The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Catalogue of the Acropolis Museum *Catalogue of the Acropolis Museum*. Vol. II.: Sculpture and Architectural Fragments. By Stanley Casson. With a section upon the Terracottas by Dorothy Brooke. Pp. x + 459. Profusely illustrated in half-tone. Cambridge: University Press, 1921. £1 16s.

J. D. Beazley

The Classical Review / Volume 36 / Issue 5-6 / August 1922, pp 130 - 131

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00016711, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00016711

How to cite this article:

J. D. Beazley (1922). The Classical Review, 36, pp 130-131 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00016711

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

one may find 'ictic' an ugly hybrid, but mostly the author's coinages are modest; but I wish he would proscribe *arsis* and *thesis* (which he himself admits are equivocal) and adopt the unambiguous terms of the French metrists *fort* and *faible*. On p. 23 Tennyson's alcaics are

maimed by losing a word; on p. 29 the note about Ausonius is a delusion—the iambics follow in the next piece; on p. 32 Meredith's galliambics might be quoted; on p. 1 the French anagrammatic verses are shockingly misprinted.
J. S. PHILLIMORE.

CATALOGUE OF THE ACROPOLIS MUSEUM.

Catalogue of the Acropolis Museum. Vol. II.: Sculpture and Architectural Fragments. By STANLEY CASSON. With a section upon the Terracottas by DOROTHY BROOKE. Pp. x+459. Profusely illustrated in half-tone. Cambridge: University Press, 1921. £1 16s.

THE first volume of the *Acropolis Catalogue*, by Guy Dickins, set a high standard. The second and concluding volume, which deals with the sculpture of the post-archaic periods, and with the terracottas of all periods, maintains that standard. It is a careful and useful piece of work, highly creditable to the authors and to the British School.

Mr. Casson's material falls into four groups: the sculptures of the Parthenon, the sculptures of the Erechtheum, the balustrade of the Temple of Athena Nike, and a miscellaneous lot of statues and reliefs, mostly fragmentary, ranging from the second half of the fifth century to Roman times. A wide field to cover. The illustrations are less numerous than in the former volume, but more would have made the book unwieldy. One or two pieces are published for the first time; for example, a female head from one of the metopes of the Parthenon (p. 96), and another, fragmentary, from the frieze (p. 138). The bibliographies are large, but not arranged chronologically, and not, perhaps not meant to be, exhaustive. The most serious omission is the lack of references to the plates in Brunn-Bruckmann, where some of the more important marbles from the Parthenon, from the Balustrade, and above all from the Erechtheum, are published better than anywhere else; and to Arndt and Amelung's *Einzelaufnahmen*, which include a number of pieces from the Acropolis less adequately

reproduced, or not at all, elsewhere (*Einzelaufnahmen*, Nos. 725 to 734, and 1274 to 1287).

The following are the points which seem to me open to criticism in Mr. Casson's account of the sculptures; not many in more than three hundred pages. P. 31, the bronze herm signed by Boethos is not a replica of a work by Alcamenes. P. 39, the first torso is not W but V. P. 104, three lines from the end, 'figures' is a slip for 'faces.' P. 106, line 12, 'right' should be 'left'; the second figure is almost certainly, I suppose, Apollo, and the third Artemis rather than Peitho or Demeter. P. 110, Pl. xli. is the right reference for 860. Pp. 111-112, the riders are wearing chlamydes not himatia. Pp. 112-113, the youths are carrying hydriai not amphorae. P. 115, lxxix., under 867, should be lxxx. P. 118, the warrior wears a corslet as well as a chiton. P. 121, the first lyre player wears chiton as well as himation. P. 144, the slab published by Miss Harrison is not 3 but 11. P. 147, did anyone ever take two hands to carry a greave? P. 148, No. 7 has either a kolpos or a kolpos with an overfall. P. 150, the chiton is girt underneath a short kolpos. P. 176, the right-hand figure has a short kolpos as well as an overfall. P. 229, the reference in *Annali* is Pl. N.: the plate is reproduced, and similar subjects discussed, by Studniczka, *Kalamis*, p. 28; the plate gives the fifth figure a chiton as well as a himation, whether rightly or wrongly; the wild attitudes of the women make it unlikely that they are Muses. Pp. 243-248, Mr. Casson speaks of Nos. 1341-1341 γ as fragments of a single relief, perhaps containing six figures; the general view has been that they come from two or three different replicas. The

Acropolis and Chiaramonti reliefs cannot be said to be derived from Acropolis 702; the most that can be said is that the original of the later reliefs stood in the same line of tradition as the sixth-century work. It might have been well to mention the theory, which has found favour, that the relief seen by Pausanias was the work of the Boeotian sculptor Socrates; see, for example, Amelung in Helbig's *Führer* I, pp. 48-50. Pp. 248-250, No. 1345, the relief is mentioned, and the type of drapery discussed, by Studniczka, *Kalamis*, p. 27 ff. P. 253, No. 1348, the hand may have held a sceptre, rather than a spear: it is hard to see how the two letters, which are all that remain of the inscription, can show the relief to be not earlier than 403 B.C.; eta is frequently found on Attic stones before the archonship of Eucleides. Pp. 257-259, the so-called Procne: 'Michaelis points out that Alcamenes was only the dedicator and not the artist'; this should run, 'not necessarily the artist.' 'The group is compared with the so-called Leucothea of the Munich Glyptothek and with the Eirene of Kephisodotus or the Hestia Giustiniani.' The 'Leucothea' is the same statue as the Eirene: I do not know who compared the Procne with the Hestia; he must have been joking. P. 272, No. 3014, the object in the man's hand can hardly be a patera, judging by the way he holds it; I doubt whether a parallel could be found among the many thousands of representations of paterae

in ancient art. P. 284, the potter (not vase-painter) Andokides flourished in the second half of the sixth century; 'fifth' is obviously a slip. P. 309, the pinax can hardly be later than 500, to judge from the vases cited by Mr. Casson: further, to speak of Euthymides as belonging to the circle of Epictetus is like speaking of Van der Goes as belonging to the circle of Memling; the phrase, however, is Dr. Hoppin's, not Mr. Casson's. Pp. 310-313, if the pithos recalls the vases of the Epictetan circle, 'the later decades of the first half of the fifth century' is not early enough for it; as to the subject, the warriors on the pithos, and on all the monuments compared with it, are not apobatai, but fighters mounting the chariot—parabatai if you like.

Mrs. Brooke's careful description of the terracottas is a valuable contribution to the study of these important monuments.

Misprints.—P. 2, a line seems to have fallen out between line 17 and 18, making Amphitrite into a monster. P. 13, *κατατεξεύχνης*. P. 241, *Πορριχίσταις*. P. 401, Grea for Gréau. Agraule, Caracallus, hydriophorai, kanephorai, *παρύθη*, all throughout.

Both Mr. Casson and Mrs. Brooke confine 'in' to the most strictly local signification ('in London'), and use 'in the case of' for the other senses, and freely besides. So do nearly all our archaeologists: I often wonder why.

J. D. BEAZLEY.

APICIUS' COOKERY-BOOK.

Apicius 'de re coquinaria.' Ediderunt C. GIARRATANO et FR. VOLLMER. Pp. 96. Leipzig: Teubner, 1922.

WHEN an editor has boasted that he has 'no inkling of "Ueberlieferungsgeschichte,"' it seems natural that his divination is now criticised as 'mere waste of time.'

The help of U. to an editor is illustrated by this, the first real edition of Apicius. In 1912 Giarratano published a monograph, 'The MSS. of Caelius de re coquinaria,' and, some years later, offered to Teubner (who accepted it)

an edition of this cookery-book, presumably under this title. Giarratano did what nine out of ten editors in these days would do: he contented himself with the MSS. within reach—the ninth-century MS. in the Vatican Library, the other Italian (Renaissance) MSS. He did not cross the sea to Cheltenham, where, in a library whose door opens but to golden keys, is imprisoned another ninth-century MS. of Apicius, destined doubtless for the shelves of some dollar-king, whose freakish son will use its pages to light a