

Prehistory and Protohistory

New Light on Palaeolithic and Mesolithic Ornament

Catherine Perlès. *Ornaments and other ambiguous artifacts from Franchthi, Volume I, the Palaeolithic and the Mesolithic, excavations at Franchthi Cave, Greece, Fascicle 15. pp. xx+ 322, b/w/ colour illustrations. 2018. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. ISBN 978-0-25303184-6 hard/paperback £43.*

Under the modest heading of a fascicle, the 15th volume of the Excavations at Franchthi Cave publication series is entitled *Ornaments and Other Ambiguous Artifacts from Franchthi* and is authored by Catherine Perlès. Unlike her previous studies of the knapped stone artifacts that were delivered in French, this work is written in English and will be valuable to a wide audience of specialists and students. The work at hand is one more welcome addition to the impressive series published by Indiana University Press, which is unparalleled in the archaeological literature of Stone Age Greece and southeast Europe in terms of quantity, quality and detail of publication. Thanks are due to the wise 'Franchthi board' who carry on the legacy of the site and its excavation in the 21st century (and perhaps to the excavator Tom Jacobsen who sends his jazzy blessings from the sky).

The book consists of fourteen chapters and an epilogue and is structured in two main sections that stand independently and deal with the shell and other ornaments and ornamental species of the Palaeolithic and Mesolithic period respectively. Each section contains chapters on individual species turned into beads, namely *Cyclope* sp., *Antalis* sp. (the Tusk shell) and *Columbella rustica* (the Dove shell), a chapter on rare ornament types, a chapter on diachronic variations and a closing comparison and discussion chapter. The book's content is wisely balanced between theory and data, between laboratory archaeology and fieldwork in the wider environs of the cave to gather modern comparative collections of shells. In its pages one can see the archaeologist's successful effort to describe the specimens as cultural entities (artifacts) and as biological entities (raw materials). The work on sourcing the molluscs transformed into artifacts is indeed a positive element of the study, whose

primary focus is the technology of human modification. The book employs descriptive and quantitative approaches and is richly documented with tables, diagrams and three appendices. The finds are illustrated by informative high-resolution colour photographs.

The book operates on multiple levels. It complements the other, more eminent categories of archaeological evidence recovered from Franchthi, the bread and butter of a prehistoric site's inventory such as the lithic finds, the pottery and the figurines, that have already seen publication in previous years or decades. It thus presents a more complete picture of the full gamut of material remains left behind by the Palaeolithic and the Mesolithic groups who lived in the cave. At the same time, it complements the 1989 volume authored by Judith Shackleton on Marine Molluscan Remains, with its distinctive palaeoenvironmental and economic focus. Perlès has been inspired by this early work and her fine observations, shifting her attention to shells as ornamentation elements and windows to the origins of human technology and spiritual life. If one were to question the necessity of another volume on this material, a perusal of the new book's content and a read of Perlès's research questions leave no doubt as to its scope. The book exemplifies the ability of a category of archaeological finds to offer multiple alternative readings and interpretations, that connect the current theoretical and methodological advances in the subject once they set off from new points of departure. Very much like the raw materials in the hands of different chefs can be turned into either a Michelin-star dish or a dull execution of an old recipe, what we have here is a first-class piece of analytical work and synthesis departing from a clearly articulated set of questions.

On another level of operation, the book will be immediately read by two scientific communities: prehistorians and those working on molluscan remains. I would argue that the methodological impact and interpretative repercussions will certainly go far beyond the two. With this study the author confirms the potential of material from excavations half a century old to contribute to the larger historical and anthropological discussions of the present, once approached with a robust and solid methodology.

A third level of operation has to do with the very nature of the Franchthi Cave sequence, which from the onset of the excavations was hailed as exceptional for allowing a deep – though not uninterrupted – view to the Stone Age world of Greece. Perlès's work on the ornaments, like her three-volume work on

knapped stone lithics which provided a basis for phasing the sequence, opens a window to long-term ornamental history and invites us to envision the individuals and the societies who made, wore and discarded them. The sheer amount of finds and the differing nature of the evidence lie behind its publication in two volumes: Volume 1 (considered here) presents the Palaeolithic and the Mesolithic assemblages and Volume 2 (to follow) shall be presenting the more diverse (in terms of materials and type) Neolithic assemblage of ornaments.

Perlès marries many different worlds. She is loyal to the French tradition of theoretically informed, meticulous work on the empirical record and at the same time she is an intelligent and daring analyst of an 'Anglo-Saxon calibre'. She delivers here a comprehensive account of a collection of more than 12,000 specimens, perforated beads and pendants and other artifacts such as perforated pebbles, without making it a chore. She is an insider of the chaîne opératoire approach with its emphasis on the biography of each object, from raw material procurement to manufacture, use and discarding as a token of technology, while treating ornaments as symbolic units, that is, as non-verbal means of communication that operate in a symbolic sphere. She has a deep knowledge of anthropological theory, which allows her to turn a collection of admittedly simple and repetitive objects into an exciting reason to cogitate not on cultural change, archaeologists' favourite topic, but on cultural permanence and the meaning of the transition from the Palaeolithic to the Mesolithic world. Last but not least, being a lithic specialist herself and having published the Franchthi Palaeolithic, Mesolithic and Neolithic assemblages of chipped stone, she has an excellent command of the different perspectives offered by the stone tools and the ornaments from both a diachronic and a synchronic perspective.

This book offers a fresh and authoritative study of the ornaments recovered from the Franchthi Cave sediments. Perhaps its greatest contribution is that it prompts us to think along the lines of very long-term regional traditions, on a scale that has not been comprehended so far despite well-known evidence for it (parietal art, for instance). This, in turn, leads us to question the backbone of the cultural paleogeography of Europe, to question the proxies used to define past cultural entities and to question the use of stone tool typology to define chronological and cultural techno-complexes.

NENA GALANIDOU
AFFILIATION DEPT. OF HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY,
UNIVERSITY OF CRETE
galanidou@uoc.gr

Anastasia Papathanasiou, William A. Parkinson, Daniel J. Pullen, Michael L. Galaty and Panagiotis Karkanas (eds). *Neolithic Alepotrypa cave in the Mani, Greece. In honor of George Papathanassopoulos*. pp. 435, colour plates. 2018. Oxford and Philadelphia: Oxbow Books. ISBN 978-1-78750-648-6 hardback £70.

Since the occupation of caves became recognised as a specific feature of the Late and Final Neolithic in Greece,¹ widely differing interpretations have been offered. Schematically, the balance shifted from a purely pragmatic interpretation – caves were used as domestic places in the context of increasing pastoralism – to a mostly or purely ritual interpretation.² However, as illustrated by a recent publication devoted to the use of caves,³ the question is far from settled. Yet, to better understand the status of LN/FN caves, or, more precisely, to better grasp how difficult it is to understand it, a key element was missing: the detailed publication of Alepotrypa Cave, in the Mani. More than any other cave site, Alepotrypa, with its apparently domestic occupations, wealth of human remains and exceptional deposits,⁴ epitomises the impossibility to draw a clear-cut opposition between the mundane and the ritual, the *polis* and the *necropolis*. Paradoxically, Alepotrypa raises not such much the question of the definition of rituals as the definition of what is domestic.

The cave, located just above the Bay of Diros on the Western coast of the Tainaron Peninsula, is about 300 m long and 50 m wide in maximum width. Several distinct chambers are separated by narrow passages; after a deep slope, the largest, deepest and most remote chamber (Chamber L) reveals a large lake of slightly brackish but drinkable water.⁵ The cave was sealed by the collapse of the porch in the late Final Neolithic, dated by U-Th on speleothems that sealed the floor, to ca 3,200 BC (Maighan Boyd and Kathrin Holmgren, Chapter 21). When speleologists discovered the cave in 1958, many intact vases and human remains were still *in situ* over the floor. Unfortunately, the anterior

¹ Renfrew 1972.

² E.g. Demoule and Perlès 1993, Tomkins 2009. This shift is not specific to Greece. See Bergsvik and Skeates 2012; Moyes 2012.

³ Mavridis and Tae Jensen 2013.

⁴ There seem be doubts, however, about the provenience of the silver beads, pendants and earrings attributed to Alepotrypa but not published here.

⁵ A section of the cave would have been useful to the reader to better comprehend the contrasted topography of the cave and the impressive slope down to the lake.

part of the cave was totally destroyed, Chamber A was largely emptied, and other sectors severely disturbed when it was decided to open the site to tourism. The work was stopped and the site saved by George Papathanassopoulos in 1970, who excavated various sectors from 1970 to 2006 and published preliminary reports but could not, alone, exploit the enormous quantity of finds. It was saved again, scientifically speaking, by Anastasia Papathanasiou who had studied the numerous human remains and had realized the urgent need to catalogue and georeference the finds, and to assemble a team of specialists to study them. Three years of renewed excavations and arduous work (2012–2014) allowed her to achieve these goals, to collect essential geoarchaeological and bioarchaeological samples and to extend the already known stratigraphy in the main trench of Chamber B. Several 14C dates on newly discovered human remains indicate that the cave was occupied not only during the Late and Final Neolithic, but already by the late Early Neolithic (ca. 6000 BC) and at the MN/LN transition (ca. 5500 BC).

The outcome of this collective effort, supported by the American co-editors and with the decisive help of the Wiener laboratory of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, is an impressive volume with many up-to-date contributions that address taphonomic, environmental, technological, economic and ritual aspects.

To get rid immediately of the few criticisms, one regrets the lack of consistency in the denomination of the various parts of the cave, in the chronological framework and, especially for the pottery, the scarcity of photographic illustrations. The lack of consistency, which also applies to the pottery classification, is clearly related to the freedom given to each contributor, who could organize their contribution at will. Each of them was nevertheless encouraged to study the spatial patterning of the finds and interpret the meaning of their data in the context of the cave's potential status. The long discussions about cave uses in the Neolithic are sometimes repetitive but always well informed. The interpretations of Alepotrypa Cave itself vary substantially according to the nature of the material studied, and probably also to the sensibility of the author. Nevertheless one observation remains constant throughout the volume: the opposition in the nature or quality of the finds between the front chambers, in particular Chambers A and B, and the back chambers, Chamber Z and Chamber L (see Chapters 1, 2 and 23 by A. Papathanasiou).

This contrast is already perceptible in Alepotrypa's most exceptional feature, i.e. the very large amount

of human remains (more than 3,500 human bones): the primary burials concentrate in Chamber B, the two ossuaries are located in Chamber A and D, while Chamber Z and L contain almost exclusively scattered isolated bones. Anastasia Papathanasiou had already published extensively on the human remains from Alepotrypa, and she chose to give here only a summary, somehow frustratingly brief given the importance and interest of her analyses (Chapter 13). Among the bone scatters, ossuaries, single or multiple burials, more than 160 individuals are represented (the updated NMI is not specified), making it by far the largest human osteological assemblage in Neolithic Greece. Part at least of this past population was genetically related, as indicated by the high overall prevalence of metopism and its unusually high ratio of 31% in Ossuary II. Although there was a low degree of stress during childhood and good sanitary conditions, as shown by the dentition, many individuals suffered from nutritional anaemia, possibly linked to a low consumption of meat. Primary burials are the exception rather than the norm: six individuals, including children, were buried in single graves, another seven in a multiple burial. Secondary burials are more numerous: 16 individuals in Ossuary I, 19 in Ossuary II. Finally, more than a hundred individuals are represented by scattered bones. In all cases, however, 'disarticulation, commingling, and moving the skeletal elements are the most prevalent characteristic of the sample' (p. 265). The analysis of the distribution of skeletal parts demonstrates that the disarticulated burials do not correspond to individuals originally buried in the cave: cranial and long bones predominate in the overall assemblage, while the small bones (hands, feet, ribs, vertebrae) are clearly under-represented. Long bones and skulls were thus selected to be transported and deposited in the cave. This pattern remains stable through time, as does the location of the ossuaries, used from the EN to the FN. Like Katsarou (Chapter 5), Papathanasiou views the secondary burials as an attempt to create ancestral authority and control of key resources, while reinforcing ties within the community. This presupposes that the community using the cave was local. The analysis of strontium isotopes by Julia I. Giblin (Chapter 15) provides somewhat ambiguous results on this question: most samples analysed are compatible with a local origin, but the signature, in terms of ratio $^{87}\text{Sr}/^{86}\text{Sr}$ is similar over vast areas of the southern Aegean, thereby potentially masking mobility patterns. A minority of the samples, from both humans and animals, show values comparable to the Vardar zone (Chios), while some are higher than any known sample elsewhere. Noteworthy is

the fact that the latter, dating to the FN, have also the most evidence for osteological disease. Contrary to several other authors, Giblin thus considers it possible that the site was visited by farmers from all over the Aegean.

The contrast between the anterior and interior parts of the cave is also clearly identified in the stratigraphy and sediments (Chapter 3). In the stratigraphic trench B1 (Chamber B), Panagiotis Karkanas distinguishes 15 layers with alternating constructed surfaces, mixed anthropogenic deposits, stony layers and hearths. They are mostly interpreted as the result of domestic activities and potentially small-scale stabling of stock (layer 8). Clay-lined pits were found in this trench and nearby in Chamber B. Further inside, in Chamber D, a thick burnt layer of dung covers human remains, and is topped by a sequence of hearths built on clay floors, with two enigmatic red clay bowl-like features. Finally, Chamber Z was filled with massive quantities of black, crudely stratified sediment interpreted as burnt dung deposits from sheep and or goats, interstratified with wood charcoal layers and corresponding to smouldering fires. These deposits are associated with human remains and a massive amount of broken fine pottery, in a Chamber of difficult access and too far inside the cave to consider the possibility of stabling.

The interpretation of the black sediment as burnt dung is confirmed by Georgia Tsartsidou, who succeeded in collecting a good sample of phytoliths from the different periods of occupation and sectors of the cave (Chapter 18). The samples from Chamber Z again stand out by the high organic content and by the presence of burnt faecal spherulites, which confirm the use of dung as fuel. Composted dung is very light, and would thus have been preferred to wood as fuel since access to Chamber Z was difficult. This does not explain, however, the 'greasy' appearance of this sediment, nor the enormous quantities that were carried to this remote and uninhabited part of the cave. Phytoliths are especially numerous in this black sediment. The range of species represented, which consist only of wild plants, indicates a free range diet for these sheep and goats. On top of the thick layer of black sediment, small hearths of pure white ash were fuelled with leafy wood and grasses, possibly for cooking or small-scale food processing. In the anterior part of the cave, on the contrary, the high carbonate content of ash in Chamber B indicates the predominant use of wood as fuel. Phytoliths were particularly rare in the clay constructions of Chamber B, although ash appear to have been used in their construction. Tsartsidou finds evidence for a more 'domestic' use of the cave, but on a modest scale: for

instance, the sparse cereal phytoliths precludes their storage on a large scale. She underlines the difference in the construction of the hearths between the 'domestic' sectors of the caves and the sectors where ritual activities are demonstrated.

Her findings are largely corroborated by Maria Ntinou's analyses of the wood charcoals (Chapter 19), who also underlines sharp contrasts between the different sectors of the cave. Most species represented in the charcoal assemblage are characteristic of the Mani lowlands and mid-altitude areas, while the black pine and the fir could only grow on Taygetos mountain. Ntinou suggests that these conifers were especially sought to be used as torches in the inner part of the cave, where these species were exclusively recovered. Otherwise, scrub vegetation was used for firewood in habitation and ritualistic contexts. Several *Prunus* species, juniper and *Maloideae*, all local, were mostly used in the anterior parts of the cave, but *Cistus* was only found in the interior chambers. While small calibre wood was used in these inner parts, some of the charcoals in Chamber Z correspond to very small twigs, which may have been used as fodder for the animals and naturally incorporated into the dung. Ntinou notes diachronic changes in the proportion of the different taxa. She suggests that visits to the cave were few and of short duration during the EN/MN, making it possible to use exclusively the immediately local vegetation. With a higher frequency and intensity of visits during the LN/FN, the increased demand for fuel would have necessitated the systematic exploitation of the open woodlands. She also insists on the fact that olive, now an indicator of the thermo-mediterranean zone is conspicuously absent, except in the topmost FN deposits.

The studies devoted to the very rich pottery assemblages also confirm the opposition between the front and the back of the cave. Barbara Kastipanou-Margeli was entrusted with the pottery from the stratigraphic trench B1 (Chapter 4). She describes the stratigraphy and burials in details, but had to rely on the original stratigraphic scheme into 9 strata, rather than the updated scheme provided by Karkanas. This may be problematic since the original stratigraphy appears to cross-cut the more recent. Unlike many other authors, she also adopts Sampson's chronological framework, with an LNII instead of a FN. The pottery itself is first described by wares according to Phelps's classification, with details on the fabric, the shapes and decoration, followed by a discussion of the dating. The characteristic profiles, handles and decoration are precisely drawn and plotted against depth in the trench. Despite the precision of the recording

and the possibility to define the stratigraphic distribution of each ware, the final diachronic synthesis reveals several discrepancies between the accepted dating of the wares and the 14C dates from the trench (in particular for the Urfirnis, the Grey Burnished, Matt Painted, Rippled Wares), which all seem to appear earlier at Alepotrypa than elsewhere. Although Kastipanou-Margeli suggests that the pottery chronological framework usually accepted may have to be revised, she also explains that the excavations were carried out horizontally on layers which presented a double slope. This, added to the stratigraphic problem mentioned above, leads one to think that Alepotrypa should perhaps be used more to define the stylistic range of these classical types rather than their chronological distribution...

Large sherds of LN and mostly FN pithoi were also found predominantly in Chamber B. They are presented briefly by George Valvis (Chapter 7). The importance of the storage capacities they represent leads Valvis to evoke a 'considerable number of people or groups of people involved in the activities inside the cave' (p. 161). Unfortunately, no precision is provided for the actual number of pithoi, nor on potential remains of the goods in store.

A very different approach to pottery is exemplified in Stella Katsarou's study of the pottery from Ossuaries I and II (Chapter 5), respectively in Chamber A and D (or so I presume, since it is somewhat difficult to relate the different systems of location used in this volume). Katsarou gives much more weight to the fabric, techniques and shapes, leaving decoration as a secondary criterion. Comparisons with Kastipanou-Margeli's typology are thus difficult to establish, all the more so since the pottery from Ossuary I is not illustrated. However, Katsarou states clearly that her aim was not to describe or classify the pottery in detail, but rather to understand its meaning for the living who deposited the sherds in the ossuaries and its relation to the commingled dead. It is impossible to summarize her long and well-informed discussion, where she draws parallels between the deliberate fragmentation of pottery, selection of 'orphan sherds', and the dismembering of human bodies and selection of specific bones to be deposited in the ossuaries. She insists on the overlapping of the domains of the living and the dead as 'an essential and intrinsic element of the Neolithic story' (p. 118). In conclusion, she considers the two ossuaries, despite slight differences, not as true cemeteries, but as monuments where social synergy and memory were regularly re-enacted by a community that ritually reinforced its claims of territorial ownership.

Katherina Psimogiannou, presenting the pottery from Chamber Z (Chapter 135), is interested in similar questions but the very peculiar character of her material allows for more straightforward answers. Chamber Z in general, and the three niches that were excavated in particular, are characterised by a massive accumulation of burnt dung, an enormous quantity of vessels, mostly decorated, and the presence of scattered human bones as well animal bones, obsidian, ornaments, etc. According to a radiocarbon date of ca 6,000 BC on burnt dung, the use of Chamber Z started as early as the anterior part of the cave, but only a few EN sherds were recovered. It was also used during the late MN/ early LN, but more intensely during the LN and FN. Mixed with the burnt dung, in niches too low to stand up in and eventually almost filled up, the remains of over 400 LN Matt-painted vessels, 57 Polychrome and many FN coarse Red-Slipped wares were uncovered. Besides the sheer quantity of pots in this remote part of the cave, several points are noteworthy: in almost all periods, closed shapes, in particular collared jars, overwhelmingly predominate, when open shapes of the same wares predominate in Chamber B. Second, most of the painted wares come from Chamber Z. Third, the stratigraphy within each niche reveals that sherds and parts of vessels were packed down continuously, in chronological order. Fourth, the sherds are in good condition (contrary to those from Chamber B and from the ossuaries) and show a marked stylistic variability, although most appear to have been locally made (Pentedeka, *infra*). Finally, many sherds join, but the sherds from a single vessel had been distributed in various sectors Chamber Z. Thus, Chamber Z supports very clearly the model of deliberate fragmentation, dispersion and structured deposition suggested by Katsarou. The cave, and Chamber Z in particular, would thus be a place for intermittent social gatherings and the performing of rituals that included the 'killing' of pottery, possibly after it had been used to collect water in the lake.

The last contribution pertaining to the pottery assemblages is petrographic. Areti Pentedeka analysed 68 LN and FN sherds from various wares, mostly from Chambers B and Z, as well as two clay samples from the cave itself (Chapter 8). After petrographic analyses and re-firing tests, she distinguishes seven fabric groups and two loners. Six of these groups as well as one loner are compatible with local sources, and represent altogether more than 90% of the sherds analysed. Group 1 corresponds to a 'recipe' that was used from the EN to the FN. It includes wares of all types and remains strikingly homogenous through time. Most other petrographic groups appear time and ware specific.

One Grey-Burnished fruitstand is the only definite import, but importation of Black-Burnished wares is also alluded to. The small number of petrographic groups thus contrasts with the stylistic variability we mentioned above, but the sample is small and should be enlarged before definite conclusions can be reached. A similar continuity through time is noticeable in the construction and firing techniques, although the study of more of the earlier material may well alter this picture.

In contrast with the ceramic assemblages, all the tool assemblages can be considered surprisingly small, given the time span and extension of the excavations. All also correspond exactly to the equivalent material found in nearby open-air settlements. The bone and antler artefacts are conspicuously scarce ($n = 116$), as underlined by Georgia Stratouli (Chapter 12). The range of types is limited, with pointed tools predominating, followed by needles and edged implements. All fit perfectly a domestic toolkit of the LN and FN periods, and most were used. Their distribution in the cave is not specified.

The flaked stone assemblage comprises 868 artefacts studied by G. Kourtesi-Philippakis (Chapter 9), but most came from disturbed or uncertain contexts. Establishing distinctions between the LN and FN chipped stones was therefore almost impossible. Some grey flints were locally knapped, while other flint implements, imported as finished blanks, were mostly utilised to cut plants. However, obsidian is overwhelmingly predominant (> 90%), in a proportion that would be expected at a Peloponnesian coastal site for the period. Danielle R. Riebe's preliminary analyses (Chapter 11) confirm that the obsidian is Melian, with a potential shift from the early LN through the FN, from an equal exploitation of Demenegaki and Sta Nichia sources to a predominant use of Sta Nichia. As usual also, the first and last steps of the *chaîne opératoire* are missing, and the blades were locally pressure flaked from already shaped or already exploited cores. The proportion of retouched tools is average for the period (ca 25%) and the types are classical. In other words, the flaked stone assemblage from Alepotrypa shows none of the outstanding pieces sometimes found in Late or Final Neolithic caves. This holds true for the small ensemble found in Chamber Z, which, as stated by Kourtesi-Philippakis, is totally comparable to that of Chamber B, although the tools are seemingly unused, although they were not analysed for wear traces.

Except on this last point, Anna Stroulia's thorough analysis of the 'macrolithics' (Chapter 10) leads

her to similar observations: the grinding tools, pounders, grooved tools, cutting tools, *a posteriori* tools, etc. would not depart from a purely domestic context and make up 'what could be broadly called a domestic toolkit' (p. 235). Here again, the assemblage is small (289 items). They are made from regional schist and metavolcanic rocks that can be found up to 25 km from Alepotrypa, and from rolled pebbles of limestone/marble that could be found locally. The selection of raw materials for specific categories of tools remains stable throughout the sequence, and, again, testifies to a marked continuity in traditions. All the tools were used, often reused and recycled, and many are broken. However, if the majority was found in the potentially domestic context of the anterior Chambers A and B, a quarter was found in non-utilitarian contexts, in particular in the Ossuaries I and II, with a few in Chambers Z and L. Instead of considering that the tools were first used in the front Chambers for domestic purposes, then deposited in non-utilitarian contexts, Stroulia doubts that any of the tools would have been used in this dark, very humid and cool cave. She boldly questions the use of the cave for storage and the possibility that any mundane activity ever took place in it. According to her hypothesis, the cave had a purely ceremonial use, and all the artefacts recovered, all the vegetal and animal foodstuff, constitute offerings, deposited in the cave and ceremonially sacrificed, as were the vessels in Chamber Z.

This conclusion is completely at odds with the interpretation of the macrofaunal assemblage offered by Angelos Hadjikoumis in a long, detailed and very complete chapter (Chapter 14) addressing taxonomic composition, herd management, biometry, pathology and butchering. The range of species is classical, with a predominance of domestic species, in particular sheep and goats, and a very low representation of wild animals. The taxonomic composition is fairly stable through time and between the different Chambers. An intriguing feature of the assemblage is the importance of neonatal (or possibly foetal) individuals among the sheep/ goat, pig and cattle remains. The presence of cut-marks shows we are not dealing with natural death. Together with the predominance of females, this suggests that sheep, goats and cattle were milked. This pattern differs from the pattern observed in open-air settlements, and would be linked to the characteristics of the cave. Indeed, Hadjikoumis considers the cave as a perfect place for the production, maturation and preservation of cheese. The ages at death and the presence of pigs also indicate some exploitation of meat, and entire carcasses would have been processed and consumed

at the site. He also suggests that the cave was appropriate to keep live animals (at least dogs and pigs), and considers it as permanent base for some herders, with seasonal congregation of more people when pastoral activities were most intense, during the spring and summer.

The microfauna, studied by Katerina Papayianni and Thomas Cucchi (Chapter 20), comprises mice, voles, toads, frogs, snakes and a few bird bones. Only two bones of bats were recovered, which would confirm continuous occupation of the cave during its use by prehistoric groups. None of the microfaunal species can shown to have been consumed by humans, and many are considered as post-depositional intrusions, or remains of predators' meals. The limited environmental conclusions that can be derived from these small samples, exclusively recovered in the last two campaigns, hint at a rocky, steppe environment.

