concluding section, containing a typology, lists the sources (Cicero is the main one), and ends with a thirty-page bibliography.

doi:10.1093/gromej/cxi014 BARBARA LEVICK

Art and Archaeology

It was in 1936 that Humfry Payne's folio volume of archaic marble statuary from the Athenian Akropolis appeared – not long after the author's premature death. The illustrative plates, by Gerard Mackworth Young, set new standards for the photography of ancient sculpture, but that did not inhibit Payne from adding his own descriptive and subjective eloquence. And Payne was nowhere more eloquent than in his account of the *korai* – the statues of 'maidens', whose presence was such a distinctive feature of the Akropolis sanctuary prior to its occupation and vandalism by the Persians in 480 BC. Ostensibly, Payne's essay was concerned to arrange these korai into a stylistic and chronological series. But it reads more like a hymn to feminine beauty, with sculptors praised or blamed according to their capacity for rendering the parts and the whole of a woman's body with due delicacy and respect. So the maker of the kore known only by her Akropolis Museum inventory number 670 is castigated as 'a man with little feeling' because he was unable or unwilling to give his subject the lovely legs that would match her face; while the sculptor responsible for the kore dedicated by Euthydikos is warmly applauded for creating a portrait of 'unimpaired individuality'. With this piece, writes Payne, a 'feeling for the substantiality of the body beneath the dress runs through the whole figure.' It is tempting to wonder, with a snigger or raised eyebrow, how far the sculptor really did feel for the substantiality of the body beneath the dress; more sensible, perhaps, to assume that here is merely a scholar from a bygone age trying to point out that the kore of Euthydikos is more 'naturalistic' than previous examples of the type. But how far have we come since Humfry Payne in understanding more objectively what was signified by the type? Three new books on the subject provide the opportunity to answer that question. Largest, and most handsomely illustrated, is Katerina Karakasi's *Archaic Korai*.[1] This is not, strictly speaking, a full *catalogue raisonné*, opting rather for an area-by-area discussion of korai so far discovered: as such it is not a complete replacement for Gisela Richter's 1968 *Korai*. But the plates alone make this an essential library resource; with the colour plates, including reproductions of watercolour sketches done when some of the pieces were newly excavated, especially valuable in helping us to visualize the original display of gaudiness. Xenophon's worthy Athenian citizen Ischomachos deplored his wife for resorting to make-up, high heels, and other adornments (*Oikonomikos* 10.2): but most of the sculpted korai once visible on the Akropolis were presented as if fresh from some glamorous 'makeover', preened and painted from top to toe. Even the so-called Peplos Kore, demure in her choice of clothes, was richly embellished, and not only on the surface of her dress. Faces were whitened, with rouge applied to the cheeks; tresses and braids of long hair carefully arranged to accentuate an upright neck and firm breasts; and various items of jewellery festooned about the person. One of the few korai to possess a name is the image of Phrasikleia, well-known as the funerary

[1] *Archaic Korai*. By Katerina Karakasi. The J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles, 2003. Pp. 187, with an additional 212 black and white and 66 colour plates. Hardback.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gromej/cxi015 Published online by Cambridge University Press

monument of a young Attic woman who died before she could be married. What is less well-known is that Phrasikleia, too, stood in a blaze of scarlet, multi-patterned glory – the chromatic antidote to deathly black or gray. Eye-catching textiles were not just part of an ancient penchant for colourful sculpture; as Karakasi suggests, it was an integral part of a woman's status that she was shown wearing fine and expensive garments – garments, implicitly, that she had fashioned for herself. Their names, apart from Phrasikleia and very few others, are not recorded. So who or what was represented by these striking figures? The problem of identity looms large in Catherine Keesling's study of *The Votive Statues of the Athenian Acropolis*,[2] which considers the korai within the category of votive offerings and reopens the notion that they have divine significance. For many scholars, this possibility was discounted long ago – given that korai from the sanctuary of Hera on Samos have none of Hera's usual attributes, and korai from the Akropolis similarly seem to lack the specific signs that would serve to make them epiphanies of Athena, Artemis, or Aphrodite – all of whom had dedicatory shrines on or around the Akropolis. And if (to put it bluntly) the korai were simply too sexy to represent priestesses of these cults, how much more unlikely is it that they represent Olympian deities? Keesling's case, as it turns out, relies firmly upon a network of tenuous conditional assumptions – that if the gesture of an extended forearm signifies divinity, then the korai might be divine; if Athena sometimes carries a pomegranate, then korai bearing pomegranates may be intended as Athena; and so on. Intuitively, we should sympathize with the effort that Keesling has attempted here: one of the few certainties about the korai is that they were votive offerings, and once a votive offering reaches lifesize or more (Antenor's kore stands at over two metres tall), the suspicion hovers that some deity is signified. But since sixth-century Athenian vases showing the birth of Athena depict her leaping from the cranium of Zeus in full 'warlike' (*promachos*) mode, complete with helmet and spear, and the tasselled aegis with gorgoneion was already fixed as part of Athena's customary guise, it is not easy to believe that any of the korai doubled for the goddess. The principal difficulty of interpretation posed by the korai lies in the statues' presence – generic and anonymous, yet so various and characterized. To turn the pages of Karakasi's ensemble of photographs is to be reminded of the wise observation, made decades ago by Brunilde Ridgway, that all korai are alike only in the sense that all Doric temples are alike. On one page, there is the girl who is so cheerfully stunted that some presume her to be a dwarf (No. 683); on another, one who seems unnervingly modern in looks, allure, and attitude (No. 674); on another, the full-bosomed matron whose title as *kore* seems a flattering fiction (No. 680). (And then there is Payne's favourite, 'the pouting one', whose tight-lipped icy gaze would freeze a suitor in his tracks). Who could allow these figures to be categorized as ideal *objets d'art*? Keesling's reluctance to accept the korai as such is shared by Mary Stieber, whose monograph *The Poetics of Appearance in the Attic Korai*[3] singles out the 'realistic' elements evident in Phrasikleia and her nameless counterparts on the Akropolis. If the original Tyrannicides by Antenor were, as Pliny believed, the first portraits in Greek art, might we be justified in treating the korai made by Antenor and others as commemorative of certain young

[2] *The Votive Statues of the Athenian Acropolis*. By Catherine M. Keesling. Cambridge U.P., 2003. Pp. xviii + 272, with 64 figures in text. Hardback.

[3] *The Poetics of Appearance in the Attic Korai*. By Mary Stieber. University of Texas Press, Austin, 2004. Pp. xiv + 230, with 38 black and white photos. Hardback £34.50.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gromej/cxi015 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(and not so young) Athenian women? The possibility is opened up and plausibly pursued by Stieber – though it remains problematic to envisage the practical consequences of the theory. Athenian citizens allowing their daughters to pose in a sculptor's workshop? Surely not. Nevertheless, viewing the korai as if they served to parade instances of eminently eligible girls, like a coming-out of debutantes in stone, makes some sense of the otherwise paradoxical mix of devotion and sensuality apparent in these statues. Take the gesture, which many adopt, of lifting the hem of a skirt, or pulling it sharply to one side. Is this simply a sculptor's trick to animate the statue? Is it another signal of devotion – the first step of a votive dance-routine? Does it add to erotic appeal, by revealing a dainty ankle? Or is it rather dictated (as Karakasi concludes) by the primal forces of natural selection: the female of the species making it clear, by tightening the drapery around her hips and thighs, that she is well-equipped for child-bearing? Humfry Payne was not so quaint after all. With the korai, revealing 'the substantiality of the body beneath the dress' was a sculptural challenge, a social requirement, and a sexual imperative.

doi:10.1093/gromej/cxi015 NIGEL SPIVEY

Philosophy

A Guide to Greek Thought; Major Figures and Trends[1] and *The Greek Pursuit of Knowledge*,[2] both edited by G. E. R. Lloyd and J. Brunschwig, form a pair of excellent introductions to, and reference works for, the intellectual life of ancient Greece. The volumes contain an exhilarating sweep of material, from Parmenides to Polybius in the first, which deals with individual thinkers and movements; from history to cosmology in the second, which focuses on intellectual disciplines. The treatments are, on the whole, magisterial without being unduly technical (though the chapter on ancient harmonic theory, at least, fails as a beginners' guide, if that is how it was intended); and there is added spice in the range of approaches and styles one gets from an international cast of contributors. For all their great virtues, however, the existence of these books is something of a mystery to me, since they turn out to be constituted as *selections* from the only slightly larger *Greek Thought: A Guide to Classical Knowledge* (itself a translation of *Le Savoir Grec*, originally published in 1996). The most obvious part of the latter *not* selected are the articles on 'Politics', and how many people with thank Harvard University Press for saving them the trouble of owning these as well? The division between people and movements on the one hand and philosophical themes on the other is a useful one that is followed by Anthony Kenny in his own survey of *Ancient Philosophy* – the first volume in a tetralogical *New History of Western Philosophy*.[3] Kenny pitches at second or third year undergraduates, and hits his mark: he is always clear, but always intelligent; sometimes idiosyncratic, but never cavalier.

[1] *The Greek Pursuit of Knowledge*. Edited by Jacques Brunschwig and Geoffrey E. R. Lloyd. Translated under the direction of Catherine Porter. Harvard U.P., Cambridge MA, London, 2003. Pp. xiii + 387, with 2 maps. Paperback £12.95.

[2] *A Guide to Greek Thought*. Major Figures and Trends. Edited by Jacques Brunschwig and Geoffrey E. R. Lloyd. Translated under the direction of Catherine Porter. Harvard U.P., Cambridge MA, London, 2003. Pp. xiii + 486, with 2 maps. Paperback £12.95.

[3] *A New History of Western Philosophy*. Volume 1: Ancient Philosophy. By Anthony Kenny. Oxford U.P., 2004. Pp. xxi + 341. Illustrated. Hardback £17.99.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gromej/cxi015 Published online by Cambridge University Press