

Großgrundbesitzer stärkte, bahnte sich eine ähnlich verhängnisvolle Entwicklung wie im Westen an, auch wenn das Ostreich noch Jahrhunderte fortbestand.

Mit seinem Buch hat der Verf. elementare Fragen zur wirtschaftlichen und gesellschaftlichen Lage des Ostreiches angeschnitten. Wünschenswert wäre gewesen, wenn er kurz die Verhältnisse in Ägypten während der hohen Kaiserzeit geschildert hätte. Eine historische Einordnung seiner Ergebnisse fiel dann leichter. Diese Kritik soll nicht den Wert dieser verdienstvollen und anregend zu lesenden Studie schmälern, die die Diskussion über den spätantiken Staat nachhaltig beeinflussen dürfte.

Oberursel-Frankfurt *Frank. M. Ausbüttel*

**Marion Meyer, Nora Brüggemann:** *Kore und Kouros*. Weihegaben für die Götter. Wien: Phoibos 2007. 259 S. 7 Ktn. 18 Taf. 4°. (Wiener Forschungen zur Archäologie. 10.).

Over 170 years after the first discovery of a kouros, and over a century since Leonardo coined this term for the type, kouros (and korai) continue to fascinate. With the increasing pace of development in Greece and the Mediterranean as a whole, new ones continue to emerge, as do new books on them – by my count, five in the last decade alone, not including the one here reviewed. Yet consensus about their meaning seems as far away as ever. Meyer and Brüggemann seek to cap this debate by examining all known examples of the two types in context, and by subjecting all current theories about them to tough, unrelenting scrutiny.

Of the 243 provenanced korai from present-day Greece, western Turkey, and Libya known to Meyer and catalogued in her Appendix,<sup>22</sup> about 75% were clearly

votive, and only 5% funerary; for the rest, the exact context is uncertain or unknown. Korai (and kouros) from elsewhere are omitted, as are those in materials other than marble (S.14 Anm. 12; S.94). Although one can understand the omission of the terracottas, which are probably innumerable, this decision snubs the Greek West (why?)<sup>23</sup>, skews the statistics somewhat, and shortchanges areas such as the Argolid, Lakonia, and Elis where few or no marble korai (or kouros) have appeared, but where small bronze ones are plentiful or at least not unknown.<sup>24</sup>

Indeed, in the latter cases, as so often in archaeology, absence may speak louder than presence. What social factors, one may ask, inhibited the *homoioi* of archaic Sparta from commissioning large-scale marble korai and kouros but encouraged them to invest heavily in small-scale metal ones? The issue begs for further investigation, perhaps along the lines of Ian Morris's fruitful distinction between 'elite' and 'middling' ideologies in the archaic period. This thesis has generated much interest in Anglophone scholarship but little, as far as I am aware, in mainland Europe.<sup>25</sup>

But what or who do the korai represent (S.15ff)? Could they be portraits, nymphs,

<sup>23</sup> Though Sombrotidas of Megara Hyblaia gets in anyway (S.125).

<sup>24</sup> See, e.g., I. Ström, *The Early Sanctuary of the Argive Heraion and Its External Relations* (8<sup>th</sup>-early 6<sup>th</sup> cent. B.C.: Bronze Imports and Archaic Greek Bronzes. Proceedings of the Danish Institute at Athens 2, 1998, 37-127, Abb. 19-22. 28-33; M. Herfort-Koch, *Archaische Bronzeplastik Lakoniens* (Münster 1986) K25-39 (korai), 76-88 (kouros), 91-95 (crowned kouros); K. Stibbe, *Agalmata: Studien zur griechisch-archaischen Bronzekunst* (Leuven 2006) 269-309 (Lakonian kouros, with expanded catalogue including hydria handles); P.C. Bol, *Grossplastik aus Bronze in Olympia*, *Olforsch* 9 (Berlin 1978) nr. 1. 128. etc.

<sup>25</sup> See, e.g., Morris in J. Ober and C. Hedrick, *Demokratia: A Conversation on Democracies Ancient and Modern* (Princeton 1996) 19-48; id., *Archaeology as Cultural History* (Malden, Mass. 2000) 155-91.

<sup>22</sup> She misses one, a fragmentary, half-lifesize, late archaic kore of high quality found in a temple perhaps of Athena Polias at Stymphalos in 1995; see H. Williams, *Excavations at Stymphalos, 1995*. *Classical Views/Echoes du monde classique* 40, 1996, 80-83, Taf. 4-5; a publication by Mary Sturgeon is in preparation.

or even statues of Athena or other goddesses? The inscriptions offer little warrant for any of these recurrent theories (even Phrasikleia's splendid kore is presented only as her *sēma*, it will be recalled, not as herself, and Aristodikos is named in the genitive). Iconography offers less, for a *stephane* is not a helmet, and a dove or apple are not a spear or shield. (Indeed, a dove held in the *left* hand makes it an *attribute* of the kore, a device for likening her to the supremely beautiful Aphrodite, not itself a gift for the divinity (S.24f): an important observation.) Of course, the kore type could always be *adapted* to serve as a goddess: Nikandre's kore and the Peplos kore are prime candidates to represent Artemis, and the three korai from the east pediment of the temple of Apollo at Delphi may well be Ge, Themis, and Phoebe. And at the other end of the ontological scale, the korai of the Geneleos monument are surely the dedicant [---]archēs's daughters, for the inscriptions name them: Philippe, Ornithe, and another whose name is now lost.

In the end, then, Schneider turns out to have been right (S.29f): the basic kore type is generic.<sup>26</sup> It represents a *parthenos* in full bloom, dressed to the hilt, heavily bejeweled, often coquettishly twitching her dress to show off her pretty ankles, auburn-haired, almond-eyed, smiling, full-breasted, and (to our eyes, rather strangely) large-buttocked. As a funerary statue, it serves to glorify the deceased and perhaps in Phrasikleia's case (though Meyer does not venture here) to liken her to the archetypal kore, Persephone. And as a votive, it is an *agalma* or perpetual delight for Aphrodite, Artemis, Athena, Demeter, Hera, and others – particularly for Artemis in her role as the special protector of *parthenoi*, and for Athena in her role as the Athenian kore *par excellence*, as numerous inscriptions on the Akropolis demonstrate (S.42ff). Apollo likes them too.

Brüggemann's discussion of the kouroi also begins with statistics (388 extant kouroi, exhaustively catalogued on S.133ff, of which 270 are definitely votive and 50+ are

funerary)<sup>27</sup> and a «Forschungsgeschichte» (of which more below) but then proceeds in a slightly different manner. She defers the question of meaning until she has thoroughly investigated the type's functions, distribution, and chronology; has correlated each of these both with the others and with the korai; and has drawn the not unsurprising conclusion that together with the gravestones, korai, and other votives, the marble kouroi body forth the preoccupations of the archaic aristocracies (S.121). En route (S.110ff, cf. 131) she notes that, suggestively, kouroi seem to disappear under populist tyrannies, for example on Samos and Naxos (cf. the anecdote in ps.-Aristotle, Oec. 2.1346a7ff), and in proto-democratic Kleisthenic Athens. As it happens, this reviewer came to exactly the same conclusions in 1986, in an essay cited earlier by Brüggemann (S.101) but not in this context.<sup>28</sup>

I noticed a few other hiccups in the argument. Although Brüggemann's research and analyses are on the whole relentlessly thorough, her «Forschungsgeschichte» overlooks one important recent contribution to the debate, namely, Rainer Mack's *Ordering the Body and Embodying Order: The Kouros in Archaic Greek Society* (Diss. Berkeley 1996); Kyrene and the NE Aegean unaccountably now also vanish from the scene; not all the kouroi from the Samian Heraion (nr. 277–95) necessarily need be dedicated to Hera, for the sanctuary hosted other temples and gods (e.g., Hermes) and Leukios's kouros (nr. 276), dedicated to Apollo, was found not far away; and finally, the kouros from the Asklepieion on Paros (nr. 233; famously celebrated by Rilke) cannot have been dedicated to Asklepios himself, for his cult colonized the spot only around 400. Instead, this kouros must have been a votive to Apollo also, for Rubensohn found it on the bedrock *under* the Asklepieion, in a location that served in the archaic period as

<sup>27</sup> Omitting the Getty kouros, which is never mentioned.

<sup>28</sup> When is a Kouros not an Apollo? The Tenea Apollo Revisited, in: Mario del Chiaro et al. (eds.), *Corinthiaca: Studies in Honor of Darrell A. Amyx* (Columbia, Miss. 1986) 54–70.

<sup>26</sup> L.A. Schneider, *Zur sozialen Bedeutung der archaischen Korenstatuen* (Hamburg 1975).

the lower terrace of the Pythion and boasted the god's own sacred spring.<sup>29</sup>

As to issues of identity and meaning, after another «Forschungsgeschichte» (S.121–24) Brüggemann comes to essentially the same conclusions as Meyer, adding that *pace* Kyrieleis, colossal kouroi cannot necessarily or even plausibly have represented heroes, for the former go out of fashion around 550 while heroes, obviously, did not. Again, I find all this completely convincing, especially since I reached the same conclusions myself in my essay of 1986 (colossi excepted), which she cites – apparently with some reservation – in her second «Forschungsgeschichte», but not thereafter (S.123f: «A. Stewart ging so weit zu sagen, dass dem kanonischen Kouros nur dann eine spezifische Deutung zukäme, wenn diese Statuen mit entsprechenden Attributen ausgestattet seien. Da dies nicht der Fall ist, sei der Kouros an sich ohne exklusive Funktion und eine jeweilige Deutung könne nur durch den Kontext erschlossen werden»). So it is rather galling to read, six pages of dense contextual and iconographic analysis later, the following conclusion, baldly presented without citation or acknowledgment (S.130): «Die obigen Ausführungen haben gezeigt, dass der Typus des Kouros je nach Kontext verschiedene Interpretationen zulässt».

Together, then, these two essays thoroughly document, summarize, and on the whole convincingly analyze the korekouros question. Yet the last word on it has yet to be written – indeed, probably never will be. New discoveries no doubt will complicate matters again; the frequent appearance of the types in other media and locations, noted above, remains to be addressed; and last but not least the issue of their demise and replacement by non-generic images (athletes, portraits, gravestones, and so on) needs further attention. Meyer briefly considers this last problem on S.47ff, in a section that is too dense and complex to summarize here. In parting, however, I want to draw the reader's attention to another provocative idea, recently advanced by Josephine Crawley Quinn: that in some sense, the

kouros's successor at Athens may have been the herm.<sup>30</sup>

Berkeley

Andrew Stewart

**Barbara Czurda-Ruth:** *Hanghaus 1 in Ephesos*. Die Gläser. Mit Beiträgen zur Baugeschichte von C. Lang-Auinger und zu den archäometrischen Analysen von K. Uhler, M. Melcher, M. Schreiner. Koordination und Redaktion: S. Ladstätter und F. Jaksche. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 2007. 326 S. zahlr. Abb. 41 Taf. 4°. (Forschungen in Ephesos. VIII/7.) 89 €.

Die Autorin (C.-R.), in der Forschung vor allem durch ihre langjährigen Studien zu den Gläsern vom Magdalensberg und aus Ephesos bekannt, stellt mit diesem Buch die Glasfunde aus dem ephesischen Hanghaus 1 an der Kuretenstraße vor. Daß dies – anders als bei den kontextorientierten Publikationen zum Hanghaus 2 – in monographischer Form geschieht, erklärt der ehemalige Grabungsleiter, F. Krinzingler, in seinem Vorwort mit geänderten Bearbeitungsstrategien. Obwohl der Band also primär unter typologischen Gesichtspunkten konzipiert ist, erschöpft er sich nicht in derart ausgerichteten Betrachtungen, vielmehr bezieht C.-R. bei der Diskussion des Materials stets auch die datierenden Fundkomplexe sowie naturwissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zu den Gläsern, welche den Schlußteil des Werkes bilden, mit ein.

Die Zeitspanne, innerhalb derer sich die insgesamt rund 1150 Glasobjekte bewegen, reicht vom 1. Jh. v. u. Z. bis ins frühe 7. Jh. u. Z. Sie spiegelt zugleich die Besiedlungsgeschichte des betreffenden Areals wider, welche C. Lang-Auinger in einem einführenden Beitrag kurz skizziert. Bei den Stücken selbst handelt es sich – abgesehen von einer Mosaikglasplatte, einer Melonenperle, acht Spielmarken und diversen Fensterglasfragmenten – fast sämtlich um Gefäße. Der Katalog, aus dem der Band im wesentlichen besteht, ist in drei Teilen

<sup>30</sup> Herms, Kouros and the Political Anatomy of Athens. *Greece and Rome* 54, 2007, 82–105.

<sup>29</sup> AM 27, 1902, 230. 236.