Alepotrypa being a coastal site, the question of the exploitation of marine resources is obviously central, and Tatiana Theodoropoulou (Chapter 17) devotes a long and interesting discussion to the question of shellfish collection, fishing techniques and seasonality of exploitation. She studied both the invertebrate remains and fish bones, the latter probably under-represented due to the absence of water-sieving until the very last years of excavation. The invertebrates include a variety of edible species, mainly limpets and topshells, but also ornamental species such as dove-shells, cones, and tusk shells. There is no marked difference in the exploitation of marine molluscs between the Late and Final Neolithic. The fish bone assemblage is dominated by Scombrids – various kinds of tuna fish and mackerel – followed by groupers. Contrary to shellfish, the number of specimens and the spectrum increase from the Late to the Final Neolithic. The fish were brought whole in the cave, but tuna were chopped-up and Theodoropoulou suggests that the caudal portions may have been stored in salt within the cave. The contrast between Chamber B and the back of the cave is confirmed by the distribution of the remains. The majority of the sea shells were found in Chamber B and very fragmented, whereas in Chamber Z they are mostly intact. The distribution of fish bones differs, with a majority from Chamber B, a good representation in Chamber Z, and almost none in Chamber D and L. Interestingly, most of the grouper remains were found in Chamber Z, and the single eel remain was found associated with the ossuary of Chamber D where she finds evidence suggesting the deposition of selected fillets of the best fish found in the cave. It should nevertheless

be noted that no effort was made to dispose of the fish remains, whose leftovers were found all over the cave, including the remote Chamber of the Lake.

The ornament assemblages mostly comprises a necklace of lozenge-shaped, biperforated spondylus beads found in Chamber Z, dove shells sawn at both extremities⁶ and tusk shells. Unfinished, failed specimens suggest that the shells were worked in the cave. Several spondylus annuli, intact and broken, were also recovered, as well as the spectacular spondylus hook and a few shell tools. Although Theodoropoulou concludes that 'marine animal resources seem to have played a central role in the everyday life and beliefs of the visitors to Alepotrypa', the number of fish remains, shellfish and ornamental species is very low compared to Franchthi for instance, in a similar setting. It is obviously difficult to estimate the bias introduced by recovery techniques, but the results of the isotopic analyses (see Chap. 13) do not show an important consumption of marine resources. Without denying their importance, it might be interesting to underline, on the contrary, that all coastal sites are not necessarily primarily oriented towards the exploitation of marine resource, and that, despite the very abundant human remains, personal ornaments are scarce.

According to the results of the isotopic analyses, terrestrial plants constituted the most important component of the diet. Nevertheless, the remains of plant food are not abundant. Eva Margaritis studied two small archaeobotanical samples, one, of FN date, from Trench B1A in Chamber B, the second from Chamber D in the centre of the cave, dated to the Late-Final Neolithic (Chapter 16). All the plant species recovered are well represented in all Greek Neolithic sites. In Chamber B, cereals predominate, barley being the most frequent. They are accompanied by pulses, a few nuts, fruits and wild/weedy species. By contrast in Chamber D, where the seeds are much better preserved, einkorn, free-threshing wheats, grass peas and cereal chaff are absent. In both cases, most of the processing would have taken place outside the cave. Given the low quantities, the variety of seeds, and the high humidity in the cave, Margaritis precludes long-term storage. The grain and chaff may have been lost and burnt after the plants were prepared for consumption, but Margaritis also considers the possibility of intentional charring, to preserve

⁶ Interestingly this pattern differs from Franchthi where only *Conus mediterraneus* was worked this way, while *Columbella rustica* was perforated (pers. obs.).

rather than to destroy the plant food that would have been ritually deposited. Here again, the notion of 'sacrifice' is put forward.

What can be concluded for such a wealth of information, sometimes congruent, sometimes less so? Anastasia's Papathanasiou provides an exemplary synthesis (Chapter 23), and there is not much to be added to her conclusions. Undoubtedly, distinct areas of the cave were used differently. It cannot be doubted that the ossuaries or the deposition and breakage of painted vases amid smouldering dung exemplify ritual activities. In addition, the term 'ritual' is here especially apt: a ritual is, by definition, an enactment that is repeated, and we have here evidence of continuity in practices from the end of the Early Neolithic to the Final Neolithic. Even the fact that Middle Neolithic occupation appears to have been restricted to the very end of the period, did not disrupt this continuity. Furthermore, the continuity of traditions does not only hold true for ritual acts, but also in large part for the manufacturing and use of pottery and tools.

The problem arises with the anterior parts of the Cave (Chambers A and B). These areas are characterized by clay floors, pits, storage jars, coarse pottery, abundant food remains and a wealth of artefacts of 'domestic' character. Several authors indeed consider this area as domestic, used either permanently or seasonally according to their evidence. At least for the LN and FN, all the faunal data, coupled with the absence of bats, do suggest year-round occupation. However, in line with several other authors, Papathanasiou does not consider this as sufficient to envision a permanent domestic occupation: the hearths indicate short-term episodes of use, the number of tools, whether made of stone or bone, is very low – and not only when compared with open-air sites, but also with a cave such as Franchthi. Similarly, the labour-intensive construction and maintenance of clay platforms would be better understood in the framework of a ritual occupation. I would add to this the fact that the cave was used already in the Early Neolithic, which is rare in Greece, and that it was immediately used as a formal burial ground. While it is true that burials are found within villages, mostly as infant burials, formal burial grounds in Central and Southern Greece are normally found besides the settlement, not a few metres away from the domestic quarters. Papathanasiou thus concludes in favour of a place for social gatherings and ritual performances, drawing on populations from the local and broader region. However, she also acknowledges a form of 'domestic' use of the

anterior part of the cave, in relation both with the maintenance and management of the site and with social gatherings. It is indeed necessary to postulate that people did live, eat and probably sleep in the cave, since no evidence for any Early, Middle or Late Neolithic occupation was found during the survey of the Diros bay. The systematic and intensive survey of the Diros Bay (Chapter 22, by Pullen, Galaty, Parkinson, Lee and Seifried) revealed two Final Neolithic sites, but no indication of an earlier occupation. One of the FN sites, Ksagounaki, is directly adjacent to the cave, the second one on the plateau west of the site, some 1,5 km away. Ksagounaki can be considered an open-air extension of the Alepotrypa Cave, during a period of florescence of its use.

Given the absence of local settlement before the FN, I do not think that all the artefacts, pottery and tools, can be considered ritually 'deposited' as were the human bodies and human bones. Some must also have been used. But, as stated by Papathanasiou, their use – and ultimate deposition – in a non-mundane context may transform the domestic/mundane item into a symbolic one. And I wish to cite Papathanasiou, since I could not have worded the conclusion better: 'The cave thus probably constitutes a lasting focal point in a ritual and social landscape, a mortuary monument for the locality or a broader area, exercised through a remarkably monumental program of worship and by repeated acts of deposition. The site most probably performs, in varying and complex ways, an important role in the Neolithic of southern Greece, as a place of congregation of different social groups, reaching the highest point sometime in the summer, where the memory of the past was revived and was invested with ritual and ancestral importance for the living, a place of remembrance and enchainment both across current space and through deep time' (p. 433). One nuance may be added, though: if Alepotrypa can be conceived of as a 'mortuary monument for the locality', and even more if it concerned a broader area, the number of individuals represented by primary burials, secondary burials or scattered bones, is much too small to correspond to the deceased of a community over some two millennia. The individuals that ultimately rested in Alepotrypa, and that were the object of continuous ritual actions of deposition, breakage, construction, transportation and burning, must have been highly selected. Both this selection of individuals, or of lineages as suggested by the metopism, and the unusual long-term emphasis on rituals possibly related to the dead lead me to favour the hypothesis of a regional or supra-regional (rather than local) recruitment. The pottery was undoubtedly locally

made, but does this imply it was made by the rather evanescent local people, who left no EN, MN or LN trace anywhere else in the Mani? If the pottery was intended to be used briefly, or to be immediately broken when deposited as obtains in Chamber Z, a rapid local manufacture by exogenous groups may make more sense than the transportation of large quantities of pots over long distances. If the potters came from different communities this would also explain the marked stylistic variability noted by K. Psimogiannou. To go back to Papathanasiou's quotation, I suspect that Alepotrypa 'played an important role in southern Greece', much more than a local role.

CATHERINE PERLÈS

UNIVERSITY PARIS NANTERRE, CNRS, UMR 7055
catherine.perles@cnrs.fr

- Bergsvik, K.A. and R. Skeates (eds) 2012. *Caves in Context: The Cultural Significance of Caves and Rockshelters in Europe*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Demoule, J.-P. and C. Perlès 1993. The Greek Neolithic: a new review. *Journal of World Prehistory* 7(4): 335–415.
- Mavridis, F. and J. Tae Jensen (eds) 2013. *Stable Places and Changing Perceptions: Cave Archaeology in Greece* (British Archaeological reports International series 2558). Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Moyes, H. (ed.) 2012. *Sacred Darkness. A Global Perspective on the Ritual Use of Caves*, Boulder: University Press of Colorado.
- Renfrew, C. 1972. *The Emergence of Civilization: the Cyclades and the Aegean in the Third Millennium B.C.* London: Methuen.
- Tomkins, P. 2009. Domesticity by default. Ritual, ritualization and cave-use in the Neolithic Aegean. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 28(2): 125–153.

Søren Dietz, Fanis Mavridis, Žarko Tankosić and Turan Takaoğlu (eds). *Communities in transition. The circum-Aegean area during the 5th and 4th millennia BC*. pp.xxi+633,374 illustrations (many colour), including maps, also tables in many papers. (Monographs of the Danish Institute at Athens 20). 2018. Oxford and Philadelphia: Oxbow Books. ISBN 978–1–78570–720–9 hardback £70.

This is a massive book, deriving from a multi-paper conference held in Athens, and really there is too much material for a single hardback volume, which seems to have affected the quality of the binding (on the reviewer's copy the front cover split from the spine at the top quite quickly). The conference was intended to focus on the social changes that occurred during the development from Neolithic to Early Bronze Age in the later 5th and 4th millennia BC, the period widely defined as Final Neolithic in Aegean terminology, in the 'circum-Aegean area'. After an explanatory preface by the editors, an Introduction contains the editors' summary presentation of their view of the content and value of the papers, arranged first by significant themes, then by survey and site reports within the regions between which the papers have been distributed. The reviewer recommends reading this as a very useful guide to the mass of material, allowing the perception of shared features and the making of cross-connections that may not be immediately apparent. The papers are arranged in six sections, the first containing six papers that consider general, often wide-ranging themes; these begin with Renfrew's exposition of how his identification of a 'Final Neolithic' period in the Aegean, stretching from the later fifth through most of the fourth millennium, led to the recognition that it could be related to comparable periods in the sequences of neighbouring regions. A further 51 papers are set out in five geographically arranged sections: the Balkans (principally Bulgaria); northern Greece, meaning the mainland and including Thessaly; west, central and southern Greece, again meaning subdivisions of the mainland; the Aegean islands, Crete, and Cyprus; and western Anatolia (which includes papers relating to Lycia and Phrygia).

The considerable length of the period under discussion makes the reviewer uneasy about the use of the term 'transition' to define this. One would normally expect this to characterise a relatively short episode, and where sites are occupied for long periods, to detect several transitions between phases

that can each have their own character. Similarly, the use of the term 'final', as in Final Neolithic in the Aegean sequence cannot avoid giving the impression of a kind of coda, a finishing off. Using the terms Late Neolithic II or Chalcolithic avoids these overtones. Coleman in fact suggests both Chalcolithic and Transitional in a new arrangement supported by a massive array of radiocarbon dates (p. 33). 'Transitional' still occupies some 400 years, but it could well be a good idea to subdivide this massive period in some way, recognising the point made by Renfrew and Mina, that the contrast that used to be made between Neolithic and Early Bronze Age is no longer so impressive, now that technological and social developments that once used to be thought new in the Early Bronze Age can now be paralleled at various later Neolithic sites.

This point is underlined by the relatively recent discovery of the extraordinary site of Strofilas on Andros, which the reviewer considers one of the most exciting and significant finds in Aegean archaeology in recent times (and which provides cover art for the volume). As Televantou's account indicates, this has many characteristics of a town, with a fortification, major buildings, and an elaborate culture that includes much use of rock-carvings, placed at significant points; links between its material and that of the earliest Cycladic Bronze Age material are evident, but it belongs essentially in the fourth millennium. For all the abundant material, however, its origins and the reasons for its abandonment remain enigmatic, serving as a salutary reminder of how much we still do not know.

Few of the papers are concerned with more than a single site or region or class of material, and a glance at the map on p. xii of sites that play a role in the discussion reveals how uneven the coverage actually is. The overall impression is of thin scatters over very broad regions, interspersed with a few tighter groups, and even this has a potential to mislead, for many of the sites shown were only occupied or otherwise in use for part of the period, and their evidence has to be combined to get any kind of impression of regional development. But the sites are still too few and too unevenly distributed for one to feel confident that they can give an adequate picture of a whole large region in Greece like the Peloponnese or Thessaly, let alone much larger sections of the Balkans or Anatolia. Of course, this reflects typical general features of the period, the abandonment of well-known and long-occupied sites and the difficulty of identifying evidence of subsequent occupation; but the example of Strofilas is a reminder of how much we owe, still, to lucky discoveries, how impossible it is to search

literally everywhere, and how much may have been lost through the effects of natural processes and later human land-use. It is worth remembering, in the Aegean context, how extraordinarily little evidence we have for the disposal of the dead for all the millennia of Neolithic occupation, and it is remarkable how many of the sites in southern mainland Greece are caves. Few of these are clearly habitation sites, but their use for various social purposes implies the existence of untraced populations settled nearby.

Nevertheless, some papers attempt to explain the disappearance of settlements in terms of the movement of human population, either to other regions (Georgieva) or from the plains to the hills (Aslanis). Coleman also invokes population movement to explain the introduction to the Aegean of the language ancestral to Greek, brought by a population originating from the Pontic-Caspian steppe, which he would place in the fourth millennium. But his arguments seem to rely more on the appearance of striking items and motifs, at least some of which could be explained in terms of interregional contacts, than of new and consistent assemblages of features. He relates various innovations to the supposed newcomers, including horse-riding, to the reviewer's surprise (it is news to the reviewer that there is any osteological evidence for horses in Greece before the Middle Bronze Age), but, as so often with such theories, he does not give attention to the question of motivation. Why should population groups whose economy was developed in the steppes, even if it changed somewhat on a passage through Bulgaria, see any advantage in moving into mainland Greece south of Macedonia, let alone the Aegean islands, and how easily could they adapt their way of life to the new environment? Populations can hardly adopt new patterns in something as basic as their means of subsistence simply by an effort of will. The reviewer has more sympathy with Renfrew's wish for greater concern with demographic processes than 'invasionary episodes' (p. 9) and notes his comments on the possibility of getting reliable data on climate change (p. 8), which suggests that he is not convinced by current arguments.

The reviewer has to admit that he is not very well informed on the arguments for climate change, nor familiar enough with the archaeological evidence for the period, even from the Aegean, let alone the Balkans or Anatolia, to be able to give a more critical analysis of the arguments presented. His general impression is that most papers will be of value principally to specialists concerned with the particular region or cultural grouping to

which the sites belong. But relatively few papers are concerned with interconnections or take wide views; most are concerned with internal processes rather than external links. Some deal with special types of artefact whose distribution spans a wide geographical range of cultural contexts, but the underlying picture of likely cross-cultural contacts is not as much discussed as one might hope. One cannot help wondering whether the discussions that followed the papers might have been illuminating sometimes. It would be interesting to know how Anatolian archaeologists took to Georgieva's suggestion that a migrant population from Bulgaria stimulated further development in Anatolian metallurgy (p. 103), for instance, or what reaction there was to Aslanis's hypothesis that the major farming settlements of mainland Greece were abandoned because of climate change, their populations moved into the hills, and 'the economy switched over to pastoralism' (pp. 28–9).

Almost all papers give detailed and readily intelligible accounts of their material and are illustrated with useful selections of photos and drawings, not only of pottery but of metalwork, figurines and other notable finds. The general papers in the first section (Renfrew; Kotsakis; Parkinson, Ridge and Gyucha; Aslanis; Coleman and Facorellis; Mina) all deserve attention, despite critical comments above. Others that seem particularly informative and/or most likely to excite some general interest, apart from that on Strofilas already mentioned, concern: the Chalcolithic site at Varhari in the Rhodope Mountains of south Bulgaria, a single-period specialist production centre of scrapers, beads and figurines in many kinds of stone (Boyadzhiev and Boyadzhiev); the latest Chalcolithic phase at Tell Yunastite, a burnt settlement site further north in Bulgaria, in which house contents including many bodies were found on the floors (Matsanova and Mishina; this site produced a remarkable series of 'cult tables', discussed by Terzijska-Ignatova); relative and absolute chronology between the Aegean and the Black Sea in the fifth millennium, with particular attention to the widespread development of graphite-painted ware (Reingruber); the role of the Theopetra cave in western Thessaly (probably ritual) at the end of the Neolithic (Kyparissi-Apostolika); the evidence of transitions in Boeotia from the earlier Neolithic to the Early Bronze Age (Bintliff and Sarri); the different patterns of development in parts of the Peloponnese between Late Neolithic and Early Helladic I (Pullen); the Early Helladic I cemetery of rock-cut chamber tombs at Kalyvia in Elis (Rambach), a considerable extension of our knowledge of Early Helladic burial customs; settlement pattern and social organisation in Crete c. 3700–3000 BC (Nowicki); the tell site of Çukuriçi Höyük on the central West Anatolian coast,

which has remarkable evidence for long-distance connections and specialised craftwork in the fifth millennium and again in the Early Bronze Age (Horejs and Schwall); and two marble conical 'rhyta' (a type with a long history and very wide distribution in the area covered by the book) of a new 'transitional' form from Yeşiltepe, a site well inland in western Anatolia (Takaoğlu and Bamyacı). Also, Alram-Stern's paper concerning the material of Visviki Magoula, close to Dhimini in Thessaly, which includes an elaborate 'megaron'-like house plan but mainly pottery that covers the transition from the Arapi to the Dhimini phase (so rather earlier than the period of the book), should not go unmentioned, because it has some particularly fine drawings of elaborately painted pottery, a reminder of how sophisticated pottery of the Greek Neolithic could be.

The general impression given by this book is that the Aegean was not influenced strongly by neighbours to north and east in this period of transition, as it had been in earlier Neolithic phases – unless one accepts Coleman's hypothesis concerning the 'arrival of the Greeks', about which the reviewer feels very wary – still less that it exercised any appreciable influence in those directions. But the example of Strofilas, once again, should warn us that at any moment a new find may radically affect our ideas about this interesting period.

OLIVER DICKINSON
READER EMERITUS
DURHAM UNIVERSITY, UK
otpkdickinson@googlemail.com

R. Angus K. Smith, Mary K. Dabney, Evangelia Pappi, Sevasti Triantaphyllou and James C. Wright. *Ayia Sotira. A Mycenaean chamber tomb cemetery in the Nemea Valley, Greece. (Prehistoric Monographs 33). pp. xxviii+202, 54 pls.+139 b/w text figures, 62 tables. 2017. Philadelphia: INSTAP Academic Press. ISBN hardback 978–1–93143–490–1, ebook 978–1–62303–420–7 hardback \$80.00*

This volume publishes a group of 6 chamber tombs excavated at the south end of the Nemea valley, not much more than a kilometre to the north-west of the settlement of Tsoungiza, which itself lies a similar distance slightly to the north-west of the historical Sanctuary of Zeus, site of one of the four

regular festivals of Panhellenic athletic contests. Tsoungiza was a long-lived settlement, originally founded in the Early Bronze Age but abandoned for much of the Middle Bronze Age and only resettled in the phase in which the foundations of Mycenaean civilisation were being laid. It was never a very large or important settlement (at its largest it consisted of at least ten structures, probably not many more), yet not only these tombs but a single one at the site of Barnavos, very close to Tsoungiza on the west, are likely to have been used by some of its inhabitants in the 14th and 13th centuries BC (the tombs were all in use for much of the LH IIIA2-III B phases; one probably began earlier, one has material suggesting early LH IIIC activity). The idea that a dispersal of cemeteries might reflect dispersed land-holdings bears consideration, but it may also reflect familial relationships, for in the Ayia Sotira cemetery some graves seem to be deliberately placed at a distance from others.

Two of the Ayia Sotira tombs had been looted, also that at Barnavos, and a third had been carefully emptied of its burials and most of its goods, but there is no reason to suppose that these differed significantly from the others in the range of goods that they once contained. This range may be considered only a little more than basic; it consisted mainly of pottery, mostly decorated, also some groups of very ordinary beads, a few figurines and a single bronze item. The tombs themselves are not very distinguished or carefully shaped; most are roughly oval and quite small, with no dimension exceeding 4 m, but they all have separate stomia and substantial dromoi, often around 5½-7 m in length. Several but not all contained pits used for primary and secondary burials. These are hardly the tombs of anything like an 'elite', but they seem likely to represent the more prosperous members of the community at Tsoungiza.

Despite the unimpressive nature of the tombs and most of the finds (the pottery includes a few unusually fine pieces, one figured), this publication is very important because of the extreme care with which the tombs have been excavated, with particular attention to working out the sequence and nature of episodes of use, the recovery of human remains, and the taking of samples for several different forms of scientific analysis. The result has been that for several tombs it has been possible to offer a very plausible reconstruction of a complex pattern of opening and reopening for burial and various forms of ritual activity involving the remains of the dead. The evidence varies in details from tomb to tomb, suggesting that there was no established system of essential rites, rather

that each group of tomb users made their own decisions within a range of acceptable behaviours, which may well have been far more complex than has generally been imagined. In particular, the plausible argument that all burial remains were carefully taken from T. 3 for redeposition elsewhere, a practice not often suggested before, is a striking indication of how little we can actually be certain of in discussing Mycenaean funerary ritual. Such a practice might explain apparently 'empty' tombs like the Dendra 'cenotaph' (T. 2).

It has to be said that the effort put into collecting and analysing various kinds of natural remains, of archaeobotanical remains, wood charcoal, phytoliths, none of which were very well preserved by local soil conditions, and organic residues on pottery, is not matched by the results, which are mainly negative or inconclusive. But it is laudable that the effort was made, adding to what are still very restricted data bases. It is little surprise that the residues, well represented in closed vases, give signs of coming from plant-based oils and fatty materials, and that olive and other lowland coniferous and evergreen species dominate in the charcoal. It is of some interest that, at Ayia Sotira at least, there is no evidence of the lighting of fires for ritual or purificatory purposes in the chamber, as has been postulated in other cemeteries, also that there is no indication that the dead were laid on any kind of mat or that flowers or grasses were placed with them.

The study of the often rather fragmentary human remains by Sevasti Triantaphyllou underlines how important it is to have an osteological specialist on site, when graves have been multiply used and often disturbed by ancient or modern looting or more recent use of the land for agriculture or construction. As well as presenting a very clear account of the remains themselves, this study is a mine of up-to-date information and ideas about the material from other sites and its interpretation, especially on important points such as the underrepresentation of some groups, notably children. In fact, in the Ayia Sotira tombs whose material is best preserved, burials of adult males form a clear majority, although there is a fair number of adult females, often young, and a certain number of children; but overall burials are not as common as might be expected, maybe representing only one or two per generation. Calculation of the likely number of dead adults and children of both genders that the Tsoungiza community might have produced over the one and a half to two centuries during which the tombs were in use forces the conclusion that we do not know how and where the

majority of the community's dead were buried, or what the criteria were for choosing which persons to bury in chamber tombs.

In fact, the Ayia Sotira evidence ties in with much from other sites where human remains have been studied with some care. Often, relatively small numbers of burials have been identified in chamber tombs that had apparently long periods of use, and at large settlements, where dozens or even hundreds of such tombs have been found, there is a glaring discrepancy between even the most generous estimates of numbers of burials and the likely numbers of dead over the Mycenaean civilisation's most flourishing period. In sum, the Ayia Sotira evidence focuses attention on important questions: should we continue to refer to these tombs as 'family tombs', do we have a clear idea what proportion of the population used them, and can this proportion be classified as an 'elite'? Given the relative insignificance of Tsoungiza, the last question can surely be answered 'No', but this does not mean that the use of such tombs could not have begun as an elite practice. There is much to be said for the argument put forward by Wright and Dabney that at Tsoungiza the locally more prominent members of the community were assimilating themselves to Mycenaean 'norms' by adopting customs established at more important centres like Mycenae, from which the community was probably governed (it is reachable through the Tretos pass in three hours' walk).

Overall, this is a study which provides considerable food for thought. It demonstrates how much knowledge can be gained through really careful excavation, but this carries with it a warning on the substantial resources that need to be committed to excavating even such essentially unimpressive tombs.

OLIVER DICKINSON
READER EMERITUS
DURHAM UNIVERSITY, UK
otpkdickinson@googlemail.com

Frederick W. Cooper and Diane Fortenberry (eds). *The Minnesota Pylos Project 1990-98 (British Archaeological Reports International Series 2856)*. pp. 426, 293 plates and figures (43 colour), 47 tables, maps and graphs, 33 state plans. 2017. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports. ISBN 9-781-40731-534-8. £79.00.

This is a somewhat delayed but extremely welcome volume. It contains a detailed account of the discoveries made in the field and study seasons of the Minnesota Pylos Project. This began with the decision of the Greek Ephoreia of Messenia that a state plan was needed of the remains of the Mycenaean palace excavated by C.W. Blegen on the site often called Ano (surely correctly Epano) Englianos, here most often simply Englianos, identifiable as the legendary Pylos, seat of king Nestor, from the Linear B archive found there. Once work had begun, it quickly became apparent that many widely accepted beliefs about the architectural history of the site were wrong, and a full study of the surviving remains was instituted, including those in various soundings beneath the palace and exploratory trenches in adjacent areas. This did not involve any new excavation, but investigation was taken to the level that Blegen and his team had reached, and the original excavators' notebooks and preliminary reports were carefully studied. A by-product of this work was the rediscovery in the Northwest Area, in 1994, of 'Blegen's backfill', an enormous mass of material (some 2.5 million items!) that had been produced in excavation and cleaned but discarded during preliminary study. Even a hasty overview of this material required extensive work, but the results included, rather unexpectedly, a few fragments of Linear B tablets, along with masses of pottery and fresco scraps, and a certain number of small finds.

The basic result of all this work has been not only to give a more accurate account of the extant palace, generally dated to Late Helladic (hereafter LH) III B, but to show that the earlier Mycenaean phases on the site had considerably more importance than the brief references to them in Blegen and Rawson 1966 and Blegen *et al.* 1973 might suggest, for there is clear evidence for a series of earlier major buildings and other structures that may stretch back as far as the beginning of the Mycenaean period. The picture of post-Mycenaean occupation has also been much clarified, including remains not merely of ordinary settlement (and possibly industrial activity), datable to what used to be called the Dark Age,

but evidence for a sequence of small but obviously significant buildings in the Northwest Area, dating to the Archaic period.

