

Renate Tölle-Kastenbein, *Frühklassische Peplosfiguren. Originale*. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz 1980. 2 vols. Text: IV + 247 pp. with 35 ills.; Plates: 176.

The peplophoros, the artistic type of the female figure wearing a peplos, can legitimately be considered among the most distinctive and frequent creations of the Severe style. A study in depth of Greek sculptural production between 480 and 450 B. C. can therefore justifiably begin by focussing on the various representations of these peplos-clad figures under three headings: as Greek originals, as Roman copies of Greek prototypes, and as classicizing creations imitating the Severe style. Renate Tölle-Kastenbein has undertaken to investigate all three forms, and in the work under review (abbreviated FKP I) deals with the first group. Her collection of Types and Replicas will be published as vol. 20 of *Antike Plastik* (abbr. FKP II), while the classicizing renderings will be gathered in a separate volume (FKP III) now in preparation. When completed, the series will provide a fundamental tool for all research on Greek sculpture. Although the Severe period is limited in time to a 30-year span, its stylistic ramifications through the various copies and imitations range over several centuries, so that the author's undertaking is monumental and fraught with difficulties.

A good sampling of such difficulties is provided in this first publication. Despite the fact that bronze was the main medium of the Severe sculptor, no large-scale bronze peplophoros has yet been found, and those that have survived in marble are, with few exceptions, architectural sculptures or relief representations. The majority of the pieces discussed in FKP I can therefore be considered as minor art. According to the

author's calculations (p. 283), of the 224 works catalogued, 165 are small bronzes, and of these two-thirds can be considered functional: parts of vessels or of stand-mirrors in which the peplophoros forms the karyatid support. The remaining third comprises statuettes, of which one-third represent Athena. Terracotta figurines have been eliminated because of their limited general quality, as contrasted with the usually high artistic level of the bronzes: only two are mentioned, largely because of their value as comparanda; and one wooden peplophoros from Brauron (no. 7d) is listed but not illustrated or included in the itemized totals on p. 283.

This minor-art material is therefore restricted in medium, fairly homogeneous in function and, because of its very nature and portable size, difficult to pinpoint to a specific findspot or geographical origin. By contrast, the marble peplophoroi are much less uniform and almost defy classification beyond the most specific or the most general terms. Finally, correlations between the stone sculptures and the small bronzes (which seem to follow conventions exclusively their own) are difficult to see, and the author is to be commended for having attempted the arduous task of classification into regional groups. That the results are open to discussion and disagreement is inevitable, and any criticism expressed in this review should be taken as sign of the great interest elicited by the publication, rather than as negative judgment on the author's efforts. The amply documented, beautifully illustrated, intelligently discussed material is so conveniently collected and presented that this book will be repeatedly mined for its riches in years to come. The reviewer will begin with general comments.

Presumably for reasons beyond the author's control, FKP I was in course of publication for a long time. Only on p. 345, however, in an addendum to the Bibliography, is the reader informed that the manuscript was closed in 1976 and the text set in 1977. Even some references to works which appeared in 1975 seem to have been added late to the footnotes, to judge by the lighter typographical lettering, and some pages (e. g., p. 177) contain contradictory statements that reflect subsequent moments in the research. That monuments published in the late 1970s are not included is therefore understandable, yet even the fragmentary marble peplophoros in Rhodes (J. A. Papapostolou, *Arch. Anz.* 1971, 19 ff. – an article otherwise cited on p. 111, no. 151) is omitted for no apparent reason. In some cases, omissions may have been dictated by the author's assessment of the piece as non-original, yet it would have been helpful to have such opinion expressed, at least in footnote, to eliminate speculation. In a few instances, statements have been made obsolete by subsequent finds, such as the discovery of the Ionic temples at Metapontion and Syracuse, or the Ionic frieze at Sybaris/Parco del Cavallo (contrast pp. 187 and 215). The author's attempts to update her text while in press are to be commended, yet the end product inevitably suffers from the patchwork approach.

By ironic coincidence, a book on a related topic, *Caryatid Mirrors of Ancient Greece*, by Lenore O. Keene Congdon, has similarly had its publication delayed since the late 1960s, to be finally produced in 1981. The author had no access to it, despite the common publisher, but the archaeological reader who can now consult both works will find it instructive that such disagreement can exist between two contemporary scholars approaching some of the same material in its wider context and with the same focus and detail. Of the 61 Severe mirror supports catalogued by both authors, only 3 are assigned to the same center (Sikyon); all other regional attributions differ, in some instances quite widely, and few more can be made to coincide by taking into account some Magna Graecian mirrors which Keene Congdon (in contrast to the author) merely lists without cataloguing.

FKP I has been organized primarily as a catalogue in three sections: Part I is subdivided according to geographical attributions, Part II deals with typological groupings, and Part III with architectural sculpture. Yet divisions among groups are not clearly marked, so that the Selinus metopes from Temple E, for instance, are discussed under the Magna-Graecian subdivision in Part I (no. 35), while the animated Nike from Paros is catalogued with the architectural sculpture of Part III rather than with the Island-Ionic production of Part I or the Figures in Motion of Part II. Each main section includes several subdivisions, and within the subdivisions primary numbers are followed by letters of the alphabet, presumably to allow for additions without disruption of the basic groupings. The catalogue numbers of FKP II will apparently follow the same sequence, beginning therefore with no. 45, since no. 44 represents the last subdivision in Part III – one that comprises all peplophoroi on the Temple of Zeus at Olympia (44a–n), despite the fact that the replacement figures on the west gable will receive fuller treatment elsewhere.

In Part I, within the geographical subdivisions, further groupings are primarily made on stylistic grounds. For instance, Attic peplophoroi are discussed under 9 headings, each comprising several items. Some

groups are homogeneous and plausible and may even represent the production of single workshops; others are held together by thematic links; but some are purely a convenient way of gathering disparate monuments in the same medium under one heading (e. g., groups 7; 9; 36). The validity of groups containing only 2 or 3 items (e. g., groups 6; 33; 37; cf. p. 190) stylistically different from each other, could also be questioned. Explanations for choices are often given (cf., e. g., p. 48) at the end of each grouping, or in lengthier discussions after each regional and thematic subdivision, which also include chronological comments. Dating within three decades only is difficult, and individual dates are often left vague; since the entries are not arranged in chronological order and some items admittedly fall after 450 B. C., the date advocated by the author is not always obvious.

The book begins virtually in *medias res*, with the catalogue. The peplos is said to be such a well known costume as to eliminate the need for preliminary presentation and discussion; yet introductory comments would have helped guide the reader through the entries. Eventually the various forms of the garment are treated (pp. 239 ff), but so far into the text that certain regional traits are taken for granted, on the basis of the arrangement of the catalogue, and the various tables – otherwise quite helpful – reflect the author's interpretation rather than objective evidence. On the other hand, even this delayed discussion comes before Section III, so that some items in the charts have not yet been presented to the reader. Omissions and contradictions have not been entirely corrected: no. 15f, a Thessalian gravestone showing, to the reviewer's mind, a peplophoros with kolpos, is not included in the relevant chart (p. 244), thus skewing the geographical data. On p. 250 the table includes no. 42f among Peloponnesian works, yet the catalogue entry (p. 238) oscillates between an Ionic and a South Italian attribution; the second regional origin seems preferred because of the presence of an undergarment, but again the piece (a mirror support, Louvre Br. 1689, pl. 167) is not listed in the appropriate chart on undergarments (p. 245; contrast the statement on p. 137). Keene Congdon interprets its costume as a symmetrical, two-piece mantle worn over a chiton, rather than as a peplos with an overfold, and her point may have some validity.

These strictures are here mentioned simply to show that the various forms of the peplos are not as clear-cut and obvious as to be taken for granted. Even the distinction between the Archaic and the Severe manner of wearing the peplos could be profitably clarified, and the reviewer still has difficulty in visualizing the Peplos Kore (Akr. 679) as a traditional peplophoros, despite the comments on p. 251. Particularly uncertain is the determination of what represents an undergarment and what should rather be seen as the buttoned edges of the apodygma over the arms, a fashion considered typical for the northern climate (p. 118 and n. 229). The sleeves mentioned on p. 157 for no. 25d are too close-fitting to be part of the peplos, yet the piece is not included in the relevant chart. On p. 56 the author states that undergarments are not present on Attic peplophoroi except for Euenor's (Angelitos') Athena (no. 9e = Akr. 140); yet on p. 219 the Athenian workmanship of no. 38a (an appliqué Nike) is postulated in part on the presence of the chiton – but the item is again omitted from the table.

The catalogue entries vary in content and length of description. The author states that the figures in Section I are treated in greater detail than the others (p. 15 n. 43), but this is not always the case, nor is the motivating principle behind the treatment entirely consistent. Occasionally, some well-known and well-published monuments are given lengthy discussion (e. g., 9e; 9f; 11b; 11f), while some equally known are more succinctly catalogued (e. g., 7b; 8a); other short entries receive greater attention in the end summaries. The brief listing of the Thessalian gravestones (15a–f) is particularly regrettable, since no illustration is provided and the author disagrees with H. Biesantz in the interpretation of the costume. Many other items are perforce treated summarily or not illustrated, since they are unpublished, but the reader is grateful for the thoroughness which prompted their inclusion. In many cases the author's comments add considerably to what is visible in the photographs, and information on conditions and possible integration of missing attributes is illuminating and valuable. Clearly the author has personally inspected the majority of her catalogue pieces, and was able to trace several of difficult location. The reviewer has not had the benefit of comparable autopsy, therefore the following comments are based largely on photographs and are advanced tentatively as suggestions for the author's consideration.

1c: Since this mirror support was found in Megara, a provenience from Argos or Corinth is as likely as one from Attica, and the reviewer sees a certain similarity with 18e and 18f; the kolpos, the author believes,

should be taken primarily as an Athenian trait; but the parallel omega-folds on either side of the central panel of the apoxygma, according to the statement on p. 68, predominate in the North Peloponnesos.

1e: Not only is the statuette dissimilar from the rest of her group – she may also not be genuine; (cf. *Aspects of Ancient Greece*. Allentown Art Mus. Loan Exhibition [1979] no. 103).

2e: One wishes that the interesting detail of the closed eyes could have been shown in a close-up photograph and discussed at greater length in the text.

6a (and 14d): If the gesture of the hand under the apoxygma has no ritual significance, could it be an attempt by the master to obtain in a peplophoros effects comparable to those on himation-clad figures, such as the so-called *Aspasia-Sosandra Type*?

6b: Already Classical? Certainly different from 6a, the only other accepted member of this group. The classicizing-early Augustan assessment of the Copenhagen mirror and the Renaissance label for the *Angerona* statuette seem convincing.

7a: This figure in Algier seems too wide at the hips, too balanced in her stance, too impressionistic in her face to be truly Severe. Could her gesture indicate clapping?

7b: An apoxygma running parallel to the kolpos all around the figure makes this statuette in Stuttgart unusual and peculiar, at best later than Severe; but is it genuine?

7c: Excessively long arms, wide hips, and a profile head which recalls that now on the *Prokne* in Athens would suggest that this is a provincial but Classical piece.

9a: The Elgin peplophoros in the Getty Museum is of grey marble, different from Parian or Pentelic. That it was bought by Lord Elgin does not necessarily imply an Athenian provenience, since the English ambassador to Turkey made further purchases of antiquities after he left Greece.

9b: The hairstyle in this Brauron marble statuette reminds me of Samian/Ionic renderings.

9e: What is the undergarment of Euenor's (*Angelitos*'s) Athena? Certainly not a standard chiton.

10c: Relatively close to this statuette is another bronze peplophoros in the Rhode Island School of Design Museum. In his 'Catalogue of the Classical Collection: Classical Bronzes' (1975) D. G. Mitten classified the piece as Peloponnesian (no. 16, pp. 53 ff); but an Ionic origin is suggested in: *Aspects of Ancient Greece*. Allentown Cat. no. 102.

10g: The open mouth, the transparent effect of the clinging drapery, the curved folds over the advanced leg suggest a non-Severe date.

11f: To the 'Girl with Doves' in New York a striking parallel from the Chalkidike has now been published by A. Kostoglou-Despinis, *Problemata tes Parianes Plastikes tou 5ou aiona* p. Ch. (1979) 89 ff. pls. 30–32, although both stelai are dated after 450. For additional Parian peplophoroi see her cat. no. 19, p. 134, pl. 43, and the torso in Athens, pp. 164 ff., pls. 53–54. The Nike from Paros (FKP I no. 43d) is discussed as cat. no. 20, pp. 135 f., pls. 44–46, but whether the piece had a votive or an akroterial function is left open.

16c: Is this candelabrum statuette wearing a chiton? perhaps with an added, wrap-around skirt. The rendering of texture seems to suggest a lighter material over the upper torso, and the sleeves seem fitted, especially on the left arm. If the bronze peplophoros from the Pindos (Athens Nat. Mus. Cat. 540, Bull. Corr. Hellénique 15, 1891, pls. 9–10, pp. 461 ff., not included in FKP I) is indeed Severe, another example of a chiton worn under the peplos should be added to confirm the practice in that region.

16d: Is this figure wearing a poncho-like cape over a belted dress?

17c: Its provenience is accepted as Corinth on the basis of a notation to a drawing in Copenhagen (p. 124 n. 247); yet the same evidence is discounted for the classicizing piece in Copenhagen (p. 43 n. 59).

27e: Like other figures within the Spartan group, this Athena is problematic. Could it be Roman in date? The circles at the breasts may then have held inlays, the misunderstood belting of the overfold on the back (not mentioned in the table on p. 243) could be explained as unfamiliarity with the costume. Puzzling are

also the hair-like striations which suggest a bare head, despite the helmet crest resting directly over them. Should these traits simply bespeak a provincial (rather than a Roman) work, the bent leg outlined by the framing folds would seem to demand a date no earlier than the late fifth century B. C.

27g: The fringed skirt of this negroid statuette would seem different from a typical peplos; the top could be a separate tunic.

28a: This karyatid from Delphi seems to me more Parian than Syracusan, as considered probable even by Kostoglou-Despinis (cf. her p. 121). Rather than a hairnet, could the statuette be wearing a decorated coif? See the painted pattern on the helmet of an Aigina warrior (East pediment IXa, Ohly's numbering). Were this surmise correct, comparison with the Arethusa head on Syracusan coins would be misleading.

28d: Appearance and provenience (the Aventine) of this terracotta in New York suggest a Roman date.

30b: Could this statuette from Akragas be influenced by Etruscan renderings? See especially the right profile view, pl. 125b. The raised right arm, as if holding a spear, recalls representations of Athena. Cf. 31b?

31a: This statuette from Lokroi is so different from the homogeneous group 31b–e that not simply a different Lokrian workshop (as suggested on p. 179) but a different tradition must be involved.

35c: Could the Athena on the Selinus metope (Temple E) be wearing not a peplos but a long archaistic mantle over a chiton? The diagonal edge under the left arm would be hidden by the aegis. Cf. the himation of Apollo on the Thasian relief 12a (without archaistic overtones); the Aigina Athena from the west pediment displays a similar treatment of the omega-folds on a squared-out himation edge that recalls the apotygmata of a peplos. The use of an archaistic garment on the Selinus metope would be in keeping with the tendencies of the temple sculptors, as stressed in FKP I, p. 196.

36a: The reviewer would stand by her non-Severe dating of the Conservatori Nike, which has recently been supported by A. Gulaki, *Klassische und klassizistische Nikedarstellungen* (Diss. Bonn 1981) 33 ff. To her convincing observations may be added the 'wrong' detail of the shoes: sandals would be inappropriate for a Severe Nike and the high soles with squared edges are also unusual for the period. The reviewer owes these remarks to K. Dohan, whose PhD Dissertation on Greek footwear is now completed.

36c: The colossal Athena in New York seems Hadrianic. Note the author's comments (p. 290) about this sole example of a 7-foot tall Severe pepliphoros.

37b: The authenticity of the Boston Throne has once again been challenged by M. Guarducci, *Atti Accad. Naz. dei Lincei, Memorie n. s.* 8, 24, 1980, 506 f.

37c: Can an anthropoid sarcophagus of Phoenician/Carthaginian inspiration and Soluntian provenience be meaningfully grouped with the Ludovisi and Boston Thrones?

38b: This bronze statuette from a vessel was found on the Athenian Akropolis, and is classified as Argive (p. 20), but could it be Etruscan? Something in its motion, the mannered gestures and the headdress recall Chiusian renderings. Its presumed counterpart (38c) is not only entirely different stylistically, but its inclusion in the catalogue is puzzling, since it seems to be wearing chiton and diagonal himation.

38e: From photographs it is difficult to understand the grouping of this statuette with figures in motion (despite comments on p. 221), unless a regional attribution could not be reached.

39: This group of figures with double-belted garment is quite interesting, but is the costume worn really a peplos? The assumption seems plausible only in some cases; however, the author is undoubtedly correct in pointing to parallels among the Olympia pedimental figures and on Attic vases. These latter are mentioned occasionally to prove or support regional identifications; yet it is also stated (p. 168) that figured vases from other areas of the Greek world at this time are rare, and almost every manner of costume can be exemplified within this undoubtedly Attic production; cf. pp. 91; 242 ff., with figs. 21–32. Is it valid, then, to give Attic vase paintings documentary value for regional styles?

41: This group of busts on vessels includes a clay pithos (41a) and a hydria mentioned among Argive pepliphoroi (19a). These busts seem to me to suffer from the same restrictions applicable to terracotta

figurines, despite their greater originality. Busts 41d, 41g and 41h do not fit within the Severe period (cf. p. 233) and are therefore included for completion sake. The Argive origin, despite the evidence of some inscriptions, seems uncertain. Can any correlation exist with the terracotta half-figures (the so-called arm-less dolls) of Attica? No arms are apparent in 41k, the bust on an oinochoe in Boston.

42a: The Greek transcription of the incised dedication seems to have dropped the second A from ΑΠΙΣΤΟΜΑ + Α.

42b: Can the elaborate and tight-fitting dress of this remarkable statuette in the Louvre be considered a peplos?

42c: The headdress resembles a polos rather than a stephane; could it be a bridal crown, appropriate to Hera?

43a: This running Maiden from Eleusis has been identified as Hekate by Ch. Edwards, *Am. Journal Arch.* 86, 1982, 2630.

43b: The marble peplophoros from Corinth is too well finished in the back to be an akroterion, and the attachment holes, in the reviewer's opinion, are for loose metal locks over the shoulders; they are, in any case, unsuitable for the attachment of wings.

One of the major contributions of FKP I is to have identified and isolated a group of Attic bronze peplophoroi. The author convincingly argues that mirror supports without recorded provenience are often called Corinthian or Argive purely by convention, and that it is unthinkable that Athens, so prominent in other artistic manifestations, should have lagged behind in the production of utilitarian objects echoing the major bronzes being manufactured in the city during the Severe period. The argument for attributing the Candia Type, at present known only through copies, to Athens will be given in FKP II (no. 50), but this geographical assignment has already colored statements and attributions in FKP I, with a reasoning that readers may find somewhat circular. Similarly, that the Olympia sculptures were made by Athenian masters is possible, but by no means provable. Comparison with Euthydikos' Kore will beg the question for those who see Peloponnesian style in the Akropolis statue. The Athenian Treasury metopes to me look different from the Olympia marbles – which indeed do not quite resemble any other contemporary monument. The kolpos is not so exclusively typical of Athens as to allow no other interpretation when it occurs on some Olympia peplophoroi, and the reviewer finds it surprising that Athena should be shown at least three times in the metopes without the distinctive overbelted apoxygma (see table on Athena representations, p. 254, and cf. chart on p. 243).

In general, the Peloponnesian groups are most convincing, even when the author qualifies her statements and mentions Athenian workshops under Peloponnesian influence or, conversely, Argive masters in close contact with Athenian ateliers (p. 228). The book is a mine of information, including a tentative outline of mirror features according to regional preferences (pp. 286 f.). The author is obviously quite competent on mirrors, and makes illuminating comments on the identification of the karyatids and the symbolism of the subsidiary figures. Some of the latter are mentioned even when the main figure-stand is missing (e. g., p. 125, no. 19d on p. 137), and Appendix IV lists an additional 63 examples of mirrors with female supports which do not qualify as peplophoroi. The insatiable reader wishes for more: is there chronological significance in the flying pose of some Erotes as contrasted with the 'Knielauf' of others? What is the meaning of the unusual long hair on a few? Is the karyatid pose with right arm raised or at least bent and right leg often forward meant to facilitate grasp by the user's left hand? The suggestion that the famous Berlin 'spinner' (5e) is instead a karyatid support in turn holding a now-lost mirror seems compelling.

Comprehensive judgment on this book is bound to be favorable. If we too, like the author, drew up a statistical chart plotting negative versus positive traits, the positive column would overwhelmingly outweigh the negative. If this reviewer has mentioned specific difficulties, it is only because FKP I will undoubtedly become the frequently consulted and quoted authority on Severe original peplophoroi. When FKP II and III appear, R. Tölle-Kastenbein will have us heavily in her debt.