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absolute standards. Cereals appear as contributions, as rations, and as a measure of land which is held or leased from either private holders or the damos. Brief descriptions of records involving spices, olives, figs, wine, and honey follow. The various listings of oxen, sheep, goats, and pigs are similarly analyzed to show methods and purposes of livestock-raising.

In “Crafts, Industry and Trade” building is represented by lists of both craftsmen and materials. The bronze industry is most fully known from lists assigning small quantities of the metal to more than 200 smiths, while vessels and implements of both bronze and other metals appear in various contexts. Other crafts are exemplified in an inventory which gives detailed descriptions of furniture and in lists of textiles and of textile-workers. The special case of flax production and amounts assessed to many places (otherwise unattested and where rebates are given to certain craftsmen) resists detailed interpretation, although C. is rather oddly tempted to explain those groups which “hold” the flax and who appear also in the mobilization texts as “people of non-Greek origin, who occupied certain of the flax-producing villages, and were employed preferably on non-combatant duties in an emergency.” The scantiness of evidence for traders or a medium of exchange is used to suggest the probability of trade as a state monopoly.

“Weapons and War” gives straightforward explanation for tablets listing armor, a few with weapons, and others counting chariots or wheels but admits puzzlement over a series which variously links all or some charioteer equipment with individual names, often with the corselet sign erased and replaced with a bronze-ingot sign. Evidence of military organization is found not only in lists of large numbers of rowers but also in the mobilization tablets authorizing a guard for ten coastal sectors, with heqetawi presumably acting as couriers. C. suggests that the expected enemy was the Sea-peoples. The work concludes with an acute demonstration of Homer’s value as a poet rather than historian and a final chapter on what the tablets of Knossos and Pylos tell about when and how the end came.

Illustrations and maps are for the most part useful and attractive, but the relevance of some pictures is not compelling, and the maps omit some known place-names used in the text to identify locations of the unknown. C. has produced a coherent and persuasive picture of the society and economy hinted at in the tablets, but much of the coherence and persuasiveness derives more from the synthesizing mind of the interpreter than from the texts themselves. Other scholars have drawn (and will draw) other pictures and other conclusions, mostly in more piecemeal fashion, but all must reckon with C.’s careful and thorough work, of which this book represents, as it were, only the tip of the iceberg.

MABEL L. LANG

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE


Gravestones are among the most interesting and controversial expressions of Greek art. Their quality ranges from masterpiece level to near incompetence, their meaning is often puzzling, and their chronology and distribution are still in need of study. The Attic products have so far monopolized scholarly attention, but have gaps in their sequence, especially, and mysteriously, during the first half of the fifth century. Stelai from other areas have been only sporadically collected, and a corpus of East Greek grave reliefs completed by E. Pfuhl in 1949 was never published; a revision of his manuscript is now being prepared by H. Möbius. Hiller has supplied for this corpus all recent finds of pre-classical and classical date—a task for which the book under review proves her eminently qualified.

First submitted as a doctoral dissertation for Göttingen University in 1966, the basic text has been greatly enlarged and revised. Some stelai included in the original catalogue have been omitted in the light of supplementary information, while others have been added. Since H.’s dissertation had been cited by E. Berger in his publication of the Doctor Relief in Basel (for which H. wrote a chapter), a concordance of catalogue numbers is appended to the present work. The bibliography has been considerably updated since 1966; a remarkable feature of the book is in fact its awareness of unpublished material and recent publications, some of which appeared while the text was in press and could be cited but not discussed. One last-minute Appendix considers Rühl’s article on the Ikaria relief (ArkK 1974). H. agrees on many points but defends her own interpretation. A similar discussion by G. Daux has now appeared (ArchCl 25-26 [1973–1974] 249–49).

The book covers stelai from ca. 500 to 450 B.C. made either in Ionia or under Ionic influence. H. first reviews non-funerary sculpture from the general area in order to determine stylistic traits and schools; she then applies the resulting criteria to the gravestones, which she attributes to four major groups. The first and largest (23 examples) comprises the East Greek stelai proper, including those from Samos, the Ionic colonies outside Asia Minor, Lydia, and the Dodecanese. The second, a Cycladic-Ionic group, encompasses the Aegean islands and their sphere of influence, e.g. Boeotia and Euboea. The third is North-Ionic, covering Thasos and Thrace. Finally, an Italic-Ionic group is limited to three works: the Esquiline stele, the Leukothea relief, and a comparable though much restored fragment in the Louvre. Within the first group a specific workshop is localized on Samos, and several small ones are hypothesized in the Miletos/
Ephesos area, though no figured gravestone has been found there as yet. Paros is the dominant school of the second group; Thasos is perhaps the only distinctive sculptural center within the third, while general Cycladic and East Greek influences are discernible in the last three works. In summary, the Cyclades seem to have played a lesser role than usually envisaged, while Ionia’s contribution to fifth-century funerary art is emphasized. Stelai are either tall and narrow, crowned by a palmette, or wider and shorter and topped by a pediment. The subjects repeat those familiar from the Archaic Attic repertoire, but add the single female figure and the rider. Multi-figured scenes and the interactive man-and-dog type (Type II) are considered local variations and elaborations of Attic prototypes. Specific Ionic traits are the meaningful gestures and the subtle modulations of surfaces. Stylistic discussion and interpretive description of the gravestones occur in the main text, with interesting digressions into comparative material. For instance, the distinctive eye rendering of the Borgia stele (accepted as Lydian) suggests that the controversial Ostia Themistokles originated in an East Greek workshop of the Severe period. The catalogue proper gives concise and factual accounts with many original observations and updated bibliography; four of its 45 entries are previously unpublished, others have just received publication. All stelai but one are illustrated, at times in detail, as well as a few related works.

H. accepts the general premise that figured grave-stones occurred only exceptionally in Ionia until the time when the Attic stelai stopped; yet she believes that the stylistically coherent East Greek production after 500 cannot be attributed to emigrant Attic sculptors, as usually stated. One might therefore ask what prompted the Ionians to imitate a specific sculptural genre just when their source of inspiration had ceased to exist, furthermore doing so with such vigor and originality as to create new forms and iconography. I suspect that an established tradition of figured stelai already existed in Asia Minor and the Cyclades during the sixth century. To be sure, examples are few and far apart, but H. may underestimate the evidence by considering it exceptional, or even eliminate it by lowering the dates of some pieces which I would consider still Archaic. In general, most of H.’s chronology seems a bit low.

H.’s text was written before the publication of Samos XI, which lists not one but two stelai with frontal youths as contemporary with the other figured gravestones. I consider stelai with frontal images a Cycladic idea and would therefore see influences other than Attic operative on Samian gravestones earlier than H. would allow with her mid-fifth-century chronology. By limiting her quest to 500–450 B.C., H. considers her examples as if in a vacuum, though giving earlier monuments sporadic attention. Were also such pieces gathered in a catalogue, their number would appear more significant. Account should further be taken of some Graeco-Karian stelai from Egypt, safely dated within the sixth century and apparently echoing a tradition in their place of origin for which the evidence is now lost. As H. notes, our knowledge of Ionic sculpture in general is severely limited, yet the existence of important artistic centers is not doubted. I may note finally that great difference of opinion exists in attributing sculptures to schools or even geographic areas, especially for the Late- Archaic/Severe period which to my eyes marks the peak of interchange within the Greek artistic sphere. Two books contemporary with H.’s (E. Langlotz, Studien zur Nordostgriechischen Kunst; D. Willers, Zu den Anfängen der archaistischen Plastik in Griechenland) suggest entirely different proveniences for the very same pieces, each with convincing supporting arguments. I personally see a resemblance (especially in the marked jaw-line) between the seated matron of the Ikaria relief (K 6) by a Parian, and the Nisyros athlete (O 16) in which H. detects instead a mixture of Samian and Mileo-Ephesian traits. Similarly classified is the man on a fragmentary relief in Basel (O 17), yet his drapery reminds me of the Cycladic stele (K 4) of a man (whom H. rightly restores as seated); and such comments could be multiplied. H.’s attempt at geographical distribution is justified, if the tentative nature of some conclusions is kept in mind. But the very real value of the book for me lies in its thorough collecting and penetrating description.

Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway
Bryn Mawr College


This is the first in a new series of monographs designed to present the results of studies, especially reconstructions, carried out with the resources of the extensive and rapidly growing collection of plaster casts of Greek and Roman sculpture in the Skulpturhalle Basel. The Parthenon pediments will require a succession of monographs. As the work of plastic reconstruction is still in an early phase, the present work acts as a kind of prospectus, to invite the interest and cooperation of the scholarly world (and perhaps also, though this is not stated, of donors to the project).

With the expert help of the sculptors Willy Walther and Ludwig Stocker the plaster casts of original fragments are supplemented to form complete figures, the supplements being carved in a light-weight plastic which makes the whole statues easily maneuverable in spite of their great size. There can be no doubt that this is a more valid and fruitful method of reconstruction than either drawing or plastic reproduction on a reduced scale. The effect of preconceptions is