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without counting group K, which is not a stylistic subdivision proper.

Yet even this meticulous apportioning of protomes could be acceptable, were the total picture of help in clarifying our understanding of regional styles and centers; but such is certainly not the case. Croissant is scrupulous in reiterating that his distributions are subject to revision according to new finds or evidence, that information on regional centers is scant or uncertain, that differences between types may be minimal and stylistic assessments subjective. I must admit I cannot always tell one group from another—let alone the various types within the group or the variations within the types—nor am I helped by the well laid-out plates with meaningful juxtapositions of comparable items. Perhaps only someone with Croissant's long familiarity based on constant handling of the protomes can distinguish them readily. The comparanda in monumental sculpture or other forms of art seem often equally elusive: either I cannot see the resemblances or I cannot subscribe to the regional attributions. To give but one example, the so-called Sleeping Head in the British Museum usually thought to belong to one of the Ephesian columnae caelatae is by Croissant labelled Milesian and used as a cog within his regional construction (p. 62); yet the recent study of all Ephesian material by C.A. Picón has convincingly shown that the London head belongs to the Artemision and is stylistically related to the other temple sculptures.

To be sure, Croissant describes vividly and at length, trying to make the reader see what he perceives as regional traits and distinctive features, but his very fluid language may hamper rather than increase comprehension. It is not that one does not understand, even share, Croissant's intuitive reading of facial expressions; it is just that it is hard to accept as objective comparisons based on, e.g., "la même franchise attentive, la même gaieté dynamique" (p. 146). The task is not made easier by the endless paragraphs, one of which can fill an entire page, and by the free associating of the thought-process, so wide ranging that virtually every major monument of the archaic and severe period is brought into the discussion—repeatedly, in different contexts and for different purposes, as the index and table of contents show.

Even the origin of Attic Red Figure is investigated in this scholarly cavalcade that is too rich in original thoughts and suggestions to assimilate at a single reading. I have only retained a few points, perhaps because closest to my concerns: that the Siphnian Karyatid and the so-called ex-Knidian head may, after all, belong to the same Treasury (p. 72 n. 1); that the Knidian Treasury may have had karyatids at all (78 n. 4); that the heads from the Aigina temple are so varied as to represent deliberate eclecticism (369); and that the Piombino Apollo, although probably archaizing (216), can nonetheless be used to date comparable protomes around 480 (111). Croissant is so open to the various possibilities for interpretation and so conscious of the variables in each problem that the reader eventually cannot even find firm points for debate, whether in agreement or disagreement.

If the proof of the pudding is in the eating, the proof of a book should be in the reading. On such criteria, I can only state that this book has not passed the test: I have emerged from it with much vaguer notions than when I started it, and this result is all the more regrettable in that so much effort and connoisseurship have clearly been expended on it. But in its present form I can only concur with Croissant that "loin de fournir des indications sur la chronologie, le style apparaît donc comme un facteur qui par définition en occulte les effets" (375) and that "la conclusion d'une telle enquête ne saurait être évidemment que provisoire" (373).
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Vincenzo Tusa, Archaeological Superintendent of western Sicily, has fulfilled one of the strongest desiderata in the field of Magna Graecian art history by providing this comprehensive, well illustrated and thoroughly documented publication of 301 items of stone sculpture from Selinous. These include all the well known metopal series and reliefs, but also as many as 242 unpublished pieces, some of them architectural, some freestanding and some of undefinable nature, both in marble and in local stone. Even items of presumed Selinuntine origin not in the Palermo Museum receive passing mention. The import of such extensive collection and publication is bound to be felt for many years to come.

In his prefatory comments Tusa stresses Selinous' originality in being "the only Greek city in Sicily to decorate its temples with stone sculptures" (15). The statement may seem rather sweeping in light of the pedimental remains once again recently attributed to Akragan and Himeran religious buildings (see, e.g., Aparchai [Festschrift P. Arias, 1982] passim), but it holds true for the archaic period, and especially for metopal decoration. (Note, however, that Tusa [125, no. 18 n. 6] would disclaim for Selinous the so-called Harpy metope in Copenhagen, which is generally considered to be from Sicily and would therefore imply metopal stone-carving elsewhere on the island.) Selinuntine workmanship is advocated for all pieces, including the marble parts from Temple E, although the analysis is sensitive to outside influences—from the mainland Greeks, the peoples of Asia Minor, the Phoenicians and local populations, as one would expect from a Phoenician expert of Tusa's caliber.

G. Pugliese Carratelli sketches the historical and religious background of Selinous, without however entering the thorny grounds of colonization dates. Helpful comments on Megara, both Hyblaia and Nysaia, underline the importance of a Malophoros cult in the Greek metropoleis, thus challenging the assumption that Selinous simply adopted Sicilian religious beliefs. Mycenaean and Cretan contacts are mentioned, as well as the difficult interrelationships of
the Greek cities in Sicily down to approximately 409 B.C.,
the date of the Carthaginian destruction from which Selin
ous never quite recovered.

E. Paribeni contributes a “historic-critical profile” of
Selinunte sculptures which takes into account also terracottas
and the bronze Ephebe, whose disharmonious appear-
ance has now been clarified by the discovery of ancient
repairs and alterations. Even some forgeries are mentioned
at the end of this brief but informative essay in which opin-
ions disagreeing with those of the primary author are occa-
sionally expressed. Paribeni, in fact, does not believe that
the folds on the Perseus of the Temple C metope were recut
and modernized (p. 28), whereas Tusa (116) finds the
theory convincing.

M. Carapezza and collaborators provide a geological
commentary on the sculptures and the geographical area.
They have identified three ancient quarries and plot a pat-
tern of ever-extending radius away from the city as each
source is exploited (cf. map fig. 5, p. 33). The farthest, the
so-called Menfi quarries, provided the stone for carved me-
topes and sculptures, the better vein being tapped for the
metopes in preference to the freestanding pieces.

The above-mentioned essays form a prelude to the mag-
nificent color plates of the ruins, followed by large black-
and-white illustrations of the major sculptures. There are
no novelties among the metopes, but the marble and lime-
stone peplophoroi are less familiar and receive well
served attention. Then comes the most important section
of the book: the extensive and systematic catalogue entries,
each accompanied by an illustration at small scale, and end-
ing with nos. 300-301, whose authenticity has been
doubted. Of the two, the stele of a youth is further discussed
in an appendix subdivided into various topics—e.g., on the
so-called piccole metope (the Y series and the two “new”
panels which Tusa no longer considers part of a single
building, despite the similar dimensions); and on the two
frieze blocks with fighting warriors (Amazonomachy?)
dated between 490 and 470, although others would put
them some 50 years later. Of special importance is the dis-
cussion on the findspots of the Temple C fragments (p.
187), all from the east front, thus precluding the possibility
that the west side also carried decorated metopes. The total
format of the book is elegant and readable, with few obvious
mistakes, although a few of the catalogue illustrations seem
upside down or otherwise rotated.

It is impossible to comment in detail on the catalogue en-
tries, which provide little known information and correct
many inaccuracies in previous publications. The following
remarks reflect “reviewer’s arbitrium.” The numbers corre-
spond to the individual entries.

Nos. 3-6, the “Y” metopes: a date in the early 6th, even late 7th c.
for the panel with the Delphic triad, seems quite high. No attempt
is made at suggesting a program for the series; yet Apollo in travel-
ing attire (winged boots, short tunic) may be returning from the
Hyperboreans (cf. LIMC 2, s.v. Apollo no. 643). Europa and the
swimming Bull go from one continent to another, while Herakles
struggling with the Cretan Bull may again be indicative of travel
westward, or at least to remote places.

No. 11, metope from Temple F: I read the dress of the goddess
as the standard chiton with diagonal himation, not as a short garment
leaving the right thigh bare (p. 119). This impression is caused by
the cloth clinging to the trailing leg and suggesting transparency,
but the long folds following the curve of the knee belong to the gath-
ering of the skirt between the legs.

No. 18, so-called Hades abducting Persephone: Tusa prefers Peiri-
thoos attempting to kidnap Persephone. Note that the woman wears
the diagonal mantle from left shoulder to right armpit, an unusual
form in isolation (i.e., not dictated by mirror reversal), but attested
in South Italy and Asia Minor. If the draped figure in no. 21 is
indeed female, it would provide another example of this fashion.

Nos. 31-38, an interesting group of small-scale peplophoroi (also
discussed in Appendix), most in limestone, two in marble: they are
probably the most convincing evidence for a local school, because of
the peculiar folds engraved on the upper torso and the distinctive
crinkling of the chiton sleeves under the peplos. R. Töllle-Kasten-
bein cited no. 34 only in a footnote [Frühklassische Peplofiguren.
Originate [Mainz 1980] 193 n. 361], because she considered it “Se-
verizing” rather than truly Severe (although she accepted the mar-
ble statuettes nos. 31-32, her nos. 35a-35b). But seeing these
peplophoroi as a group highlights their similarities and connects them
with the Artemis of the Aktaia metope from Temple E, so that a
true Severe dating seems inevitable.

Among the unpublished pieces the most interesting are: no. 29,
the corner of a metope preserving an elaborately coiffured female head,
from the eastern hill, no. 60, a small male torso with harsh anatomical
markings, “late classical, early Hellenistic”; no. 64, a squatt-
ing, plump child in Greek marble (and cf. no. 97, a chubby baby’s
foot); no. 65, a fragmentary relief of the Funerary Banquet type;
no. 268, another relief fragment, probably with tenon for insertion
into a separate support, showing some linear drapery over rocky
ground; no. 298, a marble snake coil; no. 299, a large horse’s tail,
probably archaic, in Greek island (?) marble, worked all around
and with bronze tenon for attachment.

The many draped fragments, the numerous hands and feet and se-
veral heads probably come from the lost metopes of the well known series and may now for the first time be
studied and perhaps integrated into more meaningful
wholes. Whatever the results achieved, we shall owe them to
Tusa’s initiative. His modest disclaimer (p. 14) that he has
meant to provide only a working tool, not a critical edition
of Selinunte sculpture, is amply belied by the wealth of ma-
terial and information presented in this book. The author is
to be commended indeed and sincerely thanked.
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CAMPANIA, by Martin Frederiksen, edited with addi-
tions by Nicholas Purcell. Pp. xviii + 368, maps 5,

This volume represents the vigorous thinking and writ-
ing which Martin Frederiksen devoted to the study of
Campania before his untimely death in 1980. Much of it
was written between 1967 and 1974, and it is evident from
the surviving typescript that Frederiksen had in mind a
larger book both in terms of conceptual range and of specific
problems. That any of this absorbing material has seen the
printed page in book form is due to the energies and skills of
Nicholas Purcell and his colleagues.

There are 14 chapters in all, of which Purcell found 11