The volume is well presented, with copious illustrations in plans and figures of the architectural evidence, including a set of aerial photographs, and containing a wealth of information that can be used to update received ideas of Pylos very significantly. Few typographical errors have been noticed, but one on p. 56 – ‘Middle Helladic IIIB’ where LH is surely meant – should be noted. The content is divided into two parts. The first is made up of studies written at rather different dates, because some were submitted for publication well before the eventual publication date and not all have been revised since their submission. They are also of rather varying significance. The first is a general survey of results by Cooper, which sets out very clearly the sequence of phases identified in each of the trenches or regions investigated, and provides a general commentary on the finds, including publication of the few Linear B tablet fragments found and some detailed remarks on the fresco material (including an interesting suggestion, that there were wall-paintings in many rooms of the palace, not just the main ceremonial rooms and passages, p. 85). The second is a study by Cooper of the evidence for drainage systems on the site; this combines the evidence of these with that of the remains of early architecture to reconstruct in outline the building complexes that they served. It sets out a sequence of two palaces, A (dated Middle Helladic, hereafter MH) and B (dated LH I-II), underneath the extant palace, differing in orientation from it and from each other. This may seem rather a lot to deduce from very scattered finds whose actual dating is uncertain (see further below on the terminology); but it seems clear that there were several phases of major earlier structures in various places on the Englianos plateau, under the extant palace.

Of particular importance among the other sections are those concerned with the Post-Bronze Age material, especially that of ‘Dark Age’ or Archaic date. Most considerable is that of Brenningmeyer, which covers the stratigraphy and architecture. This makes the important point that the ‘black earth layer’ found in various places above the palace remains does not reflect specifically ‘Geometric’ activity on the site, as Blegen thought, but is probably a result of geological processes (pp. 225-226). In the evidence for structures, much the most important is the stratigraphic sequence in the Northwest Area, from a circular structure of Late Geometric date, through an early Archaic three-room building that had successive roofs of Corinthian and Lakonian

tiles and apparently some terracotta decorative attachments, to a later Archaic building with a roof of more advanced Corinthian tiles, all reasonably interpreted as cult buildings, although there is no votive material, since it is hard to imagine what else they could be at this early date. This could fit very well with the growth of interest in the early historical period in ‘heroic’ cult, which might reflect some local memory of the great past; it would also suggest that Englianos was within the territory of one of the perioecic communities in Messenia, subject to Sparta but able to run its internal affairs and thus maintain a local cult.

Ross covers the most diagnostic post-Bronze Age pottery recovered from the ‘Blegen backfill’, particularly pieces assignable to ‘Dark Age’ and immediately subsequent phases, but also later Greek, Roman and medieval material. Assignment to ‘Dark Age’ phases is tricky in the absence of stratigraphy, and may well be questioned in some cases (the reviewer is particularly uneasy about the description of 1A04610 as decorated with compass-drawn semicircles). Also, the absolute dates suggested for the ‘Dark Age’ phases derive from those suggested by Coulson for the sequence of Dark Age phases at Nichoria and in Messenia generally, which are open to serious criticism as too high.¹ But it may be conceded that the material could represent an extended period of occupation from at least the ninth century BC into the Archaic period. Downey deals with some strange ceramic items that seem to be post-Bronze Age industrial waste, including what may be remains of bronze-casting moulds.

Otherwise, the most interesting section is Distler’s account of the search for the possible sources of the relatively vast quantities of poros limestone used in the building, with some consideration of how it might have been brought to the site, a facet of architecture not often explored. Brenningmeyer offers a study of movement and use patterns in the palace so generalised that it barely refers to the strong role that ceremonial activity is likely to have played; Nelson gives a clear summary of circulation patterns in his discussion of the LH IIIB palace (pp. 284-286). Hollond suggests that Courts 42 and 47, late additions to the palace, were enclosed gardens, an interesting idea but lacking really convincing evidence. Konstantinidi-Syvridi covers the relatively few small finds of metal and most other materials, which are of standard types, while Marquardt considers the 100+ items of chipped stone, which included sickle elements, blades and

¹ Cf. Dickinson 2006: 18, citing Snodgrass and Morgan.

projectile points but a large proportion of waste pieces from working a wide variety of stones and also obsidian.

The second part of the volume contains Michael Nelson's work on the architecture, covering building materials, methods and history, with considerable discussion of parallels at other mainland and also Cretan sites. The history section sets out the sequence of building styles that he has identified, which provides much of the evidence for the relation of widely separated structures and stretches of walling to each other. At its end, after three appendices on specialised matters and the bibliography, come the thirty-three state plans created during the course of the work. Some of the conclusions are really startling in their overturning of widely held beliefs. Nelson offers a completely new (and to the reviewer convincing) interpretation of the building method used for the extant palace, named 'pier-wall', into which ashlar walls from an earlier structure were incorporated in some important parts, but which did not itself make much use of stone or timber, but was rather based on 'piers' of rubble bound by a strong mud mortar and separated from each other by narrow vertical spaces filled with a mixture of mud and pebbles. He argues for a sequence of four successive styles of stone working used in monumental building, original cut ashlar, pseudo-ashlar, orthostate, and ashlar. The first is represented not by any structure but by some square-cut ashlar blocks (so not the classic shape, which tapered back from a rectangular face to allow perfect jointing at the front) that were reused in later walls, themselves dated no later than the beginning of the Mycenaean period. What is dated to early LH I includes the group of walls under Courtyard 63 that is often compared with the West Magazines at Knossos, a stretch of façade walling south of that, and an entrance from the Northwest Area (p. 354, fig. 4.1), while Building X and various scattered walls are dated to a LH I-II phase (p. 355, fig. 4.2). Something more like a coherent plan appears in LH IIIA, focusing on a Minoan-style central court with separate blocks flanking its long sides, faced in ashlar style, that later formed much of the Southwestern Building and eastern parts of the Main Building (p. 358, fig. 4.4). In considering structures elsewhere on the site, Nelson accepts the early date for the Northeast Gateway, but casts doubt on some of the evidence used by Blegen to argue for an early circuit wall, and points out that the 'Aqueduct' is misnamed, since its function was to remove water from the palace area, not bring it in. Nelson's account seems generally authoritative not merely on Pylos but on Mycenaean architecture in general, but two questionable comments should be

noted: p. 350, it is very unlikely that the Tomb of the Genii and the Treasury of Atreus at Mycenae date as late as LH IIIB; p. 353, the date of MH traditionally given to Malthi has long been questioned and has been reportedly disproved by a recent survey.

There are significant differences in the approaches of Cooper and Nelson to distinguishing a sequence of palaces, essentially because their concerns are varied: Cooper concentrates on the drainage systems, Nelson on the sequence of building styles. Neither is able to call on any pottery evidence for dating, apart from what was found in exploratory soundings in the original excavations and of which some photographs, variable in quality, are all that are published in Blegen *et al.* 1973. Often enough, as in the case of the pottery found with the very substantial walls attributed to MH (p. 35) at the north-west edge of the site, nothing was published at all. This is symptomatic of Blegen's surprising lack of interest in the early phases of significant building on the site, and also an example of his effective refusal throughout his career to distinguish phases within MH, although some 300 years were allocated to the period in his day. At one point, Cooper defines Palace A as 'late MH' (p. 139), but otherwise he and Nelson follow Blegen's lead in this and in making no further distinctions than between LH I, LH II, LH IIIA and LH IIIB.

As Cooper comments (p. 49) there is little reference to chronologically datable material in the excavators' notebooks; he publishes in Table 1.1 (pp. 50-51) the notations made by Kittredge in his excavation in the Northwest Area, which include references to particular pieces or types, but this only adds a little information, which has to be qualified in any case. For in their adherence to Blegen's terminology Cooper and Nelson have to ignore the much more sophisticated sequence of Mycenaean pottery that has been built up since the publication of Furumark² and means that Blegen's few comments on the pottery from earlier layers need reconsideration. Much of what he called LH I would now be classified as LH IIA, for instance, and it has been recognised that what is MH in style can still be early Mycenaean in date, contemporary with decorated pottery that can be classified as LH I and II. Thus, many of the walls and strata considered MH originally and presented as such here may in fact be early Mycenaean.

This creates difficulties in trying to make close comparisons between the early phases of monumental building at Pylos and those at

² Furumark 1941.

other Mycenaean centres, especially in the south Peloponnese where the number of sites with comparable evidence has been increased by the discoveries at Ayios Vasileios in Laconia and Iklaina near Pylos itself. But this need not obscure the main point, that there is striking evidence at Pylos for early monumental buildings and for quite substantial Cretan influence, to be seen in the use of the various styles of stone masonry, the construction of drainage systems on a scale unparalleled at other Mycenaean centres, and architectural features like the use of pillared halls; fragments of a ‘horns of consecration’ have even been found, that must have surmounted an early structure (pp. 36, 38). If the palace immediately preceding the extant one really did have a plan centring on a court and can be dated to LH IIIA (probably early³), this would be a notably late example of Cretan influence, which might be connected with the influence that brought Linear B to Messenia no later than early LH IIIA2.⁴

To sum up, this volume is to be thoroughly welcomed for its major contribution to our information and ideas about Pylos. It provides a salutary reminder that the development of Mycenaean civilisation was a complex process, which did not involve the simple extension of influence and spreading of a package of material features and way of life from the Argolid to other regions of the mainland, but rather a series of independent if related developments in different leading regions of the Greek mainland, under a variety of external influences, that in time coalesced into something closer to a homogeneous culture.⁵

OLIVER DICKINSON
 READER EMERITUS
 DURHAM UNIVERSITY, UK
 otpkdickinson@googlemail.com

- Blegen, C.W. and Rawson, M. 1966. *The Palace of Nestor at Pylos in Western Messenia Vol. I*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Blegen, C.W., Rawson, M., Taylour, Lord William, and Donovan, W.P. 1973. *The Palace of Nestor at Pylos in Western Messenia Vol. III*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Cosmopoulos, M.B. 2019. State formation in Greece: Iklaina and the unification of Mycenaean Pylos. *American Journal of Archaeology* 123:3: 349-380.

³ Characteristic LH IIIA2 late is hard to spot in the photographs of material thought to be LH IIIA in Blegen *et al.* 1973.

⁴ Cosmopoulos 2019: 358.

⁵ The reviewer feels bound to mention the very serious criticisms of various interpretations in this book, notably the supposed Archaic building sequence, made in the reviews by J. Davis (*Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2017.10.23) and J. Hruby (*American Journal of Archaeology* 122: 2 [2018]), of which he was ignorant when writing this review.

Dickinson, O. 2006. *The Aegean from Bronze Age to Iron Age. Continuity and Change Between the Twelfth and Eighth Centuries BC*. Routledge: Abingdon and New York.

Furumark, A. 1941 (reprinted 1972). *Mycenaean Pottery. Analysis and Classification*. Stockholm: Skrifta utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen.

Susan Sherratt and John Bennet (eds). *Archaeology and the Homeric Epic*. (Sheffield Studies in Aegean Archaeology 11). pp. 176, b/w illustrations. 2017. Oxbow Books: Oxford and Philadelphia. ISBN 978-1-78570-295-2 paperback £36.00

The title, *Archaeology and the Homeric Epics*, does not do justice to the variety of papers published in this edited volume, that cover much more than the relation between the Homeric epics and archaeology. In the introduction, the editors (Susan Sherratt and John Bennett) highlight the need to move ‘beyond the old dichotomies between historicity and irrelevance and to bring a multi-disciplinary approach’ to the study of the epics (introduction, p. viii). Indeed, the introductory chapter summarises the diversity of such approaches and argues that the relationship of the epics and archaeology is intermingled without any of them having ‘the monopoly of power to shed light on the other’ (introduction, p. xv). The introductory chapter offers a valuable review of current debates and approaches to the study of epic poetry, as well as a summary of the contributions in the volume.

The debate of dating the epics has been the focus of past and current scholarship. The more recent consensus is that a date in the seventh century BC is more acceptable than that of the eighth. Antony Snodgrass in Chapter 1 follows the evolutionary model, as argued by Nagy,¹ for the creation and recreation of the epics during a long period. Snodgrass summarises the main debates considering the date of the Homeric epics, and revisits some of the themes of his comprehensive survey, *Homer and the Artists*, published in 1998.² However, one of the main arguments, as in his earlier work, is that there are no chronological correlates between the poems and the archaeological record. To give an example, Snodgrass returns to the endeavour to

¹ Nagy 1995.

² Snodgrass 1998.

match scenes in early Greek art with episodes in the epics. One such scene, the blinding of Polyphemos, clearly suggests that what is depicted on the vases depended on the circulation of other versions of the epics, illustrating most probably accounts available in the mid-seventh century BC and not the ones in the *Odyssey*. This is of course indeed possible, that the painters were using their own resources and 'artistic freedom' in depicting such scenes.

In Chapter 2, Oliver Dickinson argues fiercely that the epics are purely a poetic creation of what the eighth century Greeks thought about their past. He examines several different aspects of the archaeological record of the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages to argue that archaeology cannot support any realistic presentation of a society or Age based on the references in the epics. He gives detailed accounts, among others, of burials practices, weapons, armours, dress ornaments, architecture and religion to support his arguments. Dickinson maintains that the poems mirror both the Bronze and the Iron Age and further argues that they did not derive from any historical events. This is particular the case for the historicity of the Trojan War, especially after the recent archaeological discoveries at the site by the late Manfred Korfmann.

It is indeed the interpretation of Troy by Korfmann that is the focus of the study by Johannes Haubold (chapter 3). Korfmann is considered together with the earlier legendary excavator, Heinrich Schliemann. Haubold believes that archaeology alone cannot contribute in answering all the questions that have been raised from the more recent excavations in Troy. Indeed Korfmann's theories about Troy or better about Wilusa, the Hittite principality, reflect the cultural and political climate of post-unification Germany. Moreover, the author claims that the 'exploitation' of Homeric Troy goes as far back as during the first unification of the country in 1871, which coincided with the period when Schliemann's excavations played a complex role in shaping German identity. Furthermore, Haubold finds that apart from their great differences, both German excavators share the definition of Homeric archaeology as a discipline whose main concern is to unearth 'reality'. To support such a claim Haubold examines publications addressed to the broader public, in which both excavators communicated what they wished the public to believe about the historicity of Troy. Starting with Schliemann's *Ilios*,³ it becomes clear that it was not only untrue that one of his dreams, as a child, was to excavate the site, but instead what the text actually reveals, is

his attempt to construct the myth of the 'bourgeois hero'. His 'reality' reflects a bourgeois desire that was accomplished; in the end, Schliemann achieved his goal and excavated Troy, despite the fact that he was deprived of a classical education and caricatured by the academic establishment. Korfmann, on the other hand, was a professional academic with many credentials. It is in his contribution for the catalogue of the exhibition, *Troia - Traum und Wirklichkeit*⁴ that he claims that only his own excavations revealed the 'real' Troy and thus he could guarantee the historical reality of the site. He adds that it is only he and his teams of archaeologists that can reveal the 'real' story, which is that of a city at the junction between Europe and Asia, a desirable node for commerce. His 'reality' aimed to make his German audience rethink the identity of a newly united nation. Korfmann's critics, however, saw his efforts with a more cynical eye: adding another dimension of 'dream and fantasy' for the purposes of funding his excavations and research. Haubold offers some interesting readings of the public work of the two excavators of Hisarlik and make us aware of how archaeological 'realities' can become a 'battleground' between disciplines, but also how they could reflect the aspirations of their historical context.

What we should not forget, however, is, as Dickinson notes, that Korfmann did discover an extended Lower Town in Troy that does change past 'realities' about the site, despite the hidden agendas that he and others have disseminated in their writings. Korfmann's discoveries are still waiting to be further digested and explored by archaeologists and specialists in order to interpret this major Hittite site and its significance for the region within its historical context.

In Chapter 4, Susan Sherratt looks at the Homeric epic and the contexts of bardic creation. She explores the role that *aioidoi* had in the epics and in particular the two renowned ones in the *Odyssey*, *Phemios* and *Demodokos*. Both were professionals bards and attached to the households of their masters. Interestingly, however, their sung tales give different perceptions of their role as bards. *Phemios's* tales were about the return of the Greek heroes from Troy and were meant to please his new patrons in Ithaca, Penelope's suitors, while *Demodokos* sings his tales 'correctly', which his audience including Odysseus recognise as 'true' tales. Next Sherratt attempts to show how the archaeological record also reflects different perceptions to those observed in the performances

³ Schliemann 1880; 1881.

⁴ Korfmann 2001.

of the two bards. She suggests that the prehistory of the bardic activity was complex and points out that some periods in the epics appear to cluster in certain chronological epochs. So, there were periods with a closer reference to contemporary material culture and others projecting lifestyles or the commonly agreed past of a community. She also offers a very useful survey of archaeological images of bards and their musical instruments, which are surprisingly few. A thorough examination of the interchangeable appearance of the *kitharis* and the *phrominx* in the ancient sources provides good references for their use and concludes that the *phrominx* might have been a more ancient instrument, even if we still lack representations of the instruments in art or actual remains of them. On the other hand, we do have an ivory lyre from the Mycenaean tholos tomb at Menidhi in Attica that might belong to the earliest burial of the tomb. The burial was given an elite funeral suggesting that playing the instrument could have been considered just as noble as that of being an accomplished warrior. Sherratt reminds us that Achilles was singing the *klea andron* as also Poulydamas, a nobleman of Troy. After the demise of the palatial administration, a fragmentary scene comes from a twelfth century vase found in Tiryns and depicts a figure holding a lyre with only three strings, that may suggest that the instrument accompanied sung hexameter verses, perhaps to celebrate some of the military events that decorate the ceramics of the period. A century later and from Cyprus comes another depiction of a lyre player, depicted inside a kalathos. What is interesting about this particular *oidos* is that he is also equipped with weapons. From eleventh century Cyprus we move to eighth century Athens from where we have images of lyre players involved in ceremonies associated with the veneration of ancestors. Mazarakis Ainian also explores such occasions in his chapter. Sherratt ends with the reminder that the scenes of bards in the epic represent the two modes of creation and transmission of heroic and pre-epic songs, which could have been authoritative over a period and which eventually contributed to the creation and maintenance of a long oral tradition. It is perhaps because of the alternate modes of active generation and more passive maintenance periods that we could also explain the various chronological patterns of the material cultural found in the Homeric epics. She ends by stating that the crystallisation of the epics around 700 BC was consciously designed to boost a notion of collective Greek identity and that the epics needed both Phimios and Demodokos to remind them how history can be manipulated especially in times of crisis. This stimulating paper offers several important aspects in the study of archaeology and

the epics and supplements Sherratt's outstanding earlier work on the subject.

Jack Davis and Kathleen Lynch scrutinize the evidence of a hypothetical cult founded in the ruins of the Palace of Nestor in Pylos and associated with a hero or some ritual. One major problem in supporting the existence of any cult on the ruins is that in later periods the palace was thought to be located at the citadel of Paleonavarino and not in the location of the Englianos Ridge. So, it appears that there was no a memory preserving the authentic setting of the Mycenaean palace. The authors also note that the alleged tiles found in the ruins of the palace and which have been associated with three different temples dated from the late seventh to the sixth century, do not actually correspond with existing finds. Consequently, there is no evidence to hypothesise, as Brenningmeyer did in his Ph.D. thesis for the reconstruction of these temples (this thesis is not available to the reviewer).⁵ The other line of investigation is associated with a number of courts that have revealed finds dated to the Postpalatial period. The evidence, however, from the remaining walls that were supposed to be associated with the pottery is not sufficient to reconstruct buildings dated to the Dark Age. Important is also to note that the alleged ritual assemblage in court 88 cannot provide enough evidence to suggest that it was related with any form of cult. Though the palace does not seem to be of great importance during the Dark Age, it is the area of the "Lower Town" that appears to have more finds dated to this particular period. So, the conclusion is that only small-scale activities took place within the ruins of the palace.

In addition, the authors offer a detail account of the pottery found and preserved from the various areas (Appendix 1). This is extremely useful but some drawings and/or photographs of the pots discussed would have been good to illustrate and to support their analysis. In any case, the vases found belong to types that come from domestic contexts comparable to those discovered in Nichoria and do not appear to include shapes that are usually associated with ritual activities. In Appendix 2, Susanne Hofstra summarised the iron finds from the areas under examination. A number of them belong to iron nails and not to spits as thought earlier, rejecting again the suggestion that there were paraphernalia of ritual activities. Noticeable is also the lack of any bronze offerings including figurines. The paper is a very important contribution to the archaeology of Pylos after the destruction of the Mycenaean palace and provides

⁵ Brenningmeyer 2003.

convincing arguments for the nature of the evidence belonging to the Postpalatial period.

Diamantis Panagiotopoulos in an innovative chapter (Chapter 6) introduces the concept of Mycenaean *memoria* by employing the study of collective memory, as a tool to understand social construction. It is argued that societies activate collective memory for preserving their corporate identity and that archaeology could use such social processes to explain approaches to human behaviour. The author attempts to employ such a theoretical background to the study of Mycenaean culture, in to reveal how the Mycenaean experienced their past by intermingling mythological and historical events. So, by employing this theoretical concept, it could be possible to appreciate whether a narrative image corresponded to the actual past or to a mythical tradition. Panagiotopoulos discusses among others the use of heirlooms as possible references to the past though he argues that such objects with 'biographies' could not amount to collective memory, as they are closely associated with individuals. A good example is the use of seals and signet rings that were passed down from father to son as insignia of office and power and as such they reveal a social habitus rather than a collective experience. Occasionally, however, we could find in Mycenaean art some shifts into the past, as in the repetition of techniques and decorative practices. But these, as the author claims, should not be considered as collective memory, a concept that presupposes an intentional act or remembering based on social contact. Interestingly, for Panagiotopoulos the fact that Mycenaean art is not characterised by creativity but rather by variation on traditional themes, may correspond to the highly formulaic nature of the Homeric verse. On the other hand, monuments and landscapes could serve for commemorating the past and providing the arena for communicative events. The only evidence we have for such events in the Mycenaean period comes from the funeral monuments. Indeed, the funeral monuments at Mycenae are employed in a contextual approach and within their particular historical context to illuminate such actions. Panagiotopoulos explores diachronically the funerary display at Mycenae from the Shaft Graves period to the end of the palatial administration period. He notes, for example how the construction of a built tomb (tomb Rho) above Grave Circle B was an attempt to appropriate a 'heroic' past or to fabricate an ancestral lineage. Equally impressive is the large scale building programme of around 1250 BC that provides evidence for appropriating a heroic past especially with the transformation of Grave Circle A into a memorial space, some 250

years after it was used as a burial ground. Finally, it is argued that the social distress that may have resulted in the palatial collapse in the twelfth century could explain the 'multivocality' of social memory that followed and which is characterised by inconsistencies in remembering and/or disregarding shared reminiscences.

Mazarakis Ainian revisits his own and others' contributions to hero cult at the end of the eighth century BC; he presents their different types, as well as the motives and inspirations behind such practices. An interesting case of hero cult is that discovered more recently at the immense Mycenaean tholos tomb at Georgiko near Karditsa in Thessaly. The hero venerated there was most probably *Aiatos*, the father of *Thessalos*, as we presume from an inscription with the name of the eponymous hero incised on a seventh or sixth century tile. The author also questions the old idea by Coldstream that cults of heroes were inspired by Homeric epics. He argues that the impact of the epics might have triggered such cults and others related to eponymous heroes at sanctuaries and cemeteries. Mazarakis Ainian also claims that the cults were performed not by elites but by a larger number of middle class devotees who could participate in rituals at the sanctuaries.

Stephanie Daley looks at evidence, some recently discovered, of cuneiform texts for the role of international education as a mechanism for the transmission of the Epic of Gilgamesh during the Middle and the Late Bronze Ages. It is argued that close connections came through a system of educational training in cuneiform in Egypt, Anatolia and the Levant in the Bronze Age and was adapted for alphabetic scripts in the transition from the Late Bronze to the Iron Age. She offers a detailed account of how we can trace evidence of such transmissions in what is a valuable chapter, especially for Aegean archaeologists, who are not always aware of the rich evidence from the Near East. Daley also reminds us how we could easily miss evidence of other materials used for writing because they were perishable, while even the unbaked clay tablets could have also been easily disintegrated. At the same time, she presents a number of old and more recently discovered evidence starting from the areas controlled by the Hittites and other regions in the Near East and Egypt. The interaction of the different polities required scribes who were writing in cuneiform script and who travelled and taught abroad. Such scribes remained active even after the collapse of the Hittite Empire because they were in need for training the local scribes to write a treaty, a seal

inscription, and other documents for the new rulers in locations such as Carchemish and other places in Cilicia. Daley recalls that extracts from the Epic of Gilgamesh were used as school exercises mostly in the Late Bronze Age but also with some examples dated to the Early Iron Age. Their scarcity later might be due to the perishable materials used for writing in this period. In any case, the Phoenicians continued the Canaanite tradition of this type of curriculum that was used to train earlier scribes. Phoenicians must also have played the most important role in transmitting earlier traditions, since the Greek adapted their alphabet in the eighth century. She suggests that one line of contact was through the training for scribes. Finally, some comparisons are offered between the Epic of Gilgamesh and the Homeric epics, in that anachronisms considering metal objects and chariots are found in both and were employed to evoke a heroic past. Lastly, it is intriguing also to consider that the Song of Release, a text found at Hattusha, might be the inspiration for the Iliad, though this suggestion has not yet been confirmed.

The last two chapters discuss later Slavic and Greek epics and their significance in forming the national identity of the people who had experience of them. Beissinger offers, in chapter 9, a very informative summary of the character of the Slavic epic tradition. She presents the singers, the main stories they sang, and at what kind of occasions they performed. She also explores how historical events could be preserved and transformed over a long oral tradition. We also learn how folklorists especially in Serbia (particularly Vuk Karadžić) promoted the notion that the epics reflected history and historical reality. This is especially the case with the battle of Kosovo, which has even been misemployed by late twentieth century Serbian nationalists. Beissinger demonstrates how history was exploited through the creation and production of the south Slavic Christian epic in order to create a Serbian national identity. What comes out from this analysis is how significant epic poetry could be to consolidate national identity.

In the same vein, Beaton recounts the rediscovery in the nineteenth century of Digenis Acritas that became a national epic during a period when the New Greek state had the ambitions to extend its territory to what was once that of Byzantium. The author also argues that Digenis Acritas' influences in Greek life and letters have an impact even today. Beaton also argues that the Homeric question provided the model in the late nineteenth century for combining an epic poem with contemporary oral songs in order to fashion national identity.

Last but not least we are treated with a 'very short epic' composed by the modern bard, Paul Halstead, who undoubtedly continues the tradition of reshaping epic sounds.

This is a valuable volume with innovative and interdisciplinary approaches and contributions that enrich our knowledge of the relationship between epic and archaeology. It also offers a variety of important studies regarding ancient and recent epic traditions. It illustrates how ancient and modern national epic poetry has the power in shaping group identity at different levels and in different periods.

IRENE S. LEMOS
MERTON COLLEGE//OXFORD
Irene.lemos@classics.ox.ac.uk

- Brenningemyer, T. 2003. Post Bronze Age Architecture at Ano Englianos: Architectural Commemoration of a Bronze Age Site (Greece). PhD dissertation, University of Minnesota.
- Korfmann, M. 2001. Troia – Traum un Wirklichkeit. Eine Einführung in das Thema. In J. Latacz *et al.* (eds) *Troia – Traum un Wirklichkeit. Begleitband zur Ausstellung 'Troia –Traum un Wirklichkeit'*. Stuttgart: Konrad Theiss Verlag.
- Nagy, G. 1995. An evolutionary model for the making of Homeric poetry: comparative perspectives. In J. B. Carter and S. P. Morris (eds) *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule*: 163–79 Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Schliemann, H. 1880. *Ilios: The City and the Country of the Trojans*. London: John Murray.
- Schliemann, H. 1881. *Ilios: The City and the Country of the Trojans*. New York: Harper.
- Snodgrass, A. 1998. *Homer and the Artists: Text and Picture in Early Greek Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Philippa M. Steele. 2019. *Writing and Society in Ancient Cyprus* (Cambridge Classical Studies). pp. xvii+272, black and white illustrations. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-1-107-16967-8 hardback £ 75.00.

Writing and Society in Ancient Cyprus is the edited version of the Evans-Pritchard Lectures, which the author, Philippa Steele (PS), delivered at All Souls College, Oxford, in 2014, under the title, *Society and Writing in Ancient Cyprus*. The decision to reverse the order of the two main terms on the book's title suggests that the primacy of *Writing* over *Society* had become obvious when the lectures were presented. PS achieved a fascinating synthesis of the written evidence, which would have, undoubtedly, steered her audience towards new venues regarding the interpretation of society in Ancient Cyprus. The monograph is divided into the following five chapters:

The Advent of Literacy in Cyprus (pp. 4–44)

Scripts and Languages in Geometric Cyprus (pp. 45–94)

'Understanding' Undeciphered Scripts and Unidentified Languages (pp. 95–146)

Visible Languages and Cypriot Identities (pp. 147–196)

Cypriot Writing at Home and Abroad (pp. 197–244)

There is a fairly extensive *Bibliography* (pp. 247–268) and an *Index* (pp. 269–272).

Preceding the first chapter, a two-page *Introduction* (pp. 1–2) underlines the first of three research principles, which constitute PS's *modus operandi*: instead of isolating the textual material of the second from that of the first millennium BC, which was until recently one of the methodological problems affecting the study of the island's antiquity as a whole, PS pledges to interpret the place of writing in the *longue durée* of Ancient Cyprus from the Late Bronze Age (LBA) through to the Hellenistic period; she honours her commitment from the first to the last page. Thus, her new book¹ becomes one of the first substantial publications on the island's archaeology to reject the unqualified

¹ Prolific and devoted to her research, PS has made significant contributions to Cypriot literacy in recent years. In 2013, CUP published her monograph, *A Linguistic History of Ancient Cyprus: The Non-Greek Languages, and their Relations with Greek, c.1600–300 BC* (Steele 2013a). That year she also edited, *Syllabic Writing on Cyprus and Its Context*, a collection of papers presented in a conference she had organised at the University of Cambridge in 2008 (Steele 2013b).

belief in a cultural break between Bronze Age and Iron Age Cyprus. This alone makes the monograph exceptional and initiates a new period in Cypriot studies.² Comments made below with reference to specific archaeological arguments that deserve to be updated in the future (PS, no doubt, will rise to the challenge) will not take away from the book's pioneering aspect.

The second principle stands out on the first page (p. 4) of the author's first chapter: it is described as *An Internal Approach*. This most welcome viewpoint suggests that the advocates of Cyprocentricism³ have had a successful effect among colleagues working on Cyprus.⁴ PS generates a fresh approach regarding the study of the first Cypriot script when she states, '[w]hat if we were to shift the focus from the external to the internal? What if we were to begin by considering not the relations between ancient Cyprus and contemporary Mediterranean powers, but rather the internal factors that gave rise to the advent of literacy on the island' (p. 5). PS cultivates this innovative research mode throughout the book, though admittedly not always with the same steadfastness. Her internal analysis of the LBA is by far more successful than that of the Iron Age. Her methodology falters when, in a rather sudden change of approach, PS attempts to interpret the human environment through external literary sources, like the *Periplus* of Pseudo-Skylax, that do not qualify as educated descriptions of the island's ethnolinguistic identities (p. 152).⁵ The third principle, which PS describes as 'a new perspective that has not previously been studied systematically', focuses on 'the immediate context of writing' (p.6). In this, the LBA textual evidence is contextualized quite successfully with the contemporary archaeological framework; the much richer written material of the Iron Age is analysed rather randomly and mostly out of its archaeological context, which is formed by the island's fragmented

² Having repeatedly underlined that the continuity of the syllabic scribal tradition is one of the 'fundamental cultural continua that bridge the divide between the island's Bronze and Iron Ages' (Iacovou 2008: 626), I cannot resist expressing my delight.

³ Note that the relevant paper, 'Advocating Cyprocentricism' is cited twice in the *Bibliography* (p.253), the first time with the wrong date (Iacovou 1997), the second time correctly (Iacovou 2007).

⁴ This positive development is also evident in the introduction of a recently edited volume by Cannavò and Thély 2018: 1–4.

⁵ The *Periplus* is an especially problematic source; the information it provides on the coastal centres of Cyprus appears to be in conflict with the archaeological evidence of the 4th c. BC: 'there is no sensible explanation as to why a fourth-century B.C. *Periplus* would have ignored the prime Classical city-states of Kition and Paphos, or why it would have claimed that the harbors of the coastal poleis of Cyprus were deserted' (Iacovou 2013a: 16).

and, admittedly, unstable political geography (further in the discussion below).

Chapter One is written with gusto and retains the liveliness of the original lecture. It makes an excellent instructor's tool that can, and will, be used when one introduces young scholars to 'the technology of writing', which developed in the early LBA in Cyprus. The *Earliest Examples of Cypriote Writing* (p. 11) is a meticulous analysis of the Late Cypriot I inscriptions: a tablet, a label (until recently described as a weight) and a steatite cylinder seal, all three from Enkomi. Commenting on their diversity, PS underlines that the object type is as significant as the epigraphic features.⁶ It is well known that, though Cypriots adopted high status insignia from their Mediterranean neighbours, they always gave them a new identity in the context of the island's own institutions. PS shows that this is also true of the technology of writing. While there was no wholesale borrowing of either Aegean or Near Eastern scribal tools or scribal uses, whatever they chose to adopt they made their own. This selective adoption pattern is also evident in the study of the Cypriot cylinder seals, which though an object borrowed from the Near East, often have decorative motifs borrowed from contemporary Aegean styles. Moreover, despite the presence of some hundreds of cylinder seals, seal impressions and sealing practices are absent.⁷ Likewise, despite the attestation of links between the inception of literacy on the island and economic administration, Cyprus never adopted anything like the systematic notation of commodities and quantities witnessed in the Aegean (p. 17).

The reader benefits from PS's intentional return to the same written evidence that she then proceeds to analyse from a different perspective. Far from being a case of repetitiveness, this approach fortifies her methodological scheme and ties different sections and chapters together. Thus, in the *Epigraphy of Early Cypriot Inscriptions* (p. 19), PS returns to the epigraphic divergence of the three earliest inscriptions. In this context, she gives a history of research, which begins with Emilia Masson and ends with Miguel Valerio, who is in this manner introduced to Cypriot scholarly society as (almost certainly) the youngest scholar to have specialized in the study of Cypro-Minoan (CM) after Ferrara.⁸

Although the direct connection of CM (some 250 documents) to Linear A (some 1500 documents) has not always been treated as a certainty, Valerio has no such reservations. This is also confirmed by his contribution to the recently published, *Paths into Script Formation in the Ancient Mediterranean*, entitled 'Cypro-Minoan: An Aegean-derived Syllabary on Cyprus (and Elsewhere)'.⁹ In *External influences on Cypriot Writing* (p. 35), PS concurs that 'the initial adoption of writing [was] almost certainly based on Linear A', but she prudently adds that, irrespective of the process of adaptation, 'the end result of the adoption of literacy on Cyprus was a writing system that was characteristically Cypriot and could not be confused with similar scripts in other areas.' (p.39). In *Multiple External Influences*, she vividly describes what she considers the '[o]ne striking aspect of Cypriot writing' (p. 43), namely the mixed nature of influences, which together with the rejection of the cuneiform script (pp. 40–41),¹⁰ suggest that the Cypriots were consciously creating their own unique written tradition in the context of building their distinctive Cypriot identity (p.43). With this statement, PS introduces one of the most prominent themes of her monograph, and one that she will develop further in the next chapters: the 'link between Cypriot writing and Cypriot identity that was to last until the abolition of the city kingdoms around the end of the fourth century BC and probably even later' (p. 39).

In *The Context of the Earliest Cypriot Writing*, PS explores the extensive divergences between the regionally specific Cypriot evidence and that of the Mesopotamian states and the states of Aegean Greece, and makes some decisive observations with respect to LBA Cyprus: she recognises that the island 'shows no direct signs of centralized economy types based around building complexes'; 'the few clay tablets that have survived [...] have not come from obvious archival contexts'; and, that 'it seems quite unlikely [...] that a single, lasting archival tradition was ever established in Cyprus, given the great degree of variation in writing practices [...] throughout the LBA' (p. 32). Hence, despite her reluctance to take a firm stand as to the political institution of *Alashiya*, in this section, and again in *Chapter 3* ('the notable lack of uniformity in any tradition of writing on clay tablets', p.

⁹ Valerio 2018.

¹⁰ On the decision of the Cypriots to shun cuneiform, see also Peltenburg and Iacovou 2012: 357: '[...] the island chose not to adopt the established cuneiform tool - with which Akkadian, the *lingua franca* of international diplomacy, was written - [...]. Thus, the expansion of the cuneiform system in the Mediterranean which, since its development by the Sumerians, had 'conquered' the whole expanse of the Near East and Anatolia, was halted in Cyprus.'

⁶ Likewise, Ferrara 2013 on 'considering the Cypro-Minoan inscriptions not only as texts but also as objects, with a full archaeological and cultural context' (Steele 2013b: 3).

⁷ How Cypriots made use of seals remains elusive, but the imagery on seals has been strongly linked with status or prestige (Webb 2002; 2005).

⁸ Masson 1987; Valerio 2016; Ferrara 2012/2013.

122), the evidence from the different regions of the island does not support the development of a real central state, either at the beginning or at the end of the LBA. Her discussion on the 'overall distribution of power on the island in LCI' (p. 9), and on the 'role Cyprus played in international diplomacy, as attested in cuneiform documents' (p. 10), would have profited from reference to two seminal works directly relevant to the *Alashiya* debate. The absence of the first, Peltenburg's 'Text Meets Material Culture in Late Bronze Age Cyprus', is hard to explain (PS has a paper in the same volume).¹¹ The absence of the second, which came out in 2018, is excusable (given the publication date of PS's book), but has to be mentioned in the context of this review since it constitutes the single most important development in the history of ancient Cyprus in recent years. The Idalion palace archive has furnished decisive textual proof that the term *Alashiya*, which appears in second millennium BC external textual records, was Cyprus's geographical and political designation. The term had evidently survived among the Cypro-Phoenician population as late as the early Hellenistic period.¹² Among other things, the preservation of Cyprus's second millennium BC name ought to make us reconsider the traditional Early Iron Age chronology of the establishment of Semitic speakers on the island; the episode of their migration could very well date to the LBA.¹³

Chapter Two is the most decisive and insightful part of the monograph; it provides a thorough documentation of scribal continuity from the LBA to the otherwise textually poor Cypro-Geometric (CG) period. PS devotes a whole chapter to *Scripts and Languages in Geometric Cyprus* because she acknowledges that 'it is not only the ruptures that are important but also the continuities across the whole period and beyond' (p. 45). PS does not find the scarcity of CG textual material daunting because, instead of isolating it, she contextualizes it between two periods in which writing is quite rich by Cypriot standards: the Late Cypriot (LC) and the Cypro-Archaic (CA). This approach identifies her as one of the first scholars to adopt the view that artificial barriers between historical periods are not necessarily helpful (p. 45),¹⁴ especially when the 'stability of certain socio-cultural phenomena

across periods of transition [is] just as important as the changes [...]' (p. 46).

Once again, therefore, PS returns to the beginning of writing on the island and takes us step by step through the development of the technology of writing from LCI to LCIIIA (p. 47), before embarking on LCIIIB (conventionally the 11th c. BC) and CG I-II (traditionally the 10th and 9th c. BC). With respect to this substantially long horizon, where others would readily identify a break, not only in literacy but also in social complexity, urbanism and even in human settlement across the island, PS exclaims: 'The 'gap' is ours, a gap in surviving epigraphy, not in literacy or epigraphic habit' (p. 48). Although her argument is well fortified throughout, I cannot help thinking of an earlier *tour de force* on the same issue, which would have deserved a reference in this as well as in other chapters: Morpurgo-Davies's contribution in 'Syllabic Scripts and Languages in the Second and First Millennia BC'.¹⁵

As few as they may be in number (less than 20), the surviving CG inscriptions are 'some of the most important texts for our understanding of the development of language and script on the island' (p. 46). This statement is not at all hyperbolic: they include (a) the *Opheltau* inscription, 'the earliest of all surviving Greek texts after the Mycenaean Linear B documents';¹⁶ (b) the earliest appearance of the Phoenician alphabetic script on Cyprus; and (c) the earliest confirmed examples of the Cypriot Syllabary that had grown out of CM (p. 46). Hence, CG cannot be treated as a silent 'Dark Age' period; it provides confirmation for (a) the continuity of CM, (b) the development of a new script (i.e. the Cypro-Syllabic) out of CM and (c) the introduction of another ready-made script (the Phoenician alphabet). The former, the Cypro-Syllabic script, becomes the writing tool for the Greek as well as for the non-Greek languages of Iron Age Cyprus; the latter is the script with which the Semitic/Phoenician language is expressed until its disappearance from the epigraphic record of Cyprus in the 3rd c. BC.

It is well known that since the first interpretation of the *Opheltau* inscription by Emilia and Olivier Masson,¹⁷ a debate has unfolded over the identification of the script. Following Olivier, PS identifies the *Opheltau* inscription as a Greek text

¹¹ Peltenburg 2012; similar views were also expressed in Peltenburg and Iacovou 2012.

¹² Amadasi Guzzo and Zamora 2018: 89.

¹³ More on this below; argument summarised in Iacovou 2018: 26.

¹⁴ See on this issue: 'The question is whether, at long last, we are ready to leave behind the compartmentalization of Cypriot history into chronologically narrow and windowless period boxes so that we can begin to define 'cycles of social complexity' in the *longue durée* of the island's landscape.' (Iacovou 2013: 17–18).

¹⁵ Morpurgo-Davies and Olivier 2012 in a joint paper where each has the authorship of a separate part.

¹⁶ Contrary to Knapp (2009: 229), PS does not see in the *Opheltau* inscription 'an endlessly-cited' object that 'serves as the lynchpin to most arguments for a Greek migration to or colonisation of Cyprus'.

¹⁷ Masson and Masson 1983.

written in the CM script.¹⁸ Therefore, '[t]he earliest texts that can be identified with certainty as being written in the new Cypriot Syllabic script' date to the 8th century BC. So far so good, as long as we do not attempt to date the establishment of either the Greek or the Phoenician linguistic element on the chance discovery of texts inscribed in the new languages. PS creates a circular argument when she suggests that Phoenician inscriptions dating to the 9th c. BC 'are likely to have been associated with the settlement of Phoenician speakers on the island' (p.71). From an archaeological as well as a linguistic point of view it would appear that the original settlement of both groups could have taken place in the 12th c. BC (LCIIIA).¹⁹ Teixidor was among the first to suspect that a resident Semitic-speaking population had been living in Cyprus since the LBA.²⁰ Now, the study of the Phoenician archive found in the palace of Idalion could turn his suspicion into a certainty, which will also explain why LBA Semitic dialectal forms that were no longer in use in the Iron Age states of the Levant were preserved only in Cyprus.²¹

In discussing the first royal inscriptions (p.55), which appear in the early 7th c. and contribute to the cultural transformations associated with the consolidation of the city-states, PS could have underlined that they are exclusively syllabic Greek and, whether by sheer chance or not, they come from the Kourion-Paphos area.²² But, I am still puzzled by the curious dismissal of the well-known syllabic inscription of king Akestor of Paphos (inscribed on a silver plate from the Cesnola collection in the Metropolitan Museum of Art), which, since its publication by Mitford,²³ has been repeatedly presented together with the inscription of king Eteandros of Paphos (inscribed on a pair of gold bracelets).²⁴ Although its existence is acknowledged once (in Chapter 4), as 'Akestor, perhaps king of Paphos' (p. 173) with a reference to Masson (only), who does not doubt the royal title,²⁵ PS's reluctance to include it in the royal inscriptions from Paphos requires an explanation.

In *Epigraphic Culture and Continuity across the CG Period* (p.83) PS makes some meaningful and daring

comparisons in relation to the state of literacy in Greece and Cyprus: 'While Greece had been illiterate since the fall of the Mycenaean palaces, writing in Cyprus continued without any break. Changes in social habits, political structure and language use did take place but they did not cause ruptures in literacy' (p. 90). However, to say that 'Palaepaphos and Kition have both produced syllabic written material' from the LBA to the Hellenistic period (p.85), is not the most accurate of statements. It would be hard to deny the extreme scarcity of the Cypro-Syllabic inscriptions from Kition in the first millennium BC,²⁶ which suggests that it was largely substituted by the Phoenician alphabet. Yon has shown that from the 9th to the end of the 4th c. BC the inscribed record from Kition is almost exclusively in the Phoenician alphabet.²⁷ This suggests that Phoenician had become the region's majority language even before the appearance of the first known official inscriptions of Kition, which are exclusively in the Phoenician script. Coin issues as well as royal inscriptions are not recorded from Kition before the early 5th c. BC.²⁸ Despite the fact that it had been the laymen's as well as the city-state's script, the Phoenician alphabet had a precise expiration date, which coincides with the termination of the Phoenician dynasty. In the 3rd c. BC, as soon as Cyprus was made a Ptolemaic colony, the inscriptional evidence from Kition became alphabetic Greek.²⁹ By contrast, as PS herself recognises (p. 241), Paphos is the region where long after the abolition of the Cypriot city-states the syllabary remained in use almost to the end of the first millennium BC.³⁰

One would have thought that in *'Understanding' Undeciphered Scripts and Unidentified Languages*, PS was going to present the Iron Age syllabic texts that are unreadable as Greek. However, this 'unknown linguistic component' (P.128) is reserved for the second half of *Chapter Three*. True to her diachronic method, PS devotes the first half to the problems of 'reading' the otherwise unreadable/undeciphered CM texts through their context (p.96). She eloquently leads us to appreciate the role played by literacy in LBA Cyprus so that we can see why it survived:

¹⁸ Cf. Olivier 2013: 16–17.

¹⁹ Iacovou 2012: 220.

²⁰ Teixidor 1975: 123.

²¹ Amadasi Guzzo 2007; 2017.

²² Satraki 2012: 391–418 provides a catalogue of Cypriot royal inscriptions.

²³ Mitford 1971: 373–6.

²⁴ Cf. Satraki 2013: 128, in an important paper on the iconography of *Basileis*, missing from PS's bibliography; also in Iacovou 2013b: 140, which was edited by Steele.

²⁵ Masson 1961/83: 412, no.180a.

²⁶ Cf. Yon 2004: 337; Iacovou 2012: 220.

²⁷ 'Pour la période qui va du IXe à la fin du IVe s. av. J.-C., on ne s'étonnera pas de trouver presque uniquement des inscriptions en phéniciens (environ 150 numéros).' (Yon 2004: 159).

²⁸ Cf. Iacovou 2008: 645 on 'the Chronology of the Cypro-Phoenician kingdom'.

²⁹ Yon 2004: 160 : 'à partir du IIIe s. le grec devient la langue commune, et Kition perd alors sa spécificité linguistique pour s'aligner sur le reste de l'île.'

³⁰ Michaelidou-Nicolaou 1993: 346–7; cf. Iacovou 2013b: 138: 'the last joint appearance of the syllabary and the Greek language occurs on first-century BC sealings from the Roman archive of Nea Paphos.'

‘literacy was sufficiently widespread for people to experiment with placing it on objects that usually did not bear writing’ (p.127). Unlike Linear B, which was apparently restricted to administration - hence ‘literacy must have declined sharply and suddenly when the [Mycenaean] palaces fell’ (p. 207) - CM was not the exclusive tool of a central state.

The most exhaustive discussion in this first part of *Chapter 3* is concerned with a distinctively Cypriot type of CM inscriptions on clay balls (p. 110). As with the majority of LC cylinder seals, the majority of inscribed clay balls come from Enkomi (81 examples), and their occurrence in layers of the 13th as well as the 12th c. BC (before and after a major reorganisation of the urban layout) provides important evidence as to the continuity of inscription types despite administrative upheavals (pp. 111, 116). The exciting discovery of one inscribed and a few more uninscribed clay balls in the post-palatial layers of Tiryns, made of local clay (p.118), is discussed here as well as in *Chapter 5*, where it is suggested that they ‘may reflect the presence of Cypriots living in Tiryns and continuing their home-grown epigraphic traditions’ (p. 206).

The second half of *Chapter 3* is devoted to the complex problem of the *Non-Greek Cypriot Syllabic Inscriptions*. Besides confronting the reader with their visibility and distribution in the epigraphic record of the different regions of the island, PS also provides the non-specialist with a fairly straightforward explanation as to why they do not constitute a homogeneous group: ‘they are written in one or more languages that we do not understand’ (p. 128). Gently but firmly, PS sides with the view that the traditional term ‘Eteocypriot’ should not be used as a catch-all term; rather as the name for only one non-Greek language identified in inscriptions, mainly from Amathus (p. 137), that share a set of confirmed linguistic features (p. 131). Hence, in accord with Egetmeyer,³¹ she sees in the non-Greek syllabic texts from the sanctuary of Golgoi ‘a different Cypriot language’, other than the Eteocypriot (p. 144). Finally, in closing this chapter PS recognizes, albeit indirectly, that besides the Greek syllabary (e.g. in Paphos, Kourion and Idalion) and the Phoenician alphabet (e.g. in Kition), Eteocypriot was the third Cypriot language found in association with official (civic/royal) inscriptions but only at Amathus (p. 146).

Chapter Four on Visible Languages and Cypriot Identities is missing a clear methodological structure that would have brought forward the socio-political

landscape of writing in the different Cypriot *poleis* (i.e., city-states that have for long been referred to as ‘city-kingdoms’).³² The main section is entitled *The 1st Millennium BC and the Age of the City Kingdoms* (p. 158–175) so the reader is led to think that PS will treat the written evidence as part of the material culture of the different Cypriot *poleis*. Instead, a subsection on Amathus is followed by another on Golgoi, which is not a *polis* but a sanctuary site, and that by Kition and other sites; but nowhere in this chapter, or even in the next (and last one, on *Cypriots Writing at Home and Abroad*) does PS provide an essential geopolitical definition of the Iron Age polities based on the latest research and literature.³³ Although *Chapters 4* and *5* are exceptionally rich in bottom-up observations - e.g. on Cypriot multilingualism and ‘multiscriptualism’ (p. 196) and on the writing habits of Cypriot mercenaries abroad (pp. 212–218) - no attempt is made to associate the written evidence with the island’s political geography and economy.

The Cypriot *poleis* and their respective political territories (the *chora*) provided the physical and socio-political context of writing in the first millennium BC. They were, nonetheless, in a constant state of flux throughout the Cypro-Achaic and Cypro-Classical eras, and political boundaries were much more elusive and unstable than PS seems to think when she suggests (in an earlier chapter) that based on Assyrian sources we can ‘draw a map of the Cypriot political configuration of the early Archaic period’ (p.55).³⁴ However, the spatial and temporal parameters of the Cypriot political establishment in the Iron Age are no longer as inaccessible as they used to be. Besides having confirmed that the number of the Cypriot city-states diminished (apparently, from 10 to 7), which betrays a healthy process of consolidation, we have also observed the primacy of coastal over inland central places;³⁵ and, most importantly, we have come to recognize the significance of the extra-urban sanctuaries in the construction of the politico-economic territories³⁶ and as ‘remarkable organisational instruments’, which gathered communities around common

³² ‘They [the Cypriot polities] were ruled by kings - basileis - and there is nothing in the ancient sources that would exclude them from the polis category.’ (Demand 1996: 8). Cf. Iacovou 2014.

³³ Useful references missing from PS’s Bibliography: Counts and Iacovou 2013; Fourrier 2007; 2013; Hatzopoulos 2014; Hermary 2014; Kassianidou 2013; Satraki 2012; 2013. Also, the papers in Cannavò and Thély 2018.

³⁴ The map to which PS refers accompanies a paper (Rupp 1987, p.166) that has often been criticized for its problematic interpretation of the origins and the number of the Cypriot city-states (cf. Iacovou 2013a: 15–16; 2014a: 119–120).

³⁵ Cf. Iacovou 2013a: 29–30.

³⁶ Cf. Fourrier 2007; Papantoniou 2012; Papantoniou *et al.* 2014.

³¹ Cf. Egetmeyer 2010.

cults.³⁷ This is the city-state landscape to which the multilingual written evidence should be anchored in order to reveal more sharply the regional identities of the Cypriot society.³⁸

In Writing and Society in Ancient Cyprus we have been offered a magisterial treatment of the scribal evidence from the time of the appearance of the autochthonous Cypriot script in the LBA to the Hellenistic period, when both the non-Greek languages and the language of the Cypro-Phoenicians disappeared from the written evidence, leaving the Greek syllabary to continue a while longer (until the 1st c. BC) alongside the Greek alphabet. This must be the first time that the intricate history of Cypriot writing has been so ably registered in a single, handy book form. PS's major accomplishment is that she has extracted from the study of the written evidence Cyprus's idiosyncratic island identity; at the same time, she has established that the culture of writing in Cyprus was unique among Mediterranean islands - especially in terms of how scripts and as many as three different languages were employed as political instruments. Because it addresses all these special themes, the book will serve as a point of reference to a much wider audience that will include scholars working on island archaeologies.

MARIA IACOVOU
UNIVERSITY OF CYPRUS
mariai@ucy.ac.cy

- Amadasi Guzzo, M.G. 2007. Notes d'onomastique phénicienne à Kition. *Cahiers du Centre d'Études Chypriotes* 37: 197–209.
- Amadasi Guzzo, M.G. 2017. The Idalion Archive 2. The Phoenician inscriptions, in N. Papademetriou and M. Toli (eds) *Ancient Cyprus. Recent Developments in the Archaeology of the Eastern Mediterranean (Greek)*: 275–284. Athens: Cycladic Museum.
- Amadasi Guzzo, M.G. and J.A. Zamora 2018. The Phoenician name of Cyprus: new evidence from Early Hellenistic times. *Journal of Semitic Studies* LXIII/1: 77–97.
- Cannavò, A. and L. Thély (eds) 2018. *Les royaumes de Chypre à l'épreuve de l'histoire: Transitions et ruptures de la fin de l'Âge du Bronze au début de l'époque hellénistique*. *BCH Supplément* 60: 1–4.
- Counts, D. and M. Iacovou 2013. New approaches to the elusive Iron Age polities of ancient Cyprus: an introduction. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 370: 1–13.
- Demand, N. 1996. Poleis on Cyprus and oriental despotism, in M.H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub (eds) *More studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*: 7–15. *Historia Einzelschriften* 108. Stuttgart: F. Steiner.
- Egetmeyer, M. 2010. The recent debate on Eteocypriote people and language. *Pasiphae* 3: 69–90.
- Ferrara, S. 2012/2013. *Cypro-Minoan Inscriptions*, vol. 1: Analysis; vol. 2: Corpus. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ferrara, S. 2013. Writing in Cypro-Minoan: one script, too many?, in P. Steele (ed.) *Syllabic Writing on Cyprus and Its Context*: 49–76. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Fourrier, S. 2007. *La Coroplastie Chypriote Archaique. Identités culturelles et politiques à l'époque des royaumes*. *Travaux de la Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée* 46. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée – Jean Pouilloux
- Fourrier, S. 2011. Pots for goods and for the gods: the Iron Age ceramics from the Malloura sanctuary, in M. K. Toumazou, P. N. Kardulias, and D. B. Counts (eds) *Crossroads and Boundaries: The Archaeology of Past and Present in the Malloura Valley, Cyprus* : 125–32. *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 65. Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research.
- Fourrier, S. 2013. Constructing the peripheries: extra-urban sanctuaries and peer-polity interaction in Iron Age Cyprus. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 370: 103–122.
- Fourrier, S. 2014. Rois et cités de Chypre: questions de territoires. *Cahiers du Centre d'Études Chypriotes* 44: 119–136.
- Hatzopoulos, M. 2014. Cypriote kingships in context. *Cahiers du Centre d'Études Chypriotes* 44: 217–233.
- Hermay, A. 2014. Les fonctions sacerdotales des souverains chypriotes. *Cahiers du Centre d'Études Chypriotes* 44: 137–152.
- Iacovou 2007. Advocating cyprocentricism: an indigenous model for the emergence of state formation on Cyprus, in S. W. Crawford, A. Ben-Tor, J. P. Dessel, W. G. Dever, A. Mazar, and J. Aviram (eds) 'Up to the Gates of Ekron': *Essays on the Archaeology and History of the Eastern Mediterranean in Honor of Seymour Gitin*: 461–75. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.
- Iacovou, M. 2008. Cultural and political configurations in Iron Age Cyprus: the sequel to a protohistoric episode. *American Journal of Archaeology* 112: 625–57.

³⁷ Fourrier 2011: 130–131.

³⁸ Minor editorial errata: on p. 25 LCIIC should be corrected to LCIIIC (there is no LCIIIC phase in the chronology of Cyprus); on p.54, note 28 and again on p.255 in the Bibliography Korou should be corrected to Kourou; on p. 258, Palaephos in the Masson, E. and Masson, O. 1983 entry should be corrected to Palaepaphos.

- Iacovou, M. 2012. External and internal migrations during the 12th century BC: setting the stage for an economically successful Early Iron Age, in M. Iacovou (ed.) *Cyprus and the Aegean in the Early Iron Age: The Legacy of Nicolas Coldstream*: 207–27. Nicosia: Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation.
- Iacovou, M. 2013a. Historically elusive and internally fragile island polities: the intricacies of Cyprus's political geography in the Iron Age. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 370: 38.
- Iacovou, M. 2013b. The Cypriot syllabary as a royal signature: the political context of the Syllabic script in the Iron Age, in P. Steele (ed.) *Syllabic Writing on Cyprus and Its Context*: 133–52. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Iacovou, M. 2014. Beyond the Athenocentric misconceptions. The Cypriote polities in their economic context. *Cahiers du Centre d'Études Chypriotes* 44: 95–117.
- Iacovou, M. 2018. From the Late Cypriot polities to the Iron Age 'kingdom: understanding the political landscape of Cyprus from within', in A. Cannavò and L. Thély (eds) *Les royaumes de Chypre à l'épreuve de l'histoire: Transitions et ruptures de la fin de l'Âge du Bronze au début de l'époque hellénistique*: 7–28. *BCH Supplément* 60. Athènes: Ecole française d'Athènes EFA.
- Kassianidou, V. 2013. The exploitation of the landscape: metal resources and the copper trade during the Age of the Cypriot city-kingdoms. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 370: 49–82.
- Knapp, B. 2009. Migration, hybridisation and collapse: Bronze Age Cyprus and the Eastern Mediterranean, in A. Cardarelli, A. Cazzella, M. Frangipane and R. Peroni (eds) *Scienze dell'Antichità*: 219–39. *Storia archeologia antropologia* 15. Rome: Rome University 'La Sapienza'.
- Masson, E. and Masson, O. 1983. Les objets inscrits de Palaepaphos-Skales, in V. Karageorghis (ed.) *Palaepaphos-Skales: An Iron Age Cemetery in Cyprus*: 411–15. Constance.
- Michaelidou-Nicolaou, I. 1993. Nouveaux documents pour le syllabaire chypriote, *BCH* 117, 346–47.
- Morpurgo-Davies, A. and J.-P., Olivier 2012. Syllabic scripts and languages in the second and first millennia BC, in G. Cadogan, M. Iacovou, K. Kopaka, and J. Whitley (eds) *Parallel Lives: Ancient Island Societies in Crete and Cyprus*: 105–18. British School at Athens Studies 20. London: British School at Athens.
- Olivier, J.-P. 2013. The development of Cypriot syllabaries, from Enkomi to Kafizin, in P. Steele (ed.) *Syllabic Writing on Cyprus and Its Context*: 7–26. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Papantoniou, G. 2012. *Religion and Social Transformations in Cyprus. From the Cypriot Basileis to the Hellenistic Strategos* (Mnemosyne 347). Leiden: Brill.
- Papantoniou, G. 2012. Cypriot sanctuaries and religion in the Early Iron Age: views from before and after, in M. Iacovou (ed.) *Cyprus and the Aegean in the Early Iron Age - The Legacy of Nicolas Coldstream*: 285–319. Nicosia, Cyprus: Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation.
- Papantoniou, G., N. Kyriakou, A. Sarris and M. Iacovou 2014. Sacred topography in Iron Age Cyprus: the case of Vavla-Kapsalaes, in C. Papadopoulos, E. Paliou, A. Chrysanthi, E. Kotoula and A. Sarris (eds) *Archaeological Research in the Digital Age*: 70–75. Rethymnon: Institute for Mediterranean Studies – Foundation of Research and Technology (IMS-FORTH).
- Peltenburg, E. 2012. Text meets material culture in Late Bronze Age Cyprus, in A. Georgiou (ed.) *Cyprus - An Island Culture: Society and Social Relations from the Bronze Age to the Venetian Period*: 1–23. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Peltenburg, E. and M. Iacovou 2012. Crete and Cyprus: contrasting political configurations, in G. Cadogan, M. Iacovou, K. Kopaka, and J. Whitley (eds) *Parallel Lives: Ancient Island Societies in Crete and Cyprus*: 345–363. British School at Athens Studies 20. Athens: British School at Athens.
- Rupp, D.W. 1987. 'Vive le Roi'. The emergence of the state in Iron Age Cyprus, in D. Rupp (ed.), *Western Cyprus: Connections. An Archaeological Symposium*. *Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology* 77: 147–68. Göteborg: Åström.
- Satraki, A. 2012. *Kyprioi Basileis apo ton Kosmaso mechri ton Nikokreonta*. *Archaioignosia* 9. Athens: University of Athens.
- Satraki, A. 2013. The iconography of Basileis in Archaic and Classical Cyprus: manifestations of royal power in the visual record. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 370: 123–144.
- Steele, P. 2013a. *A Linguistic History of Ancient Cyprus: The Non-Greek Languages, and their Relations with Greek, c.1600–300 BC*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Steele, P. 2013b. *Syllabic Writing on Cyprus and Its Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Teixidor, J. 1975. Early Phoenician presence in Cyprus, analysis of epigraphical material, in N. Robertson (ed.) *The Archaeology of Cyprus: Recent Developments*: 121–128. New York: Park Ridge, NJ.
- Valério, M. 2018. Cypro-Minoan: an Aegean-derived syllabary on Cyprus (and elsewhere), in S. Ferrara and M. Valério (eds) *Paths into Script Formation in the Ancient Mediterranean*: Studi Micenei ed Egeo-

- Anatolici, Nuova Serie, Supplemento 1. Roma: Consiglio Nazionale Ricerche.
- Yon, M. 2004. *Kition dans les textes. Testimonia littéraires et épigraphiques et Corpus des inscriptions. Kition-Bamboula 5*. Paris: Editions recherche sur les civilisations.
- Webb, J.M. 2002. Device, image, and coercion: the role of glyptic in the political economy of Late Bronze Age Cyprus, in J. Smith (ed.) *Script and Seal Use on Cyprus in the Bronze and Iron Ages* : 111–154. Boston, MA: Archaeological Institute of America.
- Webb, J.M. 2005. Ideology, iconography and identity. The role of foreign goods and images in the establishment of social hierarchy in Late Bronze Age Cyprus, in J. Clarke (ed.) *Archaeological Perspectives on the Transmission and Transformation of Culture in the Eastern Mediterranean: 177–82. Levant Suppl. 2*: Oxford.

Metaxia Tsipopoulou. *Petras, Siteia I. A Minoan Palatial Settlement in Eastern Crete. Excavation of Houses I.1 and I.2*. pp. 486, 57 b/w illustration, 48 b/w plates. 2016. Philadelphia: Instap Academic Press. ISBN 978–1–931534–85–7 hardback \$80.00

This volume is the third in a series that publishes the final results of the excavations at Petras. The first volume was dedicated to the Cretan Hieroglyphic archive from the palace, the second to the proceedings of the first Petras symposium that took place in 2010. Since the publication of the volume under review in 2016, the second Petras symposium that took place in 2015 has also been published.

The site of Petras is spread out over four hills (I-IV), which with two valleys in between that were filled with water, offered safe anchorage to boats in the Bronze Age. A Final Neolithic/EM I site is located on Hill II (Kephala), which also houses an extensive prepalatial-early protopalatial cemetery. In EM II, occupation moved to Hill I, which is also the location of the Protopalatial Wall, the Lakkos Deposit, the MM IIA Palace and the Proto- and Neopalatial settlement (Sectors I-III). The current volume is the first of two covering Sector I of the settlement, which is situated to the north-east of the Palace and comprises House I.1. and the partially excavated House I.2. It comprises chapters covering the stratigraphy and architecture (Tsipopoulou), the Early and

Middle Minoan pottery (Relaki), the Protopalatial, Neopalatial and Postpalatial cooking ware (Alberti), the miniature vessels (Simandiraki-Grimshaw) and the potters' marks (Tsipopoulou). Other chapters in the current volume cover figurines (Simandiraki-Grimshaw), textile production (Cutler), stone vases (Tsipopoulou), ground stone implements (Dierckx), obsidian (D'Annibale), mammalian faunal remains (Isaakidou) and marine faunal remains (Theodoropoulou). Note that the Neopalatial and Postpalatial pottery as well as the petrographical analytical work will appear in the next volume of Sector I.

Sector I was inhabited from the Middle Minoan period (transition MM IB/MM IIA) onwards, especially in its north-western part. The Protopalatial ceramic material from House I.1. points towards patterns of consumption on a notably smaller scale than the Lakkos Deposit but on a larger scale than the nuclear household, and are associated with a larger corporate group. Chronologically, the material from House I.1 bridges the gap between the MM IB Lakkos material and the first palatial establishment in MM IIA, and shows that relatively large consumption events were fairly regular in the settlement in the time just before and at the turn of the MM IIA period.

House I.1 was built in the Early Neopalatial period over the Protopalatial remains and was enlarged in a second Neopalatial (LM IA) phase. In its first phase, it consisted of five rooms (A, M, E, Lambda and 1–2) on the ground floor and probably also an upper story. The other rooms were added in LM IA. House I.1. was deserted after an earthquake destruction in LM IA and fell into ruin to be partially reoccupied in LM IIIA and LM IIIB. The partially excavated House I.2 was separated from I.1. by a narrow passage and reveals a similar building history as the latter.

House I.1. is interesting because it gives us an idea of how a Neopalatial house lacking in elite/palatial-type architectural features functioned and how it was integrated in the urban tissue through open spaces and passages. On its ground floor, it contained a wine-press installation and two storage rooms (E and Lambda) which, in contrast to the former, were only accessible from the first floor by means of ladders. Rooms M and A, which provided access to the stone wine-press installation, contained pithoi. On the whole, however, the house had low storage potential. Rooms engaged in the preparation of foodstuffs (Room Ksi) and rooms that were used as workspaces (Rooms 1–2 and Area 3) were also identified on the ground floor. Two pits (Thita and I) can be connected with the deposition of pottery

related to consumption activities. The open areas in Sector I were used for the manufacture of obsidian blades and stone vases as well as the preparation of food and keeping domestic animals. The pattern displayed by the obsidian from House I.1 is similar to other domestic contexts in Eastern Crete and characterized by a low frequency with 58 blades. The lack of waste material is explained by the fact that cores arrived on site as prepared products from which the occupants made their own blades.

The study of the cooking wares from Petras confirms previously identified distinctions between East and South-Central cooking wares and also suggests that cooking or other activities involving fire and embers/charcoal were taking place on a significant scale. Remains of cattle, pigs, sheep, goats, dogs and deer were recovered from EM II to LM III contexts, but the main assemblages date to LM I. A greater concentration of bones was noted in external or peripheral areas and the larger the sample, the wider the range of species and body parts represented. It is interesting to note that the animal bones show no dismembering marks but traces of burning suggest that more or less complete carcasses were roasted. Loomweights testify to the specialized production of textiles made with very thin to thin thread. The majority are discoid and cuboid and Cutler suggests that these could have been used in the manufacture of two different types of cloth, respectively dense, balanced textiles and weft-faced fabrics, or together in order to produce a pattern weave.

In all, 267 vases from Sector I bear potter's marks, an amount equal to the amount found at Malia, the majority of which are Neopalatial in date. Such marks are attested from the MM IB/MM IIA period onward and during the entire Neopalatial period. Although figurines from domestic contexts are generally rare on Crete, House I.1. yielded 13 bovine figurine fragments, while an anthropomorphic torso was found in House I.2.

The high standard of excavation and publication of the site of Petras is to be applauded. This publication and the forthcoming ones of the settlement at Petras will provide an indispensable tool for scholars interested in studying the social, political and economic organisation of a central place and its hinterland in East Crete.

ILSE SCHOEP
 KU LEUVEN, DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY
 ilse.schoep@kuleuven.be

Haggis, D. 2007. Stylistic diversity and diacritical feasting at Protopalatial Petras: a preliminary analysis of the Lakkos Deposit. *American Journal of Archaeology* 111: 715–775.

Tsipopolou, M. (ed.) 2012. *Petras, Siteia: 25 Years of Excavations and Studies. Acts of a Two-Day Conference held at the Danish Institute at Athens, 9-10 October 2010* (Monographs of the Danish Institute at Athens 16). Athens: the Danish Institute at Athens.

Tsipopolou, M. (ed.) 2018. *Petras, Siteia. The Pre-and Protopalatial Cemetery in Context. Acts of a Two-Day Conference held at the Danish Institute at Athens, 14-15 February 2015* (Monographs of the Danish Institute at Athens 21), Athens: the Danish Institute at Athens.

Tsipopolou, M. and E. Hallager 2010. *The Hieroglyphic Archive at Petras, Siteia* (Monographs of the Danish Institute at Athens 9), Athens: the Danish Institute at Athens.

A. Bernard Knapp and Stella Demesticha. *Mediterranean connections: maritime transport containers and seaborne trade in the Bronze and Early Iron Ages.* pp. xiv+263, 49 figs, (6 b/w pls.), 7 tables, 7 maps. 2017. New York and Abingdon: Routledge. ISBN 978-1-629-58354-9 hardback £80.99; 978-1-315-53700-9 eBook from £21.

This is a fairly short but important book that focuses on the part played in seaborne trade by the 'maritime transport containers' of the title (hereafter MTCs). It is packed with data; it is particularly useful to have authoritative accounts of the east Mediterranean material and of the great quantities of information now available from provenance studies and organic residue analysis. Almost inevitably some more recent studies like Stockhammer 2015 (which must have come out as it went to press) have been missed, but in general the coverage of the mass of accounts and studies of the material seems close to comprehensive. The book is produced to quite high standards, with a sturdy hard cover, and contains numerous illustrations and maps; the place names on the latter are often in notably small print, but still legible. The reviewer has spotted very few errors, but it does seem worth commenting that Dr Televantou's name is twice misspelt on p. 6, and that Cicones is the name of a people, not a person (p. 146).

MTCs are defined as types of ceramic vessel which were specially produced to be suitable for transporting goods in bulk by ship, the predecessors and to a considerable extent the ancestors of the amphorae that were so common in the historical Greek and Roman world. They require skilled potting, since they must be manufactured in a fabric that is or can be made watertight, so as not likely to interact with the contents, and they must be assembled from separate sections because of their size. They tend to have narrow necks, to make sealing them easier, and a body with two opposite handles on or near the shoulder, that can be elongated in developed examples to a foot small enough to be used like a third handle and so make carrying them and tipping out contents easier. They share some of these characteristics with storage vessels, from which the well-known types often seem to have developed, but many forms of storage vessel have relatively wide mouths and so are unsuitable for more than short journeys. The MTC proper is clearly associated with long-distance trade in liquids like wine and olive oil, also resins, sometimes foodstuffs, and at least once orpiment (a mineral form of arsenic). A wide array is named in Egyptian inscriptions on or about MTCs (pp. 51, 150), but some, like milk or meat, would hardly have kept fresh for very long, so surely indicate local reuse of the container, which could have been quite a common practice.

After a short introduction in Ch. 1, the next two chapters consider different facets of the contexts in which these containers have been found and would have been used. Thus, Ch. 2 deals with actual shipwrecks in the Aegean and East Mediterranean and the harbour and port sites where the ships would have called, while Ch. 3 deals on a general level with the mechanisms and social setting, the routes of circulation and the time involved, and what commodities were typical. It is important to be reminded how few certain or very likely wreck sites have been found, given the amount of sea-borne trade there evidently was by the Late Bronze Age. Only eight are identified as of Bronze Age date in the whole Aegean and east Mediterranean, although the existence of others can be guessed at from finds of metal ingots, as off Kyme harbour in north Euboea (p. 15) and at Hishuley Carmel south of Haifa (p. 6). The picture becomes even more patchy in the Early Iron Age, when only three certain wrecks have been identified, none in the Aegean (two are in deep water off Ashkelon, of likely eighth century date, one off the coast of southwest Turkey and probably c. 700–650 BC). The reference to a wreck in the Yagana bay off the channel between Ithaka and Kephallonia (pp. 73, 74) is of relevance to the Aegean

and particularly interesting, because it contained an early type of MTC, perhaps Cycladic, and so is dated to the later Early Bronze Age, when there are other grounds for supposing local connections with the Aegean. But no comparably early MTCs have yet been reported from other sites in north-west Greece and the Ionian Sea region.

At this point it should be noted that the status of the claimed Early Bronze Age wreck at Dokos in the Saronic Gulf is more questionable than suggested; the doubts expressed best by Broodbank¹ need to be answered. It might seem likely that it includes elements of a wreck, for there is a considerable quantity of fragmentary storage vessels that could be MTCs, but much of the material as reported has a very 'domestic' appearance and, like all the wreck sites apart from the most famous, Cape Gelidonya and Uluburun, it does not include remains of a boat. The other sites, of Middle and Late Bronze Age date (the reference to them all as *Late* Bronze Age or Early Iron Age on p. 166 is clearly an error missed in editing), show a clear predominance of MTC types (full details are cited on p. 156) or, in the case of Cape Gelidonya, relatively few MTCs but a substantial group of metal ingots and bars that are clearly cargo. Great quantities of MTCs and ingots (including many of glass) were found on the late fourteenth century Uluburun wreck, which stands out as an example of international trade at the top level, with a cargo of several valuable materials. Much of this may have been intended for one or more 'palatial' consumers (cf. pp. 157, 166); the possibility that some was a 'gift' at royal level of the kind described in the diplomatic correspondence of the time cannot be ruled out. As the text indicates, an enormous amount of detail is now known about Uluburun, though a full publication is still awaited. Cape Gelidonya, probably late thirteenth century, is more or less fully published, and much is known about the Point Iria site of similar date (Argolid, wrongly labelled Cape Iria on Map 26), but the others are known only from preliminary reports of varying detail (one in an unpublished thesis). All these seem to have been operating at a distinctly lower level than Uluburun; only Cape Gelidonya contained a significant cargo of other materials, and only this and the Point Iria site have produced material that must come from outside the Aegean.

As is indicated in Ch. 3, representations of boats and ships in various media are not uncommon (but the supposedly Early Cycladic lead boat models are unlikely to be genuine,² and quite a number of sites

¹ Broodbank 2000, 97.

² Cf. Sherratt 2000: 100–02.

in the Aegean may be considered likely ports, where cargoes were loaded and unloaded, but evidence for harbour installations of any kind has been hard to find until recently. Many of the supposed features now underwater near Minoan sites in Crete are in fact undatable, as is pointed out, but plausible ancillary structures have been identified on land. Notable are the complex at Kommos whose origins go back to Middle Minoan times, including now a likely slipway for pulling boats, and possibly larger ships, up for storage,³ and another Middle Minoan complex recently identified at Gournia; at both, stone anchors like those well known in Cyprus and the Levant have been found (pp. 14–15). On the mainland submerged platforms at Kalamianos on the Saronic Gulf, apparently founded as a port in late Mycenaean times, may well be harbour installations, but the authors are cautious about accepting the claim for a whole artificial harbour at Romanou near Pylos, presumably created in the days of Pylos's importance as a palatial centre (p. 15). It is certainly not impossible, given what is known about Mycenaean engineering work, and it has the support of the Pylos Regional Archaeological Project, but it would be helpful to have corroboration from other experts. Much better evidence for harbour installations can be found at major Levantine towns in the Early Iron Age, when their inhabitants became famous as the Phoenicians.

Much of the meat of the book is in Ch. 4, which covers the history of MTCs in the east Mediterranean in considerable detail. Many types of vessel are discussed, and in several cases the claims that they were MTCs are dismissed, because they do not seem to be of types that were deliberately created for maritime transport and often have features like wide mouths that would hinder their use as such. But the main outlines of development are clear. In the Near East, although some of the earliest evidence for possibly sea-borne trade relates to Egypt (p. 42), the centre of development was in the coastal towns of the Levant, which were already shipping vessels containing liquids to Egypt in the Early Bronze Age. This was the context in which the famous 'Canaanite jar' was developed. It was already common in Egypt in Middle Kingdom times, and a few fragments, of 'probably more than one pot',⁴ even reached Middle Minoan Knossos. In the Late Bronze Age versions of the type spread all over the east Mediterranean and reached as far west as Sardinia and as far north in the Aegean as Troy.⁵ It

was so popular that a local version was developed in Egypt, and it was quite possibly made locally on Cyprus also. Its distribution is patchy in the Aegean, but it occurs in quantity at Kommos, where a Short-necked Amphora seems to have been developed in imitation in Postpalatial times, but has barely been found elsewhere so far (pp. 93–6). The Canaanite jar is also found more sparsely (often in important graves) at about a dozen late Mycenaean sites on the Greek mainland, especially Tiryns, where fragments of 21 are reported from settlement levels, mostly on the Lower Citadel.⁶ Some 150 examples of varying sizes were found on the Uluburun wreck, and it continued to be a standard form, changed to a more 'torpedo'-like shape, well into historical times; even larger collections than at Uluburun have been estimated for the two eighth century wrecks off Ashkelon (p. 119).

The development of MTCs in the Aegean was effectively independent of the Near East, but the earliest types, apparently Cycladic in origin and argued to be linked to the development of a regular trading system, necessarily maritime, did not get outside the Aegean orbit (but do appear at Yagana in the Ionian Sea). The next form to become prominent was a Cretan storage jar shape, the Oval-Mouthed Amphora, found in wreck sites near Pseira and close to the island of Elaphonisi off the coast of Laconia, and also as an 'import' in the Egyptian Delta (pp. 77–8). But the most important development in the Aegean was that of the Transport Stirrup Jar (TSJ), developed in Crete in the early Neopalatial period but really becoming prominent in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries, when it was produced at several Cretan centres and perhaps also in important Mycenaean regions like the Argolid and Boeotia. Finds are distributed in the Mediterranean almost as widely as those of the 'Canaanite jar', but in smaller numbers outside the Aegean, although the total now known is likely to exceed 500. The TSJ was clearly associated with a system of bulk production and export of liquids, often olive oil, whose major significance is underlined by the fact that a proportion of these jars have Linear B inscriptions, although inscribed examples hardly ever appear outside the Aegean (pp. 81–4). Like the 'Canaanite jar', it may quite often have been reused, as might well be suspected in cases where single examples turn up at sites.

Ch. 5 brings all this material together, concentrating particularly on the organisation and mechanisms

³ Shaw 2018. I am grateful to Prof. J.W. Shaw for sending me a copy of this article, and for comments on an earlier draft of this review.

⁴ MacGillivray 1998, 170.

⁵ Their presence at Troy was indicated in the paper published as

Pavuk 2005, and they were specifically mentioned as occurring in Troy VIIa in the Mycenaean Seminar given by Pavuk at the Institute of Classical Studies, London, on 9th December 2009.

⁶ Stockhammer 2015, 179–81.

of trade using MTCs and the political setting of such trade, and Ch. 6 summarises conclusions. The discussion in these considers important questions such as whether the originating port of ships can be established and whether it matters, and how far those operating the ships were independent of or controlled by the rulers, usually kings, of their home bases – in fact, how far they resembled ‘merchants’ as we are accustomed to imagine them in historical times. Certainly, the written evidence from the great Levantine trading centre of Ugarit suggests that the most important ‘merchants’ were members of the elite and might act as agents of the king, but there is no need to suppose that this was true of all ship operators; some of the Aegean wrecks and even Cape Gelidonya may well belong to traders whose activities were much less extensive in range and economic value. But it is worth considering that even such ‘ordinary’ traders could have been important members of their communities; crewing and maintaining a trading ship is likely to have required substantial resources.

The Mediterranean-wide distribution of the ‘Canaanite jar’ and TSJ, along with a third type, handleless necked pithoi of considerable size manufactured in Cyprus, which are found on several wrecks and reached Sicily and Sardinia, and the wide range of foreign material found at evidently significant port sites, particularly Kommos, certainly provide speaking evidence of the extent and complexity of the international fourteenth-thirteenth century trade network that distributed MTCs so widely in the Mediterranean. But it should not be forgotten that the MTCs only represent part of the story. The extraordinary treasure trove of the Uluburun wreck and the less impressive but still significant quantities of metal from the Cape Gelidonya wreck remind us that raw materials like metal, especially the constituents of bronze, were also in constant demand, as were luxuries like ivory and glass, which was popular enough for the technology of making it to be spreading into the Aegean and part of Europe at this time. The Aegean was not a great producer of such raw materials, although metal sources of copper, silver and lead were certainly exploited during the Bronze Age, but it was clearly a consumer on a scale beyond what could be met locally; the evidence of MTCs provides some indication of what it had to offer in exchange, supported by rare texts like that concerning the Ugarit merchant Sinaranu, whose ship brought grain, beer and oil from Crete (p. 11).

The widespread troubles in the east Mediterranean and Aegean in the late thirteenth and early twelfth centuries, which included the collapse of the Hittite

‘empire’ and the ‘palatial’ societies of the Aegean, and the abandonment of Ugarit and other major centres, effectively brought an end to the Bronze Age system of international trade. The sequel in the Early Iron Age reveals a striking difference between the Levant and the Aegean. In the former, many of the trading towns survived and the ‘Canaanite jar’ continued to be a standard form, produced in great quantities in its more streamlined form. The links between the east and central Mediterranean may never have been broken; certainly, Levantine traders seem to have been calling at Kommos again, presumably on the way west, as early as the eleventh century, and Crete as a whole retained stronger connections with the Near East than did the surviving centres elsewhere in the Aegean, which seems to have had little attraction for such traders. The decline even in trade within the Aegean is indicated by the disappearance of the TSJ before the end of the Bronze Age, and it is not until the tenth century that any indication of relatively long-distance maritime trade can be identified. By then, locally produced forms of neck-handled, paint-decorated amphora were being carried about quite widely in the north Aegean, and a special connection seems to have been established between Euboea, particularly Lefkandi, and Tyre, where Euboean-style pottery including neck-handled amphorae has been found. But the quantities involved in these movements are very small, and the first evidence for renewed large-scale production of amphorae that could serve as MTCs dates in the eighth century: one type, apparently produced at several centres, continued the north Aegean tradition on a larger scale, while others can be associated with Athens (the very widely distributed SOS amphorae) and Corinth (going mostly to the western colonies). But then and for a long time to come the insistence on local independence ensured that no standard form like the ‘Canaanite jar’ developed.

Thus, from the Aegean point of view the evidence cited in the book makes very clear an essential difference in experience from the Near East. However much one may wish to qualify the traditional picture of a ‘dark age’ in the Aegean following the collapse of the Bronze Age civilisations, and to emphasise positive features, it was not until the eighth century that Aegean centres began to be active again in large-scale maritime trade in the Mediterranean. This underlines the reality of the decline, and the close relationship between the renewed involvement in such trade and the revival of general prosperity in the Aegean.

Overall, the great range of this book and the careful and sensible nature of the discussion make it a very

valuable addition to studies of early trade in the Mediterranean.

OLIVER DICKINSON
READER EMERITUS
DURHAM UNIVERSITY, UK
otpkdickinson@googlemail.com

- Broodbank, C. 2000. *An Island Archaeology of the Early Cyclades*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cline, E.H. (ed.) 2010. *The Oxford Handbook of the Bronze Age Aegean*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MacGillivray, A. 1998. *Knossos: Pottery Groups of the Old Palace Period*. London: British School of Archaeology at Athens.
- Pavuk, P. 2005. Aegean and Anatolians: a Trojan perspective, in R.A. Laffineur and E. Greco (eds) *Emporia: Aegeans in the Central and Eastern Mediterranean. Proceedings of the 10th International Aegean Conference/10e Rencontre égéenne internationale, Athens, Italian School of Archaeology, April 14-18, 2004* (Aegaeum 25): 269–79. Liège: Université de Liège.
- Shaw, J.W. 2018. The earliest harbour installations on Aegean foreshores. *The International Journal of Nautical Archaeology* 48.1: 85–102.
- Sherratt, S. 2000. *Catalogue of Cycladic Antiquities in the Ashmolean Museum. The Captive Spirit*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stockhammer, P.W. 2015. Levantine and Cypriot pottery in Mycenaean Greece as mirrors of intercultural contacts, in A. Babbi, F. Bubenheimer-Erhart, B. Marín-Aguilera, and S. Mühl (eds) *The Mediterranean Mirror. Cultural Contacts in the Mediterranean Sea between 1200 and 750 B.C. International Post-doc and Young Researcher Conference, Heidelberg, 6th-8th October 2012*. RGZM Tagungen Band 20: 177–87. Mainz: Verlag des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums.

Emily S.K. Anderson. *Seals, craft and community in Bronze Age Crete*. pp. xv+324, b/w illustrations. 2016. New York: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978–1–107–13119–4 hardback. \$70.

After a list of illustrations (191 b/w), acknowledgements, and an introduction, five chapters and a lengthy appendix constitute the core of the book. There then follow references

(bibliography), (end)notes, and an index.* The book's introduction and five chapters mostly present anthropological theories and constructions of Cretan society in the late PrePalatial period (ca. 2300–1900 BCE) seen through the lenses of other, presumably similar societies, cultures, and ethnologies as studied by a variety of quoted scholars. The chapter titles give an indication of themes, sometimes promising archaeological data (e.g., 'Identity and Relation through Early Cretan Glyptic' [ch. 2], 'In the Hands of the Craftsperson: Innovation and Repetition across Cretan Communities' [ch. 4]), sometimes teasing the reader with poetic playfulness (e.g., 'Rethinking Prepalatial Crete: Social Innovation on an Island of Persistence' [ch. 1], 'Distance and Nearness: Fundamental Changes to the Dynamics of Seal Use in Late Prepalatial Crete' [ch. 3]).

The book has been out almost three years now, but there has been only one review (that this reviewer knows of), by Borja Legarra Herrero,¹ who concentrates on Anderson's more theoretical treatments of early Cretan society and leaves the glyptic material to specialists. Anderson's Introduction basically presents the entire book's foci, which are often repeated separately in the individual chapters. I give here a summary of her three main points: 1) what was the particular nature of power in Prepalatial Crete? 2) 'Indeed, in a rush to identify marked points of social transformation, not only have we likely failed to recognize the impressive perpetuation of Prepalatial lifeways, but we have also potentially contorted data in a desire to see alteration' (p. 2). And 3) 'I develop an alternative approach to late Prepalatial social dynamics that rethinks the underlying nature of change in this period, seeking its impetus within quietly performed and often neglected practices of sociocultural innovation. (...) (F)undamental developments did take form in people's interactive experience, but they came about by means of ongoing, rhythmic creative processes in daily life' (p. 3). This all seems sensible, although the language Anderson uses marks the difference between her theoretical, comparative anthropological approach and the one that this reviewer favors, a language focused on a single culture and artifacts, namely Minoan seals that drive the discussion.

* Abbreviations for journals and for standard reference works are those followed by the *American Journal of Archaeology*: <https://www.ajaonline.org/submissions/standard-reference> (accessed 8 June 2019), and for ancient authors by the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*: <https://oxfordre.com/classics/page/abbreviation-list/> (accessed 8 June 2019).

¹ Legarra Herrero 2017.

So I pass on to the archaeological evidence presented in the appendix (171–287), leaving the theoretical assessments of early Minoan culture to others. Of the book's more than 320 pages, the appendix occupies a third. Its 117 pages presents discussions of 57 examples of Paul Yule's Parading Lions/Spiral (PL-S) Complex² – two pages per seal.

I accepted Anderson's book to review for *JGA* because Yule's Pre- and ProtoPalatial groups of seals have not received much assessment in the 30 years since they first appeared – not that his groups need any revision: they certainly have stood the test of time and are still valid, both stylistically and chronologically. But I was hoping for a modern interpretation of the importance of his PL/S group. Anderson uses the PL/S group to promote a social interpretation of the late PrePalatial period, but it does not seem enlightening to me. She lays great stress on the group's material (almost exclusively hippopotamus ivory), its primary iconography (lions), and the group's few impressions on clay. I think she does all three categories slight justice. Yule's PL/S group originally consisted of 60 seals,³ almost all of which are cylinders in shape with the carving, not, as in Near Eastern cylinders, around the barrel of the cylinder, but on the two ends (faces); they are therefore bifacial stamp seals, with the larger face almost always carrying the primary motif (often lions, but also often other animals and spiriliform patterns) and the smaller face carrying subordinate curvilinear patterns. Anderson's appendix adds more examples discovered since Yule's day, but selects only seals with lions (and one or two examples with other animals, including men), neglecting those seals whose primary face carries spiriliform patterns. I think this culling does a disservice to the PL/S group, subordinating its significance only to its lion iconography, which the author many times refers to as the 'first iconographical tradition of any kind on the island' (7, and *passim*), as if the earlier lines and hatching on EM I-II seals are beneath consideration.

Anderson assumes that the purpose of these stamp-cylinders was to impress clay sealings. She does not characterize the functions of the impressions she lists, but vaguely talks of the seal owners 'stamping impressions on objects (...) as an act of

social incorporation' (131). I think one can be more specific. Anderson cites seven PL/S seals impressing clay objects: an impression on a clay weight (*CMS* II 6.190), three impressed jar handles (*CMS* II 6.191, 223, 225), an impressed jar stopper (*CMS* II 8.6), three object sealings (pressed against boxes?) that were impressed by two different stamps (*CMS* II 8.32, *CMS* VS 3.324). Only the object sealings could imply an administrative function; the impressed jar stopper probably expressed an internal domestic use; the impressed jar handles and weight are probably 'pot marks.'

There is thus still no solid evidence in the Cretan PrePalatial period that seals stamped sealings that were retained by a central administration as receipts for commodities (taxes) rendered (the so-called 'Near Eastern sealing system'). That was the case on the Greek mainland in the slightly earlier EH II period where we have an impressive series of 'Corridor Houses' that taxed outlying districts, received their goods in boxes tied in twine and sealed with clay impressed by bifacial cylinder stamps (like those of the PL/S group); the sealings were ripped off the boxes, their contents (textiles?) were then used (exported?), and the sealings were retained as receipts. Even though Anderson cites M. Heath Wiencke's meticulous studies of the Lerna sealings,⁴ and Weingarten's series of interpretative essays on the later, ProtoPalatial development of the 'Near Eastern' sealing system in Crete, she seems to assume that such a system was, however, in use in EM Crete – it was not.⁵

So what was the function of PL/S seals? Anderson does not mention the two unique characteristics of the PL/S stamp cylinders: their two engraved faces and their so-called 'Δ' stringholes. By excising from consideration the spiriliform patterns on the smaller faces of the stamp cylinders she elides their probable functional and semantic meaning in apposition to the larger faces. The Mainland EH II bureaucrats used similar stamp cylinders with two engraved faces, the smaller ones sometimes to 'confirm' or augment the stamped impressions of the larger faces. If the PL/S bifacial stamp cylinders were used similarly, in a domestic situation that would have left little trace in the archaeological record, then people could have used their stamps to secure primary deposits of domestic goods while secondary re-openings could have utilized secondary impressions made by the smaller ends of these seals.⁶

² Yule 1977: the stamp-cylinder shapes, pp. 89–90, the stylistic group pp. 208–209.

³ To Yule's original list Anderson adds 26 additional seals and from it omits 30. The seals she adds all have lions on them; the seals she omits have mostly spiriliform patterns on the primary face and almost no lions. Since several of the seals she adds were known to Yule though he did not include them in his group, she should have explained why she adds them to his group but he did not.

⁴ Heath 1958; Heath Wiencke 1969a and 1969b; and Weingarten 1986, 1990, 1992, 2018.

⁵ Weingarten 2018: 331.

⁶ See Hallaq 1994.

About the Δ stringholes: since the stringhole cannot go lengthwise through the cylinder without marring the designs engraved on the faces, there are instead three holes in the barrel of the cylinder, two oblique drill holes that flank and meet a third in the centre (for a drawing, see the PL/S hemisphere, CMS VI 6, based on a drawing and discussion by Yule).⁷ Yule and later scholars have interpreted these Δ stringholes as implying that the stamp cylinder hung like a pendant, dangling horizontally from a cord or thong around the owner's neck. Such a wear practice would place emphasis on the seal's shape, its horizontal position at the neck, and material; one would have to get very close to see the iconography engraved on the ends. Worn this way, the wearer might find it slightly cumbersome to use the PL/S seal frequently to stamp clay objects. In other words, the Δ stringholes imply an infrequent and non-administrative use for these seals.

So, if stamping clay objects was not the primary function of PL/S seals, what was their function? Every culture in the eastern Mediterranean had its own special seal shapes, sometimes materials too, and iconography.⁸ One could tell from a distance the ethnicity and class of a person by the shape and material of their seals and, coming nearer, one could detect their political status within the regional polity by their seals' iconography. In other words, PL/S stamps in their limited cylindrical shapes and limited material (hippopotamus ivory) were primarily ethnic identity markers, with two faces denoting primary and secondary (confirmation) uses. Anderson states several times that PL/S seals 'have been discovered at sites across the island' (7, and *passim*). This is not true, and even her distribution map (fig. 3.5) shows a concentration of PL/S seals from Haghia Triada to Pyrgos, with only outliers from farther west and east. PL/S seals are therefore ethnic identity markers primarily of the inhabitants of central Crete.

Anderson also makes a connection between the exotic lion iconography and the exotic hippopotamus ivory material. It is true that lions never inhabited Crete, but they did inhabit the Greek and Balkan mainland,⁹ which should mean that even Minoans knew of them (as Legarra Herrero points out)¹⁰ and would not have mistaken the very large hippo tusks and incisors for the much shorter lion teeth (*pace* Anderson).¹¹ As for the hippo ivory: it is conventional

among glyptic scholars to assume that extant seals represent approximately 5% of the original output.¹² Thus the 57 hippo PL/S seals that Anderson cites may be all that is left of an original 1140 stamp cylinders (57/0.05). If all these were more or less the same size, roughly H. 2 x D. 2 cm., the total amount of hippo ivory needed for these 1140 seals would have been 7,163 cm³,¹³ and if a single hippo tusk (canine) and incisor is roughly 40+ cm in length and roughly conoid in shape¹⁴ with a base of about 8 cm in diameter, it would have had a volume of ca. 670 cm³.¹⁵ If the original PL/S group consisted of 1140 seals, these would have represented¹⁶ ca. 11 hippo canines and incisors, or (with four canines and four incisors per hippo) no more than two animals. I thus imagine a single shipment sometime in the late PrePalatial period of a few hippo tusks. Compare the hippo dentines from the Ulu Burun wreck: six canines and seven incisors, representing roughly two animals. Anderson does not cite the impressive MA thesis by K. Lafrenz¹⁷ that describes and analyses the Ulu Burun dentines. Although Lafrenz could not make a determination of a specific provenance, she does derive them from Egypt, Palestine, or Syria, via the customary cabotage shipping of port-to-port cargo-gathering¹⁸ in a counter clock-wise fashion that travelled north from Egypt, stopping at nightfall along the Levantine coast, and west along the southern Turkish coast into the southern Aegean. Had the Ulu Burun ship reached a Cretan destination, its hippo dentine cargo could have made its way inland across central Crete from the north, as similar cargoes did in Roman times when 'Gnossois' was the main entry harbour and Gortyn, in the middle of the Mesara, was the capital of the province, Crete and Cyrene.¹⁹

correlation made between the fantastic foreign creatures whose forms were carefully incised on the seals and equally fantastic fangs that provided the surface for those incisions (...). Hippo canines are 50+ cm in length (Lefrenz 2004); lion canines are up to 10 cm and human canines are about 1.5 cm (Cowen 2019). If seal engravers really thought a 50 cm hippo canine belonged to a lion, they would not have engraved them together with people at a proper scale on seals CMS III, nos. 222 and 300; and II6, no. 149.

¹² Younger 2018: 339, based on Betts and Younger 1982: 116–117.

¹³ Volume of a cylinder: $\pi r^2 h = 3.1416 \times 1^2 \times 2 \times 1140 = 7163 \text{ cm}^3$.

¹⁴ See <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hippopotamus>, photo of a tusk from Naqada tomb 1419.

¹⁵ Volume of a cone: $\pi r^2 \times h/3 = 3.1416 \times 4^2 \times 40/3 = 670.208 \text{ cm}^3$.

¹⁶ 7163 cm³ total amount of hippo dentine needed for the PL/S group divided by 670 cm³ per hippo canine = 10.69 hippo tusks/canines.

¹⁷ Lafrenz 2004.

¹⁸ Herodotos 1.1 describes such a cabotage boat arriving at the port of Argos from Phoenicia and spreading its trinkets on a cloth to attract barterers.

¹⁹ Sanders 1982; Younger 1969. Due to wind and sea currents, travel along the north coast of Crete went west to east; and along the south coast, east to west. Consequently a short-cut across the middle of the island would have been preferable to a dangerous sea voyage around the east end and south coast of the island – as St Paul found out.

⁷ Yule 1977: 61.

⁸ Younger 2018: 341.

⁹ Thomas 2014.

¹⁰ Legarra Herrero 2017: 2.

¹¹ Anderson, 94: 'While the lion as a factual being 'in the flesh' was also unknown to Cretans, we might assume that there was a

Finally, I'm not sure why Anderson divides her PL/S seals into the 10 subgroups discussed at length in the appendix. She implies that they might represent different creators of the PL/S seals or 'different subtraditions' (178). But since Anderson places several seals in two different subgroups, one face in one subgroup and the other in another,²⁰ is she implying two different engravers worked on one seal? I feel uncomfortable with such precision: the material of the seals is organic and veined (full of dentine tubules); the number of seals discussed is small, made within a very limited period of time in a rather small region. And I feel even more uncomfortable since I am not sure Anderson has examined the PL/S seals by autopsy, by actually holding them in her hands.²¹

JOHN G. YOUNGER
DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
PROGRAM IN JEWISH STUDIES
THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
LAWRENCE KS 66045
E: jyounger:@ku.edu

- Ameri, M., S. K. Costello, G. Jamison, and S. J. Scott (eds). 2018. *Seals and sealing in the ancient world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Betts, J.H., and J.G. Younger. 1982. Aegean seals of the Late Bronze Age: masters and workshops, introduction. *Kadmos* 21: 119–121.
- Cowen, A.M. 2019. Big cats, big teeth. Online website: <https://www.nationalgeographic.org/activity/big-cats-big-teeth/> (accessed 8 June 2019).
- Hallaq, D.M. 1994. Les sceaux des Grottes du Jebel el Akhdar, in P. Ferioli, et al. (eds) *Archives Before Writing*: 363–374. Rome: Ministero per i Beni Culturali e Ambientali.
- Heath, M.C. 1958. Early Helladic clay sealings from the House of the Tiles at Lerna. *Hesperia* 27: 81–121.
- Heath Wienke, M. 1969a. Further seals and sealings from Lerna. *Hesperia* 38: 500–521.
- Heath Wienke, M. 1969b. Typology and style of Prepalatial seals, in W.-D. Niemeier (ed.) *Studien zur minoischen und helladischen Glyptik (CMS Beiheft 1)*: 251–261. Berlin: Gebrüder Mann Verlag.
- Lafrenz, K. 2004. Tracing the source of the elephant and hippopotamus ivory from the 14th century B.C. Uluburun shipwreck: the archaeological, historical, and isotopic evidence. MA thesis, University of South Florida, published online: <https://scholarcommons.usf.edu>.
- Legarra Herrero, B. 2017. Review of Anderson 2016, *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 2017: 1–2.
- Sanders, I.F. 1982. *Roman Crete: An Archaeological Survey and Gazetteer of Late Hellenistic, Roman and Early Byzantine Crete*. Warminster: Aris and Philipps.
- Thomas, N. 2014. A lion's eye view of the Greek Bronze Age, in G. Touchais et al. (eds) *PHYSIS: L'environnement naturel et la relation homme-mieu dans le monde Égéen protohistorique (Aegaeum 37)*: 375–389. Leuven: Peeters.
- Weingarten, J. 1986. The sealing structures of Minoan Crete: MM II Phaistos to the destruction of the palace of Knossos. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 5: 279–298.
- Weingarten, J. 1990. Three upheavals in Minoan sealing administration: evidence for radical change. In T.G. Palaima (ed.) *Aegean Seals, Sealing and Administration (Aegaeum 5)*: 105–114. Liège and Austin: Université de Liège and the Program in Aegean Prehistory and Scripts, University of Texas.
- Weingarten, J. 1992. The multiple sealing system of Minoan Crete and its possible antecedents in Anatolia. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 11: 25–37.
- Weingarten, J. 2018. Introductory remarks: Aegean, in Ameri et al. (eds) *Seals and Sealing in the Ancient World*: 334–354. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Younger, J.G. 1969. The Romanization of Crete: Augustus to the Severans. Unpublished seminar paper, University of Cincinnati, 1969, archived in the Blegen Library at the American School of Classical Studies, Athens.
- Younger, J.G. 2018. Aegean Bronze Age sealstones and finger rings. Chronology and functions, in Ameri et al. (eds) *Seals and Sealing in the Ancient World*: 334–354. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Yule, P. 1977. *Early Cretan Seals*. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.

²⁰ E.g., CMS III 1, no. 336, face a with lions in her group 8 ('Elongated Heavy-headed') and face b with a star and leaves in her group 4 ('Single Lions').

²¹ Anderson mentions that she has studied the silicon casts of the seals kept in the CMS archives, now at Heidelberg (p. xiii). These casts were made in the 1960s (I have a complete set of photos of them, that I took in the 1970s); many of the dentine seals from the Mesara were consolidated with wax and glue in the 20th century (I have handled many of the cylinders, especially those from Platanos and Lebena). And though Anderson thanks the staff of the Herakleion Museum for their 'kind assistance' and the director of the museum, Stella Mandalaki, for 'providing crucial material' (p. xiv), Anderson nowhere specifically says that she actually has handled the seals she is writing about.

A. Bernard Knapp. *Seafaring and seafarers in the Bronze Age Eastern Mediterranean*. pp. 296. 52 colour b/w plates, 5 maps, 5 tables. 2018. Leiden: Sidestone Press. ISBN 97–90–8890–554–4 paperback. €34.95.

This well-priced short paperback (176 pages of text) has full references, an index, well-chosen and striking illustrations (the cover showing a Balearic scene) and several useful tables listing Ugaritic, Egyptian, Akkadian and Hittite text references of significance to the topic, as well as 5 maps, on which the lettering is somewhat too small for easy use. It will serve an informed public or student audience well as an expert guide to the known facts about how shipping and trade operated in the Bronze Age east Mediterranean, especially the Late Bronze Age (64 pages against 15 on the Early BA and 22 on the Middle BA). The presentation aims at straightforwardness (e.g. bullet-pointing themes at the start of chapters), and addresses texts and material culture in a balanced way. Having spent much of his career interpreting the evidence for trade and interaction in the region during the LBA, Knapp is well-qualified to sift data to illustrate his theme. Like much of his academically-targeted work, this is essentially a working-over of secondary material retrieved within others' research projects. Knapp does not feel a need here to put forward specific new arguments to make an analytical contribution, move interpretation forward, or drive new research. He chooses to focus exclusively on presenting the evidence for the mechanics and operation of shipping, including the personnel involved (the latter mainly in a functional sense). This is a subject more restricted than his usual reach and one which he rather mystifyingly states in the preface to be peripheral to his interests, though the statement 'There are several scholars better trained and equipped than I am to write a book such as this.' (p. 11) would contradict this. The lack of personally-generated new data or new arguments may explain why there is considerable repetition of data between the broadly chronological main chapters (Early, Middle and Late Bronze Age, 3–5) each subdivided by region (Egypt and the Levant, Cyprus, Anatolia) and also by categories of text or material object (Ports and Harbours, Ships Representations, Maritime Transport Containers, Stone Anchors/Fishing and Fishing Equipment): the same categories are also covered in some depth in his main introductory chapter 2 'Maritime Matters and Materials', inevitably causing repetition later on. In an evidence guide focused overtly on shipping/

seafarers, the inevitable incompleteness of the record for each period/area requires interpretative cross-support from the others. In addition, much evidence e.g. for ports and harbours crosses the periods in question. Thus by the end of the book we have heard a very great deal about the same evidence - e.g. Byblos; Ulu Burun; Ugarit; the Sea Peoples reliefs. Knapp could instead have filled out the book by a wider consideration of the factors and contexts affecting maritime operations, of which he is well aware as a specialist and around which there are lively and pertinent debates. It would have been possible to add this depth in a sophisticated way without making the book inaccessible to general readers (potentially improving the offer for the more specialised reader).

Important up-to-date primary and secondary source work on material culture which Knapp relies on heavily include continuing analyses and re-evaluations of Ugarit material, new work and publication at Dor, J. Webb's work at Lapithos, the recent excavations and surveys around Izmir conducted/analysed by V. Şahoğlu, and work at Akko and Tel Abu Hawam, as well as recently published wrecks like Hishuley Carmel and Hisarönü. Knapp also usefully foregrounds older material not widely discussed in these contexts from Wadi Gawasi on the Red Sea. One senses gaps, however, selective or otherwise, e.g. in his lists of likely BA ports - what of Tel Mor (near Ashdod) and Gaza, for example? We can note Knapp's ability to authoritatively summarise and interpret data on what he calls MTCs (maritime transport containers) as a result of his recent work on the subject with S. Demesticha.¹ It is useful to have this discussion sitting side by side with information on shipping and summaries of the results of recent organic residue analyses. Among analytical works on shipping and travel heavily relied on here (with no new technical observations or clarifications, and the same accepted narrative of MBA masted ship and LBA galley/merchantman development) are those of S. Wachsmann, M. Wedde, C. Monroe and C. Broodbank.² Knapp excludes Aegean evidence from his focus, despite having to reference the many Aegean links of east Mediterranean shipping, especially in the LBA. Perhaps this is to avoid addressing the overtones of Classical archaeology scholarship (though the issue of Mediterranean research history/discipline history is not addressed here anyway) or because the data have been already well published on (much evidence discussed here is, notwithstanding, equally

¹ Knapp and Demesticha 2017.

² E.g. Wachsmann 1998; Wedde 2000; Monroe 2009; Broodbank 2014.

well-discussed). Knapp may simply have felt the Aegean data *en masse* to be unwieldy. Yet he cannot resist Aegean-related asides uncontextualised for the general reader - e.g. on whether the Hiyyawa/Ahhiyawa referred to in the Ugaritic/Hittite texts are connected to the Aegean (p. 189) or on the still-tentative claims of Cypriot copper on Crete at an EBA date (p. 72). Missing out the context is particularly unsatisfying when citing Aegean evidence in central discussions e.g. the Mycenaeanising pictorial representations of ships on pottery LB III Liman Tepe and Bademigiği Tepe (p. 162–3; 177; 189) or the LB I Thera frescoes with ship imagery (p. 58). On the end of the LBA, it is encouraging to see Knapp encapsulating for a general audience the idea of economic overextension and socioeconomic mobility as leading to disruption and conflict, a model which usefully links the Aegean to the wider east Mediterranean (p. 25–7 in Chapter 1, 'A Brief Prehistory of the Mediterranean Bronze Age').

The tendency of Knapp's scholarship to generalise or conflate long time periods and processes is easily accommodated here, where a single theme subsumes all. But the general reader looking to understand *why* changes in the nature and practice of seafaring occurred, by reference to sociopolitical change in historical context, will not get much help from this approach. Nor will much empathy or insight be gained into what being an ancient seafarer was actually like, beyond some well-worn tropes about seascapes and liminal spaces, and Knapp's remembering always to mention fishing as well as trade. Little is said or inferred about the context of ritual and the sea, for example - surprising given Knapp's previously demonstrated interest in ritual, his discussion of textual references to the maritime links of deities like Ba'al, p. 95; (we can ask who might have pushed these links, in whose interests; over what length of time and in what social context?) and his concluding comment, p. 196 'People socialise and spiritualise...seascapes.' Throughout, he tends to revert to environment, process, function and economic structure as determining what people did on the sea, revealingly incorporating in Chapter 2 a bounded section on 'Social Aspects' with subdivisions 'Seafarers and Seafaring' and 'Merchants, Mariners and Pirates'. Even when he has detailed texts to build on, such as the Ugarit subclassifications of merchants, we move little beyond individuals' function in/determination by an economic and political system. Agency is rarely glimpsed: e.g. p. 178: 'To develop maritime networks of exchange, it was essential for land-based polities to support people (merchants, sailors, tinkers) who were motivated to travel, and to promote the 'technologies of mobility' (boats,

sails, port facilities) and socioeconomic institutions ('the palace'; merchant organisations) that assisted them'. The discussion of pirates, giving a useful summary of relevant texts, is apparently mainly intended (in rather too specialised a manner for this book) to question recent overblown claims about pirate agency/identification at the end of the LBA³ and is ultimately inconclusive, showing that limits on state size and bulk shipping meant piracy could not become a really regular or rewarding business, though there probably was some piracy wherever there was trade. Another example of a missed opportunity to discuss perceptions/internalisations of seafaring in ancient societies is Knapp's reference to maritime imagery, where a lack of interpretation of the material in a social context and/or as art leaves its informative value incompletely explored. The general reader gets only the point that people represented ships because they used ships and lived near the sea and acquired useful or desirable things through shipping, and that we might learn a bit about their ships from those images - nothing deeper (e.g. p. 188). Some aspects of representation (e.g. as offering insight into attitudes to conflict and power portrayal, as in the Egyptian Sea Peoples reliefs), are brushed in with a few sentences. Indeed, the difficulties and investment/rewards of maritime aggression, and the different modes seaborne conflict could take at state level or below - raiding, settlement, destruction of ports - are more generally marginalised in discussion.

Knapp's long-established interests in the big geographical picture, and in process, make him good at listing and arranging secondary data. But the challenges of inference and interpretation in ancient material culture should be lucidly exposed when doing this for the general public: this needs discussion of the research context. Knapp does identify limits in inference, often timely - e.g. warnings of over-focus on origin point in the Ulu Burun case (p. 160–1); and against straightforward identifications of 'Egyptian' against 'Syrian'/Levantine' ships, either in terms of belonging or actual provenance (p. 133). But this often sounds inconclusive: there is no sense of where research is leading or should lead. On stone anchors, which as he notes are rarely particularly informative about shipping (though numerous) one wonders why he spends so much time itemising them, interesting though some contexts are. He also notes at great length the absence of any actual harbour remains at sites clearly identifiable textually and in terms of goods as ports e.g. see discussion for Troy p. 154–55, making it hard to find where he draws the limits

³ E.g. Hitchcock and Maeir 2015.

of inference. When general conclusions are drawn, they can also sound generic and colourless: e.g. p. 195 in the 'Conclusions' chapter: 'Representational art not only depicts the ships and people who sailed them but also various types of fish and shells, highlighting the links between fishing and seafaring as well as maritime trade.' – how could fishing not be related to seafaring? Or (p. 196) 'The sea itself does not, and by its nature cannot, represent a palimpsest of human activity...Unlike a landscape...the seascape is a surface of flows and change...'. The determinist 'Maritime interaction not only motivated politico-economic development and facilitated human mobility, it also transformed social structures and modified individual human actions.', again in the chapter Conclusions: Final Words, p. 196, conveys little conclusive meaning. Finishing the book, the reader may assume that everything there is to say has been got out of the data and that the conclusions, however bland, are pretty straightforward. While it is true to say the data have been well-wrung here, Knapp knows there are many other ways and dimensions of exploring it beside his own, and that it has been gathered in a wide variety of research contexts which affect its quality. Thus, the book could be as profound and thought-provoking as the Mediterranean's winy depths – but it is workmanlike instead, a serviceable raft on the surface.

SARO WALLACE
RESEARCH FELLOW, DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY,
UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER
sarowallace@hotmail.com

- Broodbank, C., 2014. *The Making of the Middle Sea: a History of the Mediterranean from the Beginning to the Emergence of the Classical World*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Knapp, A. B., and S. Demesticha, 2017. *Mediterranean Connections: Maritime Transport Containers and Seaborne Trade in the Bronze and Early Iron Ages*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Hitchcock, L., and A. M. Maeir, 2014. Yo-ho, yo-ho, a *seren's* life for me! *World Archaeology* 46: 624–40.
- Monroe, C., 2009. *Scales of Fate: Trade, Tradition and Transformation in the Eastern Mediterranean*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Wachsmann, S., 1998. *Seagoing Ships and Seamanship in the Bronze Age Levant*. College Station, Texas: Texas AandM University Press.
- Wedde, M., 2000. *Towards a Hermeneutics of Aegean Bronze Age Ship Imagery*. Bibliopolis: Mannheim und Möhnsee.

Food for thought: socialising meals, cuisine and subsistence practices in prehistoric Southeast Europe

Maria Ivanova, Bogdan Athanassov, Vanya Petrova, Desislava Takorova and Philip W. Stockhammer (eds). *Social Dimensions of Food in the Prehistoric Balkans*. pp. xvii+367. 2018. Oxford: Oxbow. ISBN: 978–1–78925–080–0 £48.00

Food practices and their social implications are an important focus of investigation for a wide range of disciplines. In anthropology in particular the cross-cultural importance of meals or of the exchange of food and substances in creating and enduring social bonds gained attention already in Malinowski's era and has remained a central theme of inquiry ever since.¹ It is now widely acknowledged that food practices play an active role in the negotiation of social identities, relationships and distinctions at different social scales. In archaeology, the economic dimensions of subsistence practices have always held an interest, but food itself was not recognised as a significant analytical or theoretical concept until recently. Since the 2000s, however, there is a growing interest in the cultural and social analysis of food, accompanied by a surge of novel perspectives and methods in palaeo-botanical, zoo-archaeological, palaeo-anthropological and material culture research, including the regions in question here.²

Social Dimensions of Food in the Prehistoric Balkans reflects these changes, focusing on the cultural, social, ritual and ecological dimensions of food practices from the Mesolithic to the Early Iron Age and advocating a combination of practice-oriented approaches with new scientific techniques. At the same time, it demonstrates the profusion of fresh data and the emergence of new research themes, including the human-animal relationship, feasting and ritual consumption, memory, culinary practices, ecological dimensions, the variability of subsistence preferences and the dispersal of farmers, crops, livestock and foodways across Greece and the Balkans. The volume consists of 19 chapters, in addition to an extended introductory section by the editors, apparently originally presented at an

¹ E.g. Carsten 1995; Fernández-Armesto and Smail 2011; Goody 1982.

² E.g. Halstead and Barrett 2004; Hastorf 2017; Mee and Renard 2007; Pollock 2012.

international conference held at the Heidelberg Academy of Sciences in May 2015. It is partly related to an ERC project by one of the editors (Philipp Stockhammer). The lack of a preface does not help us understand the volume's history or whether it also includes newly commissioned papers.

In the Introduction the editors set out the aims of the book in interesting detail. They can be summarised in three main points: a) to contribute to the integration of past and present studies of food, or of archaeology with Food Studies (p. vii); b) 'to implement a transcultural archaeology that integrates an archaeology of the senses, practice-oriented approaches and cutting-edge scientific techniques' (p. vii), and, ultimately, c) to show how archaeology, with the historical depth and materiality of its data, can add a long-term diachronic perspective to wider studies of food practices (p. xi-xii). A further goal of the volume is to highlight the crucial role of the Balkans in the dissemination and adjustments of food practices across the wider geographical context, i.e. from the Near East to Central Europe and vice versa.

The volume, thus, seeks to locate itself on new ground as a cohesive discourse on food as a prominent social (and symbolic) medium, 'entangling different approaches' (p. xi-xiii) and emphasising the human interaction with food as well as the inter-regional co-operation. It certainly achieves most of its stated aims, especially those of showing the importance of approach and data-integration as well as the dynamism of culinary practices. But whether it provides a cohesive treatise or comprehensive coverage or, more importantly, a clear *outline* of the much desired long-term, historical perspective is very questionable. This would have required a final remark at the very least. Instead, the complete absence of a concluding section (after 19 individual contributions) leaves the reader at a loss. A second caveat is the lack of any partitioning – e.g. thematic, chronological or geographical. This, in conjunction with the lack of chapter abstracts, leaves it to the reader to understand the logic of the volume's structure and to make connections between its contents. A third shortcoming is the partial (and sometimes confusing) geographic coverage, starting from the volume's title. 'Balkans' seems rather narrow, given that the volume includes important evidence from Anatolia (Ch. 2, pp. 14–30), Romania and Central Europe as well as a chapter that distinguishes between 'Aegean' and 'Balkan' prehistory (Ch. 19, pp. 320–367) (how is 'Aegean' different from 'Greece', featuring in three other chapters?). Perhaps 'Southeast Europe', a term featuring in a couple of chapter titles, instead of

'Balkans' would have worked better. Furthermore, some regions are under-represented. For instance, the overall balance tilts heavily towards Bulgaria, whereas all of the three chapters on Neolithic Greece (Chapters 3–5) deal mostly with the same few and well-known sites in Macedonia (e.g. Makriyalos) in whose research all four authors happen to be involved as a team and about which they have published several papers of similar content in other edited volumes (see Note 13 for references). Despite these shortcomings, the strength of the volume is certainly its ability to inform us on a variety of social and cultural issues concerning food, to embrace these concepts as matters of research rather than as self-explanatory and to illustrate their contextually contingent nature.

The first two chapters reflect the recent shift of attention in zooarchaeological research to the human-animal relationship, including herd management systems. In a theoretically-centred paper, Bartosiewicz and Bonsall (Ch. 1, pp. 1–13) offer a useful critique of the traditional functional and mechanistic models of herd reconstruction and management, pointing out that the vast majority of faunal data represents dead stock rather than livestock and should therefore be approached accordingly. Advocating the abandonment of the pressure of having to envision herds, the paper calls for a shift of emphasis from meat production to meat consumption and for an effort towards a more precise terminology. Russel (Ch. 2, pp. 14–30) approaches the interaction between humans and animals through a focus on food taboos as detected in the faunal patterning at Çatalhöyük, and to a lesser extent at Opovo, providing a comprehensive presentation of the differential occurrence and treatment of animal body parts as well as of the animal representation in art and in depositional patterns. Her contextual and integrated analysis offers a very interesting insight into patterns regarding the domestic vs. wild animal perception and manipulation by early farming societies, including possible connections between different kinds of taboo on the one hand, and socio-cultural norms concerning food, social distinctions such as clans or sodalities with totem animals, group identities and myth or religion, on the other. It is regretful that these interesting points, especially those about kinship, appear briefly and largely as concluding remarks rather than suggestions regarding specific ways of detecting such connections.

In the first of the three chapters on Neolithic Greece, Kotsakis (Ch. 3, pp. 31–46) discusses the context of food consumption, opposing eating in public and

eating in private (i.e. inside houses). He argues that the replacement of pit-dwellings with solid over-ground houses over time reflects a progression from public food-sharing to privatised hospitality, defined as ‘the domestic mode of living’ (p. 36). This only occurred, according to Kotsakis, at a later stage, when ‘houses hide their residents behind walls, forming ... a new, separate social group, the household’ (p. 37) and reflects a ‘secession of the household from the collective social body’ (p. 43) and a movement to social complexity and change. There are several caveats in this argument. Firstly, it seems to reiterate, if in a more blurred version, the model of progressive household isolation, and generally of a progression from social cohesion and communal values to inequality and antagonism over the course of the Neolithic, advanced by Halstead³ more than twenty years ago. However, debate on all of these notions, including the relationship between household and community,⁴ has moved forward considerably. Such models, which tend to rely on top-down perspectives and the grand models of social evolution, as does the equation of complexity with hierarchy, the view of change as teleological and the classification of societies either as simple (i.e. egalitarian) or complex (i.e. unequal), have been challenged across a broad range of different contexts by new, bottom-up approaches, which reveal instead household interdependence, social balance, integration and/or heterarchy and cross-cutting networks of power.⁵ It is surprising that the author does not take this rich literature into account. Secondly, this argument is not convincingly supported by the evidence. For instance, the many examples of flat sites with pit-dwellings, thus of ‘eating out’, as well as of public spaces for conspicuous consumption that are dated to the Late rather than the Early Neolithic are cursorily dismissed as simply preserving ‘the ancient pattern of habitation’ (p. 39). And so is the role of kinship in inter-household connections and other levels of social organisation,⁶ despite abstract references to ancestry and lineage. Finally, there is a problem with conceptual definition and with theorisation. The variety of terms and notions used by the author, i.e. ‘house’, ‘household’, ‘dwelling’, ‘community’, ‘domestic’ and so on are confusing. For instance, what exactly is meant by ‘a frozen conflict between the communal and the household unit’ (p. 32)? What is the relationship of house, dwelling and household, and why should earlier Neolithic societies be

deprived of the ‘domestic mode of living’ and of the ‘household’ as a context of food-sharing? Actually, shared food consumption is a most fundamental component of the very formation and definition of a household, a key part of the processes that make up its creation and sustaining,⁷ and not the other way around. Similarly, ‘household’ and ‘domesticity’ have been shown to apply to all types of societies, mobile and sedentary alike, with or without permanent architecture, including the Upper Palaeolithic hunter-gatherer societies.⁸

The other two chapters on Greece are more methodologically-oriented. Urem-Kotsou (Ch. 4, pp. 47–65) examines the morphology, style and organic residues of ceramic vessels in order to identify food practices, including the key issue of a Neolithic baking or boiling culture, and to detect changes in cuisine and consumption. As has long been suggested with regard to southern Greece,⁹ Urem-Kotsou finds that the first pots from sites in western Macedonia were also not used for cooking. An interesting suggestion here is that food may have continued to be prepared in a pre-pottery period fashion (p. 50). During the Early and the Middle Neolithic technological and stylistic innovations resulted in a proliferation of shapes and the regular use of vessels for cooking, but boiling still remained the most common method. Baking and a greater culinary variety, including stews and liquid dishes, seem to occur in the Late Neolithic, when vessels grew more complicated and variable. Significantly, it was accompanied by a remarkable increase in decorated serving ware, highlighting the social role of shared food-consumption, especially in public contexts, which also seem to proliferate in this period (pp. 58–60). Although the author does not seem to escape the stereotypical opposition of earlier Neolithic pottery as playing a unifying role within a community and later Neolithic pottery as a marker of social distinctions, the interesting pattern that emerges here actually indicates maintenance and intensification rather than erosion of shared values over the course of the Neolithic.

The social significance and use of painted pottery is fully demonstrated by Bajcev’s thought-provoking paper (Ch. 6, pp. 86–108) on Starčevo material. Employing an exemplary use-alteration analysis and a very refreshing new perspective, Bajcev convincingly deconstructs the unproductive dichotomy between ‘elite’ and ‘utilitarian’ items and specifically the assumed function of painted

³ Halstead 1995, 1999.

⁴ Souvatzi 2012.

⁵ E.g. Chapman 2003; Kohring and Wynne-Jones 2007; Mina 2018; Moore 2012; Souvatzi 2007.

⁶ Ensor 2013; Souvatzi 2017.

⁷ See Souvatzi 2008: 9–18 for definitions and related anthropological literature.

⁸ E.g. Zubrow, Audouze and Enloe 2010.

⁹ Vitelli 1995.

ware as a luxury or prestige marker intended solely for display. Her analysis shows that far from being static, painted vessels were used for various food-related purposes, ranging from food preparation by fermentation to storage and from grinding foodstuffs to making medicinal mixtures, in addition of course to their many social or symbolic functions. One important implication here is that all material products are used in a social context, and their relationship with this context is recursive. Indeed, in Neolithic Greece too, the context of finding and use of fine ceramic wares also indicates that even the most highly decorated pots could have had a more daily use than is usually assumed.¹⁰ At the same time, the high proportions of richly decorated serving ware (for example, at Dimini they amount to over 31% of the ceramic assemblage)¹¹ underline the importance of shared food consumption in social life and in reinforcing social bonds. In turn, the elaboration of the means of food preparation and consumption, further indicate where the value of the so-called 'prestige' pottery must be situated and assessed.

Recent archaeological literature has also demonstrated that food exchanges, especially in communal gatherings and ceremonies, play an important role in the development and renegotiation of a variety of social roles and relationships.¹² Three chapters in the present volume focus on ritualised consumption or feasting in shared contexts through an archaeo-zoological focus and with regard to pits. Isaakidou and Halstead (Ch. 5, pp. 66–85), the third chapter on Greek Macedonia, revise the evidence from the well-known example of LN Makriyalos I, including the large pit-feature which contained an extraordinary amount of animal bones and material culture and has been interpreted as representing large-scale, communal, and perhaps regional, commensality.¹³ Their integrated analysis of faunal, botanical, ceramic and human skeletal data suggests a distinction between largely plant-based daily meals and special occasions involving meat and leads to a discussion of the significance of meat in commensal practices. Similarly, Greenfield and Jongsma-Greenfield (Ch. 7, pp. 109–140), and Bacvarov and Gorczyk (Ch. 8, pp. 141–156) explore the ritual dimension of meat consumption as reflected by animal bone concentrations and special deposits in unusual pits in EN Blagotin, Serbia, and LN Sarnevo, Bulgaria, respectively. Greenfield and Jongsma-Greenfield's paper also

offers a most welcome attempt to systematise the identification of feasting (faunal) assemblages in the archaeological record, including conceptual definition, general archaeological indications and specific zooarchaeological evidence, thus providing a good general methodological basis. Their data analysis leads them to suggest that feasting was an integral part of Early Neolithic societies. It is a pity that the paper ends there and does not take this important point any further, for instance by providing some discussion of the social role and meaning of feasting in early farming societies or by synthesising data from some other contemporary sites, or even by integrating some ethnographic or anthropological examples. In a more interpretative paper, Bacvarov and Gorczyk address pits and structured deposition in SE Europe and make the interesting suggestion that pits with exceptionally rich and uniquely combined contents may be conceived as 'ritual packages' based on translocal relations and contributing to the construction and preservation of collective memory. Furthermore, 'ritual packages' comprise heavily and intentionally fragmented material, including animal bones as food or as feasting remains, whose deposition extends the social life of food beyond the moment of consumption (p. 154).

The interesting concept of 'ritual package' may be of wider analytical applicability and cross-cultural utility. For instance, it recalls Pauketat's¹⁴ notion of 'bundling' inspired by his analysis of North American practices of sacred bundling (or assembling) of objects. Bundles are seen as composed of and mediating a series of relationships, forms of remembrance and social traditions. Regarding the idea of structured deposition and deliberate fragmentation, put forward by Chapman¹⁵ for the Balkans, one additional interpretation may be that it served for social enchainment and relational identities, especially when accompanied by a reuse of fragments.¹⁶ One important omission from Bacvarov and Gorczyk's otherwise valuable argument is an account of time, other than the fact that Sarnevo was used for 50 years (p. 142). But what is the stratigraphy of the ritual pit under study, and, more importantly, does it suggest a relatively short depositional episode or a repeated process, a cycle of ritualised and collectively organised act? The lack of any such information collapses the time scale, thus blocks an attempt at understanding history-making processes. For instance, in Pauketat's argument, acts of bundling are potential processes of historical

¹⁰ Souvatzi 2008: 180–182, 224–225.

¹¹ Souvatzi 2008: 119–120.

¹² E.g. Pollock 2012; Spielmann 2002.

¹³ Halstead 2007; Halstead and Isaakidou 2014; Pappa *et al.* 2004; Urem-Kotsou and Kotsakis 2007.

¹⁴ Pauketat 2013.

¹⁵ Chapman 2000.

¹⁶ Chapman and Gaydarska 2006; Chapman *et al.* 2011.

meaning making and therefore form the fabric of history.

Ground- and chipped stone technologies and their role in prehistoric farming form the basis of two chapters in the volume. Ivanova (Ch. 10, pp. 173–189) does an excellent job in highlighting the cross-cultural importance of cereal grinding and associated tools, habitually a heavily underestimated activity and material class in prehistoric archaeology. Focusing in particular on milling slabs from a variety of sites across SE Europe, she shows how contrasting patterns in grinding tool morphology between the Hungarian Plain and the Balkans can be used to infer differences in the exploitation of cereals, in farming practices and in food systems. Flint assemblages from Bulgaria, especially sickles, provide Gurova (Ch. 11, pp. 190–214) the opportunity to observe long-term patterns in crop production as well as to identify connections with the Near East. One significant conclusion is that the labour for harvesting and threshing obviously ‘required a particular social/kinship organisation’ (pp. 209–210). As with Russel’s chapter (see above), it is regretful that this paper does not explore this issue further. For instance, Karimali’s¹⁷ study of the production of threshing sledges in Neolithic Thessaly shows that several production systems and overlapping distribution networks operated simultaneously, and that the ‘distance’ between producers and consumers was primarily a distance in kinship and socio-cultural ties.

A further two, regrettably very short, contributions explore the interesting phenomenon of salt exploitation in prehistory and its relationship with social status and wealth. Harding (Ch. 13, pp. 221–229) offers a useful overview of the various scales of salt production, trade and use (including in food) and the social, economic and symbolic dimensions of salt in prehistory, incorporating examples from Iron Age Halstatt and from later antiquity. Advocating a contextual approach, Harding recommends that there is no a priori association of salt with hoards or wealth. A rather different conclusion is reached by Nikolov (Ch. 12, pp. 215–220), who interprets salt trade as being associated with people of a higher status and as key to the emergence of the exceptionally rich graves of Varna.

The chapter by Krauss, De Cupere and Marinova (Ch. 9, 157–172) approaches the old and recurrent question of the Neolithisation and Neolithic origins of SE Europe from a new perspective, bringing food production and nutrition strategies into the

discussion of the development and dispersal of subsistence practices across the Balkans. On the basis of new archaeological, zooarchaeological and archaeobotanical data, differences in economy and dietary preferences in Romanian Banat, from what is usually found in the core areas of the Early Balkan Neolithic, may be due to a survival of a Mesolithic tradition in the former region (p. 171). Significantly, this suggestion aligns with new research in the Aegean, which indicates mobility and connectivity between late foragers and early farmers rather than mutual exclusion and isolation as was previously believed.¹⁸ Rosenstock and Scheibner’s study (Ch. 19, pp. 320–367) addresses the impact of Neolithisation on human diet and stature and more widely the long-term trends and differences in the Aegean and the Balkans from the Mesolithic through to the end of the Bronze Age, from the point of view of anthropometric and stable isotope research. Their analysis suggests that while in the Aegean no major change in human stature seems to have occurred after Neolithisation, in the Balkans stature started to decline already during the Mesolithic. Both cases show, according to the authors, that human height was influenced not only by food but also by various other factors, such as the admixture of shorter Aegean ancestry and the possible effects of migration of people from the Near East to the Aegean and from the Near East or the Aegean to the Balkans. This suggestion would seem to provide support to the traditional migrationist (or diffusionist) models of ‘cultural groups’ and ‘Neolithic packages’,¹⁹ although the authors point out that the anthropometric and isotopic data published so far are very patchy and they do mention (although in passing) the effect of pre-existing adaptive processes in the Balkans at least.

The remaining chapters deal with later periods, from the Early Bronze Age to the Late Iron Age, and with more diverse topics, ranging from changes and continuities in plant-based food in Bulgarian Drama (Gleser and Marinova, Ch. 14, pp. 230–247) and in Eastern Rhodope (Popov *et al.*, Ch. 16, pp. 263–277) to bioarchaeological aspects of food production and consumption at a gold-mining site, indicating interrelated innovations in metallurgy and food practices (Nikov and colleagues, Ch. 17, 278–299), and to the relationship between changes in animal husbandry and the creation of regional hierarchies (Nikodemus, Ch. 15, pp. 248–262). The issue of hierarchisation is also addressed by Gorczyk, Athanassov and Stockhammer (Ch. 18, pp. 300–319) through the prism of hunting at the Iron Age fortified settlement of Bresto, Bulgaria,

¹⁷ Karimali 2005.

¹⁸ Reingruber 2018.

¹⁹ See Chapman and Souvatzi in press for discussion.

though from an important alternative and critical perspective. Taking into account the context of the overall system of animal management at the site, they refute dominant views of hunting either as a resource buffering in difficult times or as an elite prestige activity. They argue instead that it was a communal activity used as a means for the maintenance of social solidarity at a time when the pull towards hierarchisation was strong. Indeed, this significant new outlook is in accordance with the recent literature on collective processes and complex social integrative mechanisms resisting hierarchisation, evidenced across a very broad range of societies, from Neolithic Europe and the Near East²⁰ to the pueblos of the American Southwest²¹ and to the Mesoamerican politically centralised societies.²² The fact that the site in question here is of a later date only serves to emphasise that history is non-linear and change towards hierarchisation not inevitable.²³

Overall, what I would have liked to have seen in addition to what the book contains is a more congruous view forward, including a suggestion about how these exciting new data and approaches can be articulated into a 'deep historical perspective on Asian and European food practices', which is the volume's overarching aim. This would have required greater attention to history, history-making processes and perceptions of time.²⁴ Critical discussion of earlier approaches and illustration of novel perspectives and methods are useful but not enough if we are to move towards suggestions about diachronic patterns or to reach historical understanding. Given also the number of issues that the book addresses, as well as the varying emphasis on theory and definition in the different papers, a Concluding Chapter summarising the points of consensus and pointing the way forward would have helped.

Furthermore, the volume would have gained more, had it included a plethora of other themes crucial to a social analysis of food, especially: a) landscape dynamics and the interactive relationship between people and land,²⁵ including potential landscape modification and land management systems,²⁶ of which, surprisingly, there is little or no mention whatsoever; b) the role of cooking facilities and of the variety of cooking implements apart from

pots and stone tools; and c) how exactly kinship, sodalities, community, larger socio-economic groupings and wider social institutions, often referred to in the volume but only in an abstract manner, can actually play a role in foodways and in connections, distinctions and transformations through food consumption.

But on the whole, the book's weak points are counteracted by its openly interpretative rather than descriptive and prescriptive character; its incorporation of interdisciplinary and integrated analyses; and its employment of multiple scales of analysis (e.g. domestic space and the shorter term but also external, communal or public areas, whole settlements and the medium- and longer-term). Despite the fact that it is not in its composition the best example of a holistic and comprehensive approach to food as a social, symbolic and historical medium as I would look forward to, *Social Dimensions of Food in the Prehistoric Balkans* is definitely a salient and timely production, offers nuanced analyses, sets out directions for future regional studies and deserves attention and readership by both junior and senior researchers.

STELLA SOUVATZI
HELLENIC OPEN UNIVERSITY
stellasouvatzi@hotmail.com

- Carsten, J. 1995. The substance of kinship and heat of the hearth: Feeding, personhood, and relatedness among Malays of Pulau Langkawi. *American Ethnologist* 22: 223–241.
- Chapman, J. 2000. *Fragmentation in Archaeology. People, Places and Broken Objects in the Prehistory of South Eastern Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Chapman, J. and B. Gaydarska. 2006. *Parts and Wholes: Fragmentation in Prehistoric Context*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Chapman, J. and S. Souvatzi. in press, to be published in October 2020. The Neolithic of Southeast Europe: Recent Trends. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 49.
- Chapman, J., B. Gaydarska, E. Skafida and S. Souvatzi. 2011. Personhood and the life cycle of *Spondylus* rings: an example from Late Neolithic Greece, in F. Ifantidis and M. Nikolaidou (eds) *Spondylus in Prehistory: New Data And Approaches - Contributions to the Archaeology of Shell Technologies* (BAR International Series 2216): 139–160. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Chapman, R. 2003. *Archaeologies of Complexity*. London: Routledge.
- Ensor, B.E. 2013. *The Archaeology of Kinship: Advancing Interpretations and Contributions to Theory*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

²⁰ E.g. Souvatzi 2007; Kuijt 2001.

²¹ E.g. Moore 2012.

²² Hendon 2010.

²³ Souvatzi, Baysal and Baysal 2018a.

²⁴ E.g. Shryock and Smail 2011; Souvatzi, Baysal and Baysal 2018b.

²⁵ E.g. Souvatzi 2013.

²⁶ E.g. Tankosić and Katsianis 2017.

BOOK REVIEWS

- Fernández-Armesto F. and D. Lord Smail. 2011. Food, in: A. Shryock and D. Lord Smail (eds) *Deep History: the Architecture of Past and Present*: 160–188. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Goody, J. 1982. *Cooking, Cuisine and Class. A Study in Comparative Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halstead P. 2007. Carcasses and commensality: Investigating the social context of meat consumption in Neolithic and Early Bronze Age Greece, in C. Mee and J. Renard (eds) *Cooking Up the Past: Food and Culinary Practice in the Neolithic and Bronze Age Aegean*: 25–48. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Halstead, P. 1995. From sharing to hoarding: The Neolithic foundations of Aegean Bronze Age society?, in R. Laffineur and W.-D. Niemeier (eds) *Politeia: Society and State in the Aegean Bronze Age* (Aegaeum 12): 11–20. Liège: University of Liège.
- Halstead, P. 1999. Neighbours from hell? The household in Neolithic Greece. In P. Halstead (ed.) *Neolithic Society in Greece* (Sheffield Studies in Aegean Archaeology 2): 77–95. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Halstead, P. 2012. Feast, food and fodder in Neolithic-Bronze Age Greece: commensality and the construction of value, in S. Pollock (ed.) *Between Feasts and Daily Meals. Toward an Archaeology of Commensal Spaces* (eTopoi: Journal for Ancient Studies, special volume 2): 21–51.
- Halstead, P. and J.C. Barrett (eds) 2004. *Food, Cuisine and Society in Prehistoric Greece*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Hastorf, C. A. 2017. *The Social Archaeology of Food: Thinking about Eating from Prehistory to the Present*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hendon, J. A. 2010. *Houses in a Landscape: Memory and Everyday Life in Mesoamerica*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Karimali, E. 2005. Inferences and limitations in chipped-stone modeling: learning from an ethnoarchaeological case (threshing-sledge production in Thessaly, Greece), in: X. Terradas (ed.) *L'Outillage Lithique en Contextes Ethnoarchéologique* (BAR International Series 1370): 47–56. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Kohring, S.E. and S. Wynne-Jones (eds) 2007. *Socialising Complexity: Approaches to Power and Interaction in the Archaeological Record*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Kuijt, I. 2001. Place, death and the transmission of social memory in early agricultural communities of the Near Eastern Pre-Pottery Neolithic, in M.S. Chesson (ed.) *Social Memory, Identity and Death: Anthropological Perspectives on Mortuary Rituals* (Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association 10): 80–99.
- Mee, C. and J. Renard (eds) 2007. *Cooking Up the Past: Food and Culinary Practice in the Neolithic and Bronze Age Aegean*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Mina, M. 2018. Casting doubts on metallurgy and the transition to social complexity, in S. Dietz, F. Mavridis, Ž. Tankosić and T. Takaoğlu (eds) *Communities in transition. The Circum-Aegean Area in the 5th and 4th Millennia BC*: 67–74. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Moore, J. D. 2012. *The Prehistory of Home*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Nuttall, M. 2000). Choosing kin: Sharing and subsistence in a Greenlandic hunting community, in P.P. Schweitzer (ed.) *Dividends of Kinship. Meanings and Uses of Social Relatedness*: 33–60. London: Routledge.
- Pappa, M., P. Halstead, K. Kotsakis, and D. Urem-Kotsou. 2004. Evidence for large-scale feasting at Late Neolithic Makriyalos, northern Greece, in P. Halstead and J.C. Barrett (eds) *Food, Cuisine and Society in Prehistoric Greece*: 16–44. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Pauketat, T. R. 2013. Bundles of/in/as time, in J. Robb and T.R. Pauketat (eds) *Big Histories, Human Lives: Tackling Problems of Scale in Archaeology*: 35–56. Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press.
- Pollock, S. (ed.) 2012. *Between Feasts and Daily Meals. Toward an Archaeology of Commensal Spaces* (eTopoi: Journal for Ancient Studies, special volume 2).
- Potter, J. M. 2000. Pots, parties and politics: Communal feasting in the American Southwest. *American Antiquity* 65: 471–92.
- Reingruber, A. 2018. Geographical mobility and social motility in the Aegean before and after 6600 BC. *Præhistorische Zeitschrift* 93(1): 1–24.
- Shryock A. and D. Lord Smail (eds) 2011. *Deep History: The Architecture of Past and Present*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Souvatzi, S. 2007. Social complexity is not the same as hierarchy, in S.E. Kohring and S. Wynne-Jones (eds) *Socialising Complexity: Approaches to Power and Interaction in the Archaeological Record*: 37–59. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Souvatzi, S. 2008. *A Social Archaeology of Households in Neolithic Greece. An Anthropological Approach*. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Souvatzi, S. 2012. Between the individual and the collective: household as a social process in Neolithic Greece, in B.J. Parker and C.P. Foster (eds) *Household Archaeology: New Perspectives from the Near East and Beyond*: 15–43. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Souvatzi, S. 2013. Land tenure, social relations and social landscapes. In M. Relaki and D. Catapoti

- (eds) *An Archaeology of Land Ownership*, 21–45. London: Routledge.
- Souvatzki, S. 2017. Kinship and social archaeology. *Cross-Cultural Research* 51 (2): 172–195. Special Issue: Murdock and Goody revisited: (Pre) History and Evolution of Family Systems, Part I.
- Souvatzki, S., A. Baysal and E.L. Baysal (eds) 2018b. *Time and History in Prehistory*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Souvatzki, S., A. Baysal and E. L. Baysal. 2018a. Is there prehistory? in Souvatzki, S., A. Baysal and E.L. Baysal (eds) *Time and History in Prehistory*: 1–27. London and New York: Routledge.
- Spielmann, K. A. 2002. Feasting, craft specialisation, and the ritual mode of production in small-scale societies. *American Anthropologist* 104: 195–207.
- Tankosić Ž. and M. Katsianis. 2017. Cycladic or Mainland? The prehistoric landscapes of southern Euboea, in: A. Sarris, E. Kalogiropoulou, T. Kalayci and E. Karimali (eds) *Communities, landscapes, and interaction in Neolithic Greece* (International monographs in prehistory: archaeological series 20): 234–246. New York: Berghahn.
- Urem-Kotsou, D. and K. Kotsakis. 2007. Pottery, cuisine and community in the Neolithic of north Greece, in C. Mee and J. Renard (eds) *Cooking Up the Past: Food and Culinary Practice in the Neolithic and Bronze Age Aegean*: 225–246. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Vitelli, K. D. 1995. Pots, potters, and the shaping of Greek Neolithic society, in W. Barnett and J. Hoopes (eds) *The Emergence of Pottery: Technology and Innovation in Ancient Societies*: 55–63. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Zubrow, E., F. Audouze and J. G. Enloe. 2010. Introduction: domesticity expressed, in E. Zubrow, F. Audouze and J.G. Enloe (eds) *The Magdalenian Household: Unraveling Domesticity*: 1–7. Albany NY: State University of New York.

Archaic to Classical

Myrina Kalaitzi. *Figured Tombstones from Macedonia, Fifth–First Century BC*. pp. xxx+288, ills, maps, many b+w and colour pls. 2016. Oxford: Oxford University Press, in collaboration with the Institute of Historical Research, National Hellenic Research Foundation. ISBN 978–0–19–874645–4 hardback £120.

Myrina Kalaitzi dedicates this important new study of ancient Macedonian tombstones of the fifth through first centuries BC not to any named individual but to ‘the courageous reader.’ Most readers will not need courage to understand its familiar structure: a catalogue of surviving tombstones preceded by a chronological survey discussing major trends in the corpus. As Kalaitzi outlines in her Introduction, it is a structure determined less by a conceptual or theoretical model than by scholarly precedent – a structure that has been developed and deployed by scholars of ancient material culture on numerous occasions in order, ostensibly, to describe rather than interpret. The framework presumes that, when the corpus is addressed in comparative terms, visual patterns will emerge, ones that might tell us about cultural values shared between the people who produced or commissioned the individual monuments.

For a study of this kind, Kalaitzi’s book is exemplary, offering a meticulously detailed presentation of 216 tombstones that have survived from ancient Macedonia. Some of these, like the magnificent fifth-century stele from Pydna (no. 24) showing a mother sorrowing over the limp body of her child, or the stele from Dikaia of a girl holding a dove (no. 157), are already well known in their own right. They are here contextualized with many others that have received only minimal scholarly attention, including some that will not be familiar even to specialists. Kalaitzi has expended a tremendous amount of effort to study first-hand as many monuments as possible, while at the same time informing her readers of new discoveries or monuments that have not yet been fully published.

The result is a wealth of information and observations, including new studies of important groups of tombstones such as those from the ‘Great Tumulus’ at Aigai and those from Hellenistic Beroia. In both the main text and the catalogue, descriptions

are precise and clear, citations are thorough and up-to-date (through 2012, when the manuscript was submitted), and indexes and concordances are detailed and easy to use. Discussions of relevant inscriptions and an appendix on Macedonian cemeteries usefully complement the focus on sculpted images. Kalaitzi wades into scholarly debates in a circumspect and even-handed fashion, using her first-hand observations to inform her opinions or generate new interpretations. Readers wishing to judge for themselves can turn to the excellent photographs, beautifully printed in large scale and, in the case of painted stelai, in colour.

The book's dedication is only the first indication of Kalaitzi's self-reflexive approach to her objects, one that acknowledges the interpretive dimensions of even the most empirically-grounded catalogue. In the Introduction, she outlines the deliberations and decisions that have generated the terms for her study, and acknowledges their shortcomings or inherited nature with refreshing openness. Thus, the broad chronological scope, spanning five centuries, does not correspond to a discrete period of sculptural production or Macedonian history, and although the chapters are organized by century, the divisions between them are generally without historical significance. Likewise, 'Macedonian' here does not denote a style, a center of production, or even a coherent cultural context, but rather a geographical unit – one that is determined by modern constraints, such as the boundaries of Greece today, as much as by ancient historical conditions. Equally dependent on a modern definition is what constitutes a 'figured tombstone.' While Kalaitzi discusses early anthropomorphic monuments and the remarkable free-standing Archaic funerary sculptures from Aiane in the first chapter, these are not included in the catalogue itself, which confines itself to stelai either carved in relief or painted. Likewise, ancient visibility is secondary to modern: stelai found intentionally buried in tombs are included in the catalogue, but not those whose imagery no longer survives in a clearly legible state, even when they have appeared in other studies from which Kalaitzi derives her catalogue.

Kalaitzi openly discusses, moreover, the difficulty the modern scholar faces in giving equal attention to objects from a single geographical region that have been excavated under different circumstances and that are now dispersed in a number of different museums and storerooms. The survival and excavation of Macedonian tombstones has been much more happenstance and piecemeal than is the case with their counterparts in Attica and elsewhere in the Greek world, and most have only come to

light in recent decades. Despite Kalaitzi's formidable efforts to be as thorough as possible, differences in presentation are inevitable depending on the level of access she was granted. Some monuments, for instance, are only illustrated in drawings, while others, such as the stele of Agenor (no. 165), one of the most remarkable Greek tombstones of the fifth century, are not shown at all.

Such unavoidable contingencies reveal that the traditional structure of such a book, with its chronological surveys and catalogue, can never fully tame the erratic and fragmentary nature of the corpus. By openly acknowledging the degree to which modern constraints shape the taxonomies of her study, Kalaitzi exposes the distance between our positivist desires for a coherent narrative and the realities of our evidence. It is into this rift that the 'courageous reader' must descend.

In this sense, Kalaitzi is the first reader of her own text. In the Introduction, she outlines how her study is motivated by questions concerning the expression of cultural identity in ancient Macedonia and the ways in which ancient individuals represented themselves as Greek or non-Greek. In extracting cultural history from figurative sculpture, questions of style and iconography loom large. Beginning with the Classical monuments, specific visual devices or carving techniques, such as the treatment of drapery folds, are used to trace the influence or even the hands of foreign sculptors, especially those from Attica. Iconographic motifs, such as particular gestures (the so-called 'gesture of the horns') or garments (the Macedonian kausia), are identified and analyzed with an eye to evaluating the degree to which they record local cultural practices. Other characteristic features of Macedonian tombstone iconography, such as the prevalence of men at arms, emerge when the Macedonian corpus is compared with monuments from elsewhere in the Greek world with which they share stylistic affinities.

The insights generated by stylistic and iconographical analysis of this kind can help us better understand the relationship between sculptural practice and lived reality, and so can generate more precise and accurate readings of what these monuments depict or the values they express. But a focus on mining sculpture for cultural information comes at the cost of understanding tombstones in the context for which they were created – as monuments erected to commemorate a particular death and a particular experience of bereavement. Comparisons to Attic or Ionian monuments were surely not on the minds of most individuals who viewed or even commissioned these monuments. (The single signature in the

corpus, on no. 142, identifies the sculptor as Beroian and so proudly associates him with a local sculptural tradition). Instead, as suggested by epigrams carved into several monuments (see, for instance, no. 10, 42, 53, 84, 88, 186, and 209), bereaved families were more likely searching for the most effective means to make visible and permanent the memory of the deceased. In some cases, the evidentiary status of tombstones with regards to Macedonian social realities can overshadow more salient aspects of their funerary function.

I take as one example the unusual Hellenistic stele of Hadea from Beroia (no. 84, discussed on pp. 64–66 and 205–206). Kalaitzi identifies the deceased as a priestess primarily because a wreath is depicted in the upper right corner of the figure field. As a result, much of her discussion – one of the more substantial in the book devoted to a single stele – is focused on Hadea’s public role and determining the local cult where she served. Yet the wreath is only one of a number of objects depicted in the field, including a mirror, a hat, a fan, and a small chest. Rather than encode the fact that she was a priestess, these objects might simply allude to the kinds of funerary gifts that could have been buried with a young woman or left at her tomb – an interpretation bolstered by the fact that they are here depicted floating in the figure field as if affixed to the surface of the stele itself. (The identification of the objects in Hadea’s hands is the subject of some debate; Kalaitzi describes them as a sceptre and an object with a handle and pointed ‘prongs’).

Yet even if Hadea was in fact a priestess, this biographical detail is hardly the stele’s focus. The relief depicts several other figures in addition to that of Hadea, including a double depiction of the god Hermes in an anthropomorphic guise and as a herm statue, both standing on a base inscribed with a dedication to Hermes Chthonios. While this doubling is difficult to interpret iconographically, it suggests the ways in which a single entity can exist both in flesh and in stone, and so offers a way to theorize the relationship between the corpse beneath us and the monument before us. This relationship is explicitly articulated in the four-line epigram inscribed below the carved figures which commands the reader to ‘Observe Hadea’s tomb, which lies beneath me,’ and goes on to describe how Hadea was snatched by Hades while suffering from an illness, leaving permanent grief to her parents. Rather than characterize Hadea biographically, the inscription speaks in the first person to establish the monument as its own social agent, one that is distinct from the tomb below, and so one that helps negotiate the gap between figure and monument

that is made visible through Hermes. Like the other objects shown in the figure field, the wreath, if understood as a funerary gift, might do nothing more than emphasize the monument’s status as a monument – a material presence that does not provide direct access to Hadea herself, but Hadea as she was remembered and grieved for by her parents.

In highlighting the memorial function of Hadea’s stele rather than its ability to establish her public persona, I aim merely to emphasize that there is no ‘objective’ way to present such tombstones. As I hope I have shown, this point is entirely consistent with Kalaitzi’s own methodological self-consciousness and her willingness to approach her material in variegated ways. Rather than lay claim to the final word on Macedonian tombstones, Kalaitzi has masterfully provided us with everything but the courage necessary to study them ourselves, with fresh questions and interpretations of our own.

SETH ESTRIN
DEPARTMENT OF ART HISTORY,
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
sestrin@uchicago.edu

- Bergemann, J. 1997. *Demos und Thanatos. Untersuchungen zum Wertsystem der Polis im Spiegel der attischen Grabreliefs des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. und zur Funktion der gleichzeitigen Grabbauten.* Munich: Biering and Brinkmann.
- Himmelmann, N. 1999. *Attische Grabreliefs.* (Nordrhein-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Geisteswissenschaften Vorträge G 357). Wiesbaden: Opladen.

Mary Emerson. *Greek Sanctuaries and Temple Architecture. An Introduction, 2nd edition.* pp. xx + 270, 2 maps, 85 b/w illustrations. 2018. London: Bloomsbury Academic. ISBN 978–1–4725–7528–9 paperback £17.09.

In her preface the author explains what is new in this second edition: chapters on Paestum and the temple of Zeus at Akragas, commentary on architectural sculpture, and an expanded bibliography. The book is avowedly introductory, the emphasis is on buildings, and a glossary explains the technical terms used in the text, which the reader had best get used to since – as Emerson says – they litter the further reading. Other than the new sites (above),

the content focuses on Delphi, Olympia, Athens (Acropolis and the Hephaisteion) and Bassae. These being the core sites ('classics' as Emerson says) for the study of Greek sacred architecture, this is a sensible approach for an introduction (one might quibble about the omission of any structures specifically built for initiation rites from the Archaic and Classical periods, the timespan to which the book confines itself).

One immediate strength of the book is its informed and well-judged use of ancient Greek literature, deployed – in this reviewer's opinion – to original effect in 'What is a sanctuary?' (ch. 2), where extracts translated by the author help to define for the reader a sense of what a sanctuary might have meant to the Greek 'person in the street'. The next chapter ('From Mud Hut to Marble Temple: Doric and Ionic Orders') shows the author equally at home with the architectural technicalities, which are clearly introduced in simple but instructive language (e.g. temples, like Stonehenge, as examples of 'post and lintel' construction). Ch. 4 introduces 'Architectural Sculpture', *i.a.* rightly emphasising the use of 'strong colours' and how these – an interesting point rarely made – would have helped the eye take in 'the geometric forms' of a temple.

To finish with chapters having a broader application, the very interesting ch. 13 on 'Views and their Meanings' takes the Acropolis and its surroundings as a case study and considers how the ancient gaze experienced views both of and – an original touch surely – *from* the Acropolis. Emerson sees 'purposefulness' in the way in which the view of the 5th-century Acropolis makes most sense from a standpoint to the west on the hill of the Pnyx, none other than the engine room of the democracy which commissioned these 'works of Pericles,' while the westward view *from* the Acropolis took in e.g. the Hill of Ares, legendary site of the camp of the Amazons whom Theseus beat off – the very subject of the metopes on the *west* side of the Parthenon. These are clever and persuasive observations. They suggest how there could be much more to the siting of pre-Hellenistic sacred architecture (sculpture included) than a cursory glance suggests, even if the eye-catching symmetries and framing devices found (e.g.) on post-Alexander Kos and Rhodes are absent. Finally, ch. 17 ('Looking at Art in Sanctuaries') starts with the well-known lines in Euripides' *Ion* (190–199), where Athenian women visit Delphi, to suggest how the sometimes – to us – unimaginative-seeming choices of the same sculptural themes in temple after temple were perceived in antiquity, giving pleasure in 'finding and naming, in an unfamiliar place, familiar stories'; also how the

women's response to what they see mixes up the religious, aesthetic, cultural and social, since, as with most people in antiquity, visiting a sanctuary was 'a leisure experience, 'time-out' from normal duties'.

To give the flavour of Emerson's treatment of individual sanctuaries, the reviewer starts with out-of-the-way Bassae because, of the archaeological sites of mainland Greece which she discusses, readers are perhaps the least likely to have seen this one in person. Reliably interesting on visual impact, she starts by suggesting how the local limestone, characterised as 'sombre,' 'fissured' and 'harsh,' when combined with the Parian marble used for the sculpture and roof-tiles, might have seemed to echo 'the roughness of the mountainside itself, and the smooth brightness of Apollo,' the patron divinity. She (rightly in the reviewer's opinion) sees the temple design as innovatory and the Pausanian attribution to Ictinus as therefore credible. There are good comments on the style of the interior frieze (now in the British Museum) and its visibility (likely use of oil lamps). She is aware of Fred Cooper's work, but does not mention his claims for the sunrise effects allegedly enabled by the opening on the temple's east side, called here, conventionally, a 'door' (Cooper proposes that this was an opening, originally grilled); Emerson's take on these ideas might have been valuable.

Turning to the two new chapters on Western Greece, ch. 15 on Poseidonia introduces Greek settlement overseas and does not shy away from use of the word 'colony' – of debated appropriateness in current scholarship. Discussion of the temples themselves, as elsewhere in the book, is aided by bullet points (a boon for essay-writers). It is clear and detailed, so as to be worth having to hand on a visit to the site, especially since nearby structures are included. The Foce del Sele extra-mural Heraion receives a full treatment, with interesting speculation on why the temples here, alone of the Paestum temples, had architectural sculpture, along with a nice extract from Eur. *Iph. Taur.* to contextualise the finds of loom-weights by highlighting Argive Hera's particular appeal for Greek women, who *i.a.* wove for her. Finally, ch. 16 takes on the enigmatic temple of Zeus at Akragas. This is one of the best recent discussions in English of which the reviewer is aware. It highlights the vast structure's assertive quality of *megaloprepeia* (as Diodorus put it), sees the segmented 'giants' as evocations of the legendary Atlas who held up the sky, and argues for conscious rivalry with giant temples as far afield as Ionia, and for the startling design features as entirely Greek in inspiration (although for the screen wall

of the outer ‘colonnade’ the Archaic temple BII at Metapontion is perhaps a better precursor than the Late Archaic temple F at neighbouring Selinus, where the intercolumnar walls are a later addition of uncertain date).

In sum this book is much more than a work of armchair scholarship (although that aspect is well done): it bears the imprint of fresh insights and observations which are the author’s own, based, it seems, on extensive autopsy. In a good way these make familiar ground feel unfamiliar. The reviewer would recommend the book to everyone interested in the subject. Written for beginners in accessible English, it contains much of value for specialists too.

TONY SPAWFORTH
BRIGHTON, U.K.
tony.spawforth@newcastle.ac.uk

S. Rebecca Martin. *The Art of Contact. Comparative Approaches to Greek and Phoenician Art.* pp. 320, 38 color, 59 b/w illus. 207. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. ISBN 978–081224–908–8 cloth \$59.95 Outside the Americas £50.00 ebook editions are available.

Two cartoons in a much-cited handbook on archaeological theory¹ depict the practitioners of the discipline in 1988 and again, in 1998. The first cartoon on the discipline in 1988, shows a ferocious fight going on between representatives of different theoretical approaches. Situated at the periphery are, on the side, confused members of the public, and, on the other side, turned with his back to the rest of the world, a bearded pipe-smoking Classical Archaeologist, browsing a ‘monumental’ publication while seated on another pile of Classical Archaeology books. The next cartoon shows the discipline ten years later, in 1998. The fight at the core has dissolved and made place for stimulating parallel debates between factions in which members of the public participate. Untroubled and still seated on his pile of books, is the same bearded pipe-smoking Classical Archaeologist.

Were a cartoon be drawn of the discipline today, the pipe smoking would no doubt be abolished due to health-and-safety regulations and the bearded man might be replaced by a woman to reflect a gender

balance in the discipline, but the ‘monuments’ of Classical Archaeology would still be there. The pile of books on which the Classical Archaeologist is seated would be even higher, as even major university presses today continue to publish works that confirm the established hellenocentric and Winckelmanian narrative of Classical Art and Archaeology, in which aesthetics is the main objective and archaeology - at best - a technique to recover art.

It is exactly this approach that the recent book by S. Rebecca Martin tries to undermine. By selectively comparing Greek and Phoenician art works, she seeks to question the biased, essentialist and colonial discourse usually attached to Classical Art. The approach takes what the author calls a ‘holistic view of their modern study [of Greek and Phoenician art] in order to advocate for greater awareness of the relationship between theory and the writing of ancient (art) history’ (p.4). A comprehensive study or a Mediterranean approach would be inappropriate, because, as the author states, she wishes to address interpretative problems mainly and the Mediterranean was not a unified context anyway.

The book contains, following a short introduction, five chapters and a short conclusion. The introduction presents the various topics that will be discussed, the theories and case studies, as well as the general principles that guide the project. One of the main aims of the book, as is outlined in the introduