

plinths to statue bases replaced by the better-known dowel technique in the fifth century.

Finally, Kissas's catalogue of funerary bases produces a clearer picture of both the original forms of these monuments and their reuse in the Themistoklean Wall than has previously been possible. For example, we learn that in bases consisting of more than one step, the lower blocks (nos. A20, A22, A28, and A33) were just as likely to carry the inscribed epitaph as the top block (nos. A30, A39, and A41). All but one of the bases reused in the Themistoklean Wall whose positions in the wall were recorded at the time of discovery appear to have been placed with their inscribed faces turned into the wall so as not to be seen (nos. A4, A5, A16, A17, A19, and A21; cf. A31).

The only problems with this book are relatively minor ones, and they spring directly from the author's admirable goal of presenting the archaeological evidence succinctly. Points of disagreement with Raubitschek and others, as well as important corrections to earlier scholarship, have largely been relegated to endnotes; some deserve to be brought forward here. There is no physical evidence to support a connection between the Kritios Boy and the column base dedicated by Kallias son of Didymias (B207), or between the marble Nike (Acropolis 693) and the dedication by Iphidike (B195); new fragments of the Kallimachos dedication (B154) support its connection with the marble Nike (Acropolis 690); and the marble scribe (Acropolis 629) dissociated from the Ionic column base B152 by I. Trianti (*The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy* [Oxford 1994] 85–6) could really belong to it after all. Unfortunately, readers of Kissas's book will have to look elsewhere for the details of the controversies surrounding the Phrasikleia kore (A14), the Boiotians and Chalcidians dedication (B17), the Nearchos/Antenor dedication (B45), and the fragmentary Tyrannicides base (C83).

All in all, Kissas has produced a thorough and accessible publication that should bring the evidence of statue bases to the attention of the wide variety of scholars interested in Archaic sculpture and its original contexts.

CATHERINE M. KEESLING

CLASSICS DEPARTMENT  
140 NEW NORTH  
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY  
WASHINGTON, DC 20057-1134  
KEESLINC@GEORGETOWN.EDU

CORPUS VASORUM ANTIQUORUM. DEUTSCHLAND.

Vol. 71, WÜRZBURG, MARTIN VON WAGNER MUSEUM 4, by *Gudrun Güntner*. (Union Académique Inter-nationale.) Pp. 67, figs 3, pls. 55, Beil. 13. Verlag C.H. Beck, Munich 1999. DM 142.00. ISBN 3-406-446-507 (cloth).

The first volume of the *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum* appeared in 1922, and in the 80 years that have passed since that time almost 300 volumes have been published. To publish all ancient vases in public or private collections was unrealistic, and the corpus has tended to con-

centrate on Greek, Etruscan, and Roman pottery. The German series has been carried through with the greatest thoroughness—it has reached 71 volumes, and the latest is the fourth devoted to the Martin von Wagner Museum in Würzburg. This fascicle describes and illustrates all the South Italian red-figure vases at present in the collection as well as 10 Gnathian vases not found in Z. Kotitsa's recent publication of the Hellenistic pottery (*Hellenistische Keramik im Martin von Wagner Museum der Universität Würzburg*, Würzburg 1998). The South Italian red-figure, as one would expect, is predominantly Apulian (39 complete or fragmentary pieces), but there is a small group of 13 Campanian vases, as well as two Paestan and two Sicilian. There is no Lucanian.

Anyone familiar with the collection in Würzburg will be aware of the two volume catalogue produced by E. Langlotz in 1932, a remarkable work for its time, and one might well wonder whether it was necessary to republish so many vases. Indeed, in 1956 (*Colloque international sur le Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum, Lyon, 3–5 juillet 1956* [Lyon 1957] 29) Beazley himself had remarked in regard to this matter: "Le republication dans le *Corpus* de collections déjà bien publiées ailleurs (par exemple catalogue de Würzburg par Langlotz . . .) doit venir en dernier sur la liste de nos tâches ou même n'y pas figurer du tout." The previous three Würzburg fascicles had tended to concentrate on vases acquired after 1932; the present differs from that policy since, of the 66 vases illustrated, some 40 were included by Langlotz. Still, some 70 years have passed since Langlotz' work, the collection has not remained static, and this volume clearly forms part of an attempt to make the current collection readily accessible to scholars with full description and superior illustrations. The next step will be a complete computer database with digitized images.

Only in the Apulian red-figure does the range of shape and style allow one to gain some idea of the development of the fabric, and even here the earliest phase is not represented. Much of the subject matter of these vases is standard (Eros, women, heads), but the collection is leavened with a few interesting scenes of myth: Perseus and Andromeda on a fragmentary Apulian pelike (H 4606) by the Felton Painter; an aulos-playing Siren on the Apulian patera H 5751-2; a sleeping Thracian from a picture of Rhesos or Orpheus on the Apulian volute-krater(?) fragment H 4705; Kerberos (and Herakles?) on the Campanian skyphos H 5383; infant Herakles strangling the snakes in the tondo of the stemless cup HA 832; and the meeting of Orestes and Elektra, according to some scholars, on the Campanian hydria HA 192 and the Paestan neck-amphora H 5739.

However, the volume will perhaps be mainly used by those interested in representations connected with ancient theatre. There are some 12 complete or fragmentary vases with stage scenes, actors, or theatre masks. All are Apulian with the exception of the well-known Paestan bell-krater H 5771. They include some of the most important surviving representations in this genre: the two Gnathian fragments, one with actor holding the mask of a king, the other with the staging of a lost tragedy; and the Tarentine bell-krater with the Telephos parody from Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazousai*.

The descriptions are generally accurate and easy to read, and the author has clearly taken pains to make the discussions relevant and the comparative material pertinent. But a few minor points come to mind. Even though the Apulian squat-kyklos L 826, attributed by A.D. Trendall to his Waterspout Group (*RVAp* 1, 292, no. 47), and the small Campanian squat-kyklos L 881, decorated with female head, were lost during the war, they could have been included, if only in an appendix. Also, the fragment L 612, catalogued by Langlotz as Attic, looks to me to be Apulian or Lucanian, so might have found a place. Since the very first vase in this *CVA*, the Apulian bell-krater by the Tarporley Painter, suffered damage during the war, an old photograph would have been a useful addition. The fragment H 5357 (pl. 27.5), surely from a kantharos as Trendall saw, is attributed to the White Saccos Chariot Group, but this should really be the White Saccos Painter (the Chariot Group is simply a phase of the painter). It is never possible to be comprehensive in providing bibliographies, but the most glaring omission is Trendall (*Red Figure Vases of South Italy and Sicily*, New York 1989; or the German edition, Mainz 1991), where three of the Würzburg vases are illustrated (H 5697, fig. 109; H 4043, fig. 317/8; and H 5739, figs. 380–381).

The technical quality of this publication is, as one would expect, high. The photographs are uniformly sharp, generally superior, and more numerous for each piece than in Langlotz (although anyone wishing to study the comic fragment H 4601 [pl. 28.2] will do much better to go to the illustration in Langlotz). Some 40 vases are provided with full or partial profile drawings. In general, this volume is a worthy continuation of the Würzburg series.

IAN MCPHEE

DEPARTMENT OF ART HISTORY  
LA TROBE UNIVERSITY  
BUNDOORA, VICTORIA 3083  
AUSTRALIA  
I.MCPHEE@LATROBE.EDU.AU

DER MAKEDONISCHE SCHILD, by *Katerini Liampi*.

(Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Athen 16.)

Pp. xvi + 227, fig. 1, pls. 39. Rudolf Habelt, Bonn 1998. DM 120. ISBN 3-7749-2934-3 (paper).

This study of the Macedonian shield, an important contribution to the burgeoning field of Macedonian studies, is a revision of the author's 1988 doctoral dissertation for the University of the Saarland.

The book is divided into five chapters, followed by a substantial catalogue. Chapter 1 addresses historiographic matters and provides an overview of sources, written and archaeological. Chapter 2 is a sensible discussion of shield construction based on the extant specimens. Chapter 3 concerns historical developments. Chapter 4 analyzes the decoration of the shield, including the many different shield devices whose significance is, surely rightly, thought to be primarily propagandistic. And chapter 5 broadens the topic to consider the symbolic character of

the shield as a whole. Finally, the detailed catalogue, divided under archaeological and numismatic headings, provides the backbone for discussion.

In chapter 1, we learn that the purely modern term "Macedonian shield" or "scuta macedonica" derives from late 18th-century numismatic research. The sole ancient textual source for the shield is Asklepiodotos (ca. 110–40 B.C.), followed by Aelian, who says the Macedonian "aspis" is eight palms wide. Only four inscriptions (all dedicatory, three dating to the late fourth century) refer to Macedonian shields, which are uniformly called "peltai." For the appearance of the shield with its distinctive surface decoration of segmented circles, we rely on numismatic evidence and other artifacts that include two fragmentary bronze Hellenistic working shields (one from Vegora, Florina, the other from Dodona) to which is now added a third, discovered in 1999 at Dion. But earliest evidence for the existence of the Macedonian shield derives from an undersized specimen from Olympia, presumably a dedication. Published here for the first time, it is dated on stylistic grounds to the late fifth or early fourth century. The coin series employing the device starts only with a posthumous emission of Philip II from Pella and contemporaneously on coins of Alexander the Great. Completing the first chapter is an overview of some 50 monuments, large and small, Greek and Roman, that appear in the catalogue.

Liampi proposes in chapter 3 that the late fifth-century emergence of the Macedonian shield is linked to the military reforms of Archelaos (ca. 413–399) documented by Thucydides (2.100.2–3). This eminently reasonable suggestion is obviously based on the state of today's knowledge; revision may be required with future discoveries. It is, in any case, recognized that the origins of the shield motif have early prehistoric roots and are common to vast areas of Anatolia, the Balkans, and Greece, a topic nicely explored by Liampi in chapter 4 where, however, a few well-chosen illustrations might have made a welcome addition.

The question of who carried the Macedonian shield is controversial. Liampi makes the attractive suggestion that it was neither the Sarisophoroi, nor the hoplites, but rather the elite royal guard known as Pehetairoi under Philip, as Hypaspists in the later reign of Alexander the Great, and, finally, as Peltasts under the Antigonids. As reconstructed by Liampi, the royal guard was armed lighter than hoplites, wearing helmets, but no breastplates, and carrying spear and sword in addition to the Macedonian shield. A recently discovered late fourth-century tomb at Aghios Athanasios, of which no pictures were available to Liampi at the time of writing, illustrates her point. Military historians are sure to continue the debate.

Chapters 4 and 5 address the symbolic significance of decorative details and of the shield as a whole, respectively. Liampi convincingly argues that the distinctive Macedonian shield provided a desirable and readily identifiable military "logo" in a society whose strength rested in its citizen army. The shield took on a "national" identity that was disseminated through many sorts of monuments, but, most notably, through its coinage. Furthermore, certain Macedonian allies (notably Thessalians and Illyrians) came to adopt the motif, particularly as the