

McPhee & Pemberton do indeed illustrate this when they discuss the impact of Macedonian domination on the Corinthian ceramic corpus, for which there is very little evidence. The point can be made more explicit, however: we are dealing here with a ceramic corpus late Classical in nature and character, but chronologically straddling the late Classical/earliest years of the Hellenistic period.

As indicated earlier, the real meat of this volume is in its series of pottery catalogues. A helpful introduction (Chapter 3) sets out how the ceramic material is organised. The decision to organize the pottery by function is a sensible one, enabling a clearer overview of how the catalogued vessels were most likely used and were related, in terms of use, to other shapes. Interestingly the authors mention here that, with a few exceptions, no dates are assigned to individual shapes. They opted to focus on the discussion of the deposit as a whole, which they argue contains pottery mostly belonging to the second half of the 4th century BC. This is, indeed, a valid approach, but as indicated earlier raises the question as to why the material in question is labelled as late Classical and its occurrence, potentially, during the earliest years of the Hellenistic period not explicitly highlighted.

The catalogues themselves expertly discuss the various shapes in question, focussing specifically on the shape development visible within the drain material and where relevant its chronological associations. The series of catalogues appears primarily intended for the specialist reader, although the more general reader can take much away from the brief summarizing paragraphs tucked away in the individual shape discussions. With regard to the saucer, for example, we learn that its introduction, simultaneous to that of the echinus bowl, signifies a change in dining habits. Sadly, it is left up to the reader to find such attempts at wider interpretation of the ceramic material presented amongst the various shape discussions. There is no one chapter/section devoted to contextualizing the pottery presented. It would have been helpful to have included a more detailed discussion as to how this deposit relates to contexts of similar date elsewhere and how it fits into the wider narrative of Corinthian pottery production and consumption during the late Classical/early Hellenistic period (although in their defence, the authors highlight the lack of comparable deposits at Corinth for the late Classical/early Hellenistic period).

In sum, there is a tremendous amount of information and detail encapsulated in this volume. The long list of individual pottery catalogues and appendices

incorporated in this work are exemplary. Corinth VII.6 indeed expertly succeeds in presenting and discussing in detail the ceramic material of an archaeological context deposited in the latter part of the 4th century BC. The work is a treasure trove for ceramicists working in the field and significantly advances our understanding not only of the shapes represented in the catalogue but more importantly the nature and character of a fairly homogenous assemblage datable within the second half of the fourth century BC. Where the book is somewhat lacking, is in its accessibility to the more general reader. No overview section detailing the nature and character of the material and its implications for eating and drinking at late Classical/early Hellenistic Corinth is apparent. Instead, this information is buried within the various pottery catalogues and therefore, more difficult to access by a non-specialist audience.

Overall, however, the positives significantly outweigh the negatives. *Late Classical Pottery from Ancient Corinth, Drain 1971-1 in the Forum Southwest* is a vital contribution to the field of Classical and Hellenistic ceramics, providing important new information on the nature and character of late Classical/early Hellenistic pottery production and consumption at ancient Corinth. It reinforces once again the apparent disconnect between geo-political changes and ceramic production and consumption by showing us how an assemblage deposited around 310 BC is still decidedly late Classical in nature and character.

MARK VAN DER ENDEN
LEICESTER UNIVERSITY
mv92@leicester.ac.uk

Carol L. Lawton. *The Athenian Agora XXXVIII: Votive Reliefs*. pp. 248, with 12 col. ills, 3 col. and b/w plans, 60 plates. ISBN: 978-0-87661-238-5, hardcover £130.

This beautiful volume is more than up to the high standard of Agora sculpture publications, first set by Evelyn Harrison's study of Roman portraits (*Agora* v.1, 1953), which appeared some 66 years ago. This, the latest volume to appear in the Agora series, is the fourth devoted to sculpture, following Harrison's on Archaic and Archaistic Sculpture (v.11, 1965)

and that on Funerary Sculpture (v.35, 2013) by Laura Grossman. The Classical and Hellenistic sculpture is currently under intensive study by Andrew Stewart, who has produced a series of stimulating articles in *Hesperia* on free-standing and especially architectural sculpture, adding to our understanding of the Hephaisteion and, currently, bringing lesser-known buildings like the Temple of Ares to life by identifying substantial portions of its sculptured adornment.

Lawton presents here those marble reliefs from the Agora, mostly fragmentary and usually highly fragmentary (six of the 224 catalogued are more or less intact), that she has identified as having had a votive function. All fragments are fully illustrated and twelve of the best-preserved and more important pieces are shown in excellent colour plates. The Introduction provides a thorough yet succinct overview of the nature of the material and issues related to its study: excavation history and contexts, earlier literature on the corpus (limited), chronology, the objects of reverence for these reliefs and what is known of their shrines, the dedicators (only a dozen or so names are preserved and only two appear in other sources), methods and materials of production, iconography, and function. The catalogue itself is arranged by the subject matter and/or recipient of the relief, first gods and goddesses (Agathe Tyche to Zeus), and then heroes and heroines. The latter include Herakles, less specifically named heroes (e.g., Heros Iatros, Heros Strategos) and generic figures like banqueting heroes (who account for about a quarter of the corpus) and rider heroes. Each section of the catalogue begins with its own introduction, surveying not just the reliefs dedicated to the deity in question, but exploring the evidence for the existence and location of the cult in and around the Agora; this constitutes a major contribution of the volume, going beyond the documentation of the material *per se*. There follows a treatment of reliefs that show (or preserve) only worshippers, anatomical reliefs, and unfinished or illegible reliefs. The catalogue entries themselves are both detailed and thorough with full provenience, dimensions, description, and bibliography. The

bibliography, concordance, and indices are equally exhaustive and useful. This is, quite simply, a model publication.

The study of sculpture from the Agora of Athens is no easy task, as already pointed out by Harrison in her 1965 volume (pp. v-vi). An area of intensive public political, commercial, and religious activity beginning in the later Archaic period, and used previously as a cemetery from the Bronze Age onward, the Agora was expanded and reworked by Hellenistic princes and Roman emperors. With its many centuries of post-antique usage as well, the Athenian Agora is the quintessential site of urban Classical archaeology. Specifically, for the study of sculpture, the resulting issue is that virtually every piece has been found out of its original context, sometimes reworked into a later wall, more often deposited with fill or dumped in a well. Moreover, a good deal of the sculpture was discovered by the scholars themselves, poring through 'marble piles' assembled by the early excavators.

A related challenge, especially pertinent to the study of votive reliefs, is that the Agora is a low-lying area flanked to the south and west by several hills of varying height and steepness. From southeast to west: Acropolis, Areopagus, Philopappos Hill, Pnyx, and the Hill of the Muses, and, immediate adjacent to the Agora proper, Kolonos Agoraios. These hills, including their slopes, housed numerous sanctuaries, especially in caves, that were commonly used for the kind of private dedications treated here. It is clear that masses of objects discovered within the extensive limits of the Agora explorations had, over the years, made their way down from these cult places by various means. Moreover, the fact that joining fragments from a single relief were found 300m apart within the excavation further testifies to the extent of migration of material across the Agora itself. It is possible to plot the findspots of those pieces for which the data are known, and indeed the volume includes two excellent plans that do just that. In fact, Lawton notes that there are several cases where reliefs ostensibly related to a particular cult seem to cluster around an area where that deity or hero

was likely to have been worshipped. She is also able to argue convincingly for several reliefs, based on the figures or, less often, inscriptions, a plausible original location among the many cult areas surrounding the excavation area.

As a result, this study, like the other studies of Agora sculptures, can rely far less on what we might consider traditional archaeological evidence than might be true at a different kind of site. To be sure, whatever use of such evidence may be pertinent and useful is fully applied here, but the study primarily depends on on 1) an extraordinary talent for looking at sculpture, nearly always fragments and in most cases relatively small fragments; 2) an encyclopaedic knowledge of the styles, carving techniques, and subject matter of Greek sculpture, and, when relevant, 3) a strong familiarity with the subjects and methods of epigraphical study.

Prof. Lawton is well-known for her work on document reliefs;¹ indeed, she is the acknowledged expert on these works, and the skills she developed in her exemplary research on them are strongly applicable to this rather different category of sculpture. Although produced at roughly the same time (late 5th to early 3rd century BC; votives go on a bit longer) the two types of monument are different in obvious ways. The document (sometimes termed 'decree') reliefs were publicly erected and generally accompany official decrees of the state, whereas votive reliefs are concerned with cult, most often as private dedications. The images on document reliefs are often metaphorical; treaties between poleis are an especially common theme and paired images of their respective patron deities generally stand for the cities themselves. Votive reliefs most often show deities, usually in groups, as recipients of worship, just as often with the worshippers themselves absent as present. Just what the worshipper anticipated in return for his/her/their dedication is sometimes implicit in the nature of the cult (e.g. healing

cults) or left unspecified by the imagery. When inscriptions do provide this information, for cults that are less specific, health-related issues occur most often as well, at least in the Agora corpus. A variant is the anatomical relief, of which there are many here, being the most explicit form of all, as it depicts exactly what ails the dedicator, if not exactly the ailment to be alleviated. Presumably the god will know.

What document reliefs and votive reliefs do share, however, is an important role in the study of sculptural production in Classical Athens. Document reliefs have been especially looked at as a means to pin down the chronology of stylistic sequencing. Since those with preserved decrees are datable, they promise to provide fixed points for the particular style of the figures illustrated. Votive reliefs are less useful in this regard, but the juxtaposition of image and inscription, when such occurs, can provide complementary evidence. More significant, for the study of sculpture generally, is the relationship of certain figures found on the reliefs to purported statuary types. Several figures on these reliefs are seen to recur on other Classical reliefs and/or among Roman series and can strengthen the argument for a Classical prototype, either in statuary or relief. Examples include figures of Athena (cat. nos. 32, 34, 37), Demeter and Kore (5th century: 44, 45; 4th century: 49, 50), and processions of Charites (archaistic: 38; 41, a figure from the highly problematic 'Graces of Socrates'). Minimally, the identification of the figures on works surely datable to the Classical period or shortly thereafter contributes significantly to sorting out, among 'Neo-Attic' types, what is Greek and what may be late Hellenistic or Roman. One might further note, however, that in both categories of relief there is considerable variation among figures of a given type, so it is likely that artists, as is usually the case, were working as much from a mental corpus of images ('This is what Athena looks like') more than copying a particular prototype in order to preserve its existence for posterity, as we often seem to assume.

¹ Esp. *Attic Document Reliefs: Art and Politics in Ancient Athens*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995. Also, pertinent to the volume under review: 'Four Document Reliefs from the Athenian Agora,' *Hesperia* 64 (1995) 121-130.