving the current location of each base, their findspots where known, their physical condition, a description, and current bibliography (to cat. nos 33 and 42, add F. Rausa, *AM* 113 [1998], 191–234). In many cases the marble type is noted, although whether this was determined by isotopic analysis or other analytical means or by visual inspection alone is not explained. On some of the more complex bases fragmentarily preserved, e.g. the base for the statue of the Athena Parthenos, there is discussion of various reconstructions.

K. treats relief bases as a development within Greek sculpture, but based on the provenience of those she includes in her study, they seem to have been overwhelmingly

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni360 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a phenomenon of Athenian sculpture. Most of the examples in the catalogue were found either on the Acropolis or in Athens, and a strong argument could be made for most of those found elsewhere that they were produced either by Athenian sculptors or by sculptors influenced by Athenian style. The book is useful in bringing together this small genre of Archaic and Classical relief sculpture in an organized and logical fashion and should be consulted by those with an interest in all the forms of Greek sculpture.

The J. Paul Getty Museum JANET BURNETT GROSSMAN
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni360

A NEW RESPONSE TO VASE-PAINTING

C. MARCONI (ed.): *Greek Vases: Images, Contexts and Controversies. Proceedings of the Conference Sponsored by The Center for the Ancient Mediterranean at Columbia University, 23–24 March 2002*. (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 25.) Pp. x + 149, b/w and colour pls. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2004. Cased, €105, US$150. ISBN: 90-04-13802-1.

This important volume represents the advancing forefront of the new approach to the study of vase-painting: the scholarly heirs to the earlier preoccupation with stylistics and connoisseurship are now developing diverse methodologies that variously situate Greek vases within a much broader evidential context for cultural historical study, and each chapter, in demonstrating a new response to vase-painting or an extended application of an existing methodology, provides a methodological exemplum as well as offering specific insight into an object, category, or phenomenon in vase-painting. These are not strictly the proceedings of an international conference under approximately the same title (2002, sponsored by the Centre for the Ancient Mediterranean at Columbia University), for in some instances the papers have been significantly altered in response to the conference debate.

In 'Leagros the Satyr', Alan Shapiro broadens the understanding of name-inscriptions on vases through a new analysis of the diverse vase-contexts in which the name 'Leagros' is inscribed; situating the range of vases within their chronological and historical context leads to the conclusion that the name, although referring initially to a historical youth, subsequently became a byword for the kind of dissolute aristocratic lifestyle of sympotic and sexual indulgence that was later both mocked and admired by Aristophanes.

Judith Barringer, writing on 'Skythian Hunters on Attic Vases', challenges the assumption that images of Skythians referred to a historical presence in Athens, in a case study of their inclusion along with Atalanta in the Kalydonian Boar-hunt. Noting the tendency for iconographical blurring between huntress and archers, she concludes that Skythians are used almost as attributes of the female hunter, to mark her 'strangeness'.

With his 'Images for a Warrior. On a Group of Athenian Vases and Their Public', Clemente Marconi enters the long-standing debate about the extent to which Athenian vases reflect the values of the settlements in Italy where so many were

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni360 Published online by Cambridge University Press