L.'s book, according to the dust jacket, offers 'a complete overview of current knowledge about the sculpture of the Parthenon and suggests new interpretations of the ancient temple's sculptural creations'. This is indeed an ambitious programme, and it is not surprising that it is not realized. Not only are there omissions from the bibliography on the Parthenon—the shortage of Greek works is especially regrettable—but L. is not in full command of the scholarship that she does know. For example, writing on the East pediment (the theme, so certain on pp. 50–60, suddenly becomes 'probable' on p. 82), L. says 'if the reconstructions hold good—with a commanding, seated Zeus . . .' (p. 51), thus bypassing the influential arguments of Olga Palagia (*The Pediments of the Parthenon* [Leiden, 1993] pp. 29–30, ills 18, 20) for a standing Zeus, although L. cites Palagia in her bibliography. And there are significant omissions elsewhere, e.g. L.'s discussion of Plato (notably pp. 148–65) would have been enhanced, and clarified, by reference to C. Janaway, *Images of Excellence. Plato's Critique of the Arts* (Oxford, 1995).

At times, L. is far from providing a clear critique of the scholarship that she uses. Most obviously, her ambivalence over Joan Connelly's interpretation of the frieze, which she appears to believe compatible with the traditional interpretation of the cloth as a *peplos*, reveals a failure to comprehend and respond to the arguments used. Nor does she give proper weight to published responses to Connelly.

These difficulties are compounded by it being quite unclear who the book was written for. At times it seems to be for those with little or no knowledge of Greek, or Greek architecture or sculpture, hence L. explains what an 'aition' is (pp. 2–3), and what metopes and triglyphs are and where (p. 2: L. wrongly calls the metopes rectangular and the triglyphs square, the former error corrected on p. 166). But the elaborate, at times tortuous, analysis which makes up much of the book presumes a detailed knowledge of the sculptures, as does the absence of reconstructions of the pediments and other visual aids. These are essential to all but experts if the reader is, as L. intends, to understand the overall theme of the sculptures. Similarly, it is a major fault that she concentrates overwhelmingly on the frieze and East pediment, with the metopes and West pediment ill-served. Most regrettable is the omission of the Parthenos, bar a passing reference (p. 7); without it, any attempt at an overall view of the themes of the sculpture is severely restricted, and L.'s claim, in itself perfectly reasonable, that 'Athena herself determines the core meaning of the temple as a whole' (p. 88), is deprived of one of its chief supports.

There are a few errors of fact, e.g. Plutarch is dated over a century early (p. 8). The rather convoluted style in which the book is written may be the responsibility of the translator rather than the author. The infelicities certainly are, e.g. 'gigantomacchia' (e.g. pp. 2, 3, 16), 'instantaneity' (p. 51), 'belongingness' (pp. 57, 88, 89), 'envisualize' (e.g. p. 22), 'insettings' (p. 80).

King's College London K. W. ARAFAT

STATUE GROUPS

C. Ioakimidou: *Die Statuenreihen griechischer Poleis und Bünde aus spätarchaischer und klassischer Zeit*. Pp. 409, plans, ills. Munich: Tuduv, 1997. Paper, DM 79.80. ISBN: 3-88073-544-1.

This book, which is the publication, in a slightly revised form, of the author's dissertation (Heidelberg 1994/5), offers a very useful discussion of the large statue

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

groups of the late archaic and classical periods commissioned by city-states or federations. Among these groups were some of the most significant monuments of Greek bronze statuary.

In the introduction (pp. 17–25), I. declares her interest in large statue groups, and in their use as political propaganda by independent polities. The study thus leaves aside statue groups comprising only two or three figures, statue groups having a cultic function, and groups commissioned by private patrons.

The catalogue (pp. 27–124, with twenty-three entries) collects the literary, archaeological, and epigraphic evidence pertaining each monument. The descriptions of the remains of the monuments are very accurate, but are not accompanied by new drawings. In the following chapter (pp. 125–341) I. focuses on the historical context, subject matter, composition, and original appearance of the groups. The discussion of the historical context is competent and, at times, seductive, as in the case of the Athenian dedication at Delphi commemorating Marathon. The group is dated by I. at the time of major success of Cimon's political career (475–461), and is interpreted as an attempt by the Athenians to give legitimacy to their own political leadership over the Delian League. Also competent is the discussion of the subject matter, and the proposed restitutions of several groups are reasonable. Thus, for the dedication by the Argives at Delphi after the battle of Oinoe, I. proposes a single group, representing both the 'Seven' and the 'Epigoni', contrary to the *communis opinio* regarding them as two distinct groups. Leaving aside a few plans, however, there are no reconstructive drawings accompanying these proposals. These would have been helpful for the reader, especially in cases like the second group dedicated by the Tarentines in Delphi, commissioned from Onatas, and whose original composition might have shown analogies with the pediments of the temple of Aphaea at Aegina.

The last chapter (pp. 342–90), though labeled a conclusion, is more a summary of the evidence regarding the historical context, the iconography, the location, and the composition of the groups. I. insists on the use of these statue groups as political propaganda, a function that in the classical period would have become even more significant than the religious one, despite the fact that most of these groups were dedications at sanctuaries.

Mythology was the favorite metaphor for such political propaganda, and this explains the prominence in these groups of heroes, who were sometimes eponymous and/or ancestors of the commissioning communities. Second in order of occurrence were the images of the gods, especially those of the sanctuaries where the groups were located. Less frequent were the representations of mortals. Here, the prominence of prisoners and military officers is a reminder that most of these groups were votive offerings related to war.

The favorite arena for this political propaganda were the major, panhellenic sanctuaries of Delphi and Olympia, where the groups were usually displayed in the most prominent places, often in connection with the temple and the altar. At Delphi, groups commemorating victories of Greeks over Greeks were more numerous than groups commemorating victories of the Greeks over the barbarians. The latter, however, were the rule at Olympia.

Directly related to the function of these groups was their attempt to engage the viewer, which appears to become a major concern in the second half of the fifth century. The compositional strategies, however, were basically the same, both in the archaic and the classical period. The statues could either be presented in isolation from one another, directly facing the viewer, or be presented in profile, participating in some action.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This book represents a sort of compromise of two different approaches: a formal one, interested in compositional issues, and a historical one, interested in political issues. The two approaches run parallel, and there seems to be no effort to reconcile them. The real problem, however, is that there seems to be little ground for any conclusive compositional and historical interpretation of the groups, which are very fragmentary. For many restitutions, I. heavily relies on Pausanias, taking his references as systematic descriptions, and as records of the original sequence of the statues. I. acknowledges that this might not always have been the case (p. 191), but this possibility should have been taken into more serious consideration, especially in cases where no other evidence is available. Also, for many groups, chronologies are only approximate, and are often determined on the basis of the historical context, a strategy which runs the risk of some circularity in the argumentation. This is an intelligent, useful book, but many of I.'s conclusions are only plausible possibilities.

Columbia University CLEMENTE MARCONI

PERGAMUM AND SPERLONGA

N. T. DE GRUMMOND, B. S. RIDGWAY (edd.): *From Pergamon to Sperlonga: Sculpture and Context*. Pp. xxiv + 315, ills. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 2001. Cased, $70. ISBN: 0-520-22327-6.

This provocative volume publishes the proceedings of a conference held at the Florida State University in February 1997, on a theme proposed by Professor Brunilde Ridgway. The purpose of the conference was to explore the relationship between what are often seen as two of the best-known products of Hellenistic art, the Great Altar at Pergamon and the sculptures from the Cave at Sperlonga. Like R.'s own work in the field, the volume claims to take a fresh look at traditional approaches to Hellenistic sculpture. As outlined in the introduction (pp. 1–6), a key theme of the conference and the resulting publication is the question of sculptural style. Is it possible to see a discrete sculptural style, here the oft-quoted Pergamene or Rhodian 'Baroque' of the mid-second century B.C., as typical of a particular chronological period, or can a style be reused at a later period to evoke particular ideas and associations? While the appearance of similar stylistic features in both the gigantomachy of the Great Altar and the sculptures from Sperlonga has led past scholars to suggest a direct connection between the two, the papers presented here suggest that such links are, in fact, rather more elusive.

The volume is roughly divided into two halves. The Pergamene section includes a paper by Erich Gruen setting out the wider cultural context within which the Great Altar was created, as well as two papers concentrating on the Altar itself. That by Andrew Stewart gives a useful survey of recent scholarship on the Great Altar and presents his own views on various contested issues. A particularly interesting suggestion (pp. 46–9) is his argument that cuttings in the blocks from the sacrificial altar suggest the display of captured arms rather than sculptures (such as the so-called Lesser Attalid Dedication figures proposed by Hoepfner). Mary Sturgeon's paper looks at the parallels between the Altar and earlier dynastic funerary monuments, as well as the decorative programmes of later Roman theatres, suggesting the multiple associations of the Altar as a dynastic, religious, and celebratory monument.

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.221 Published online by Cambridge University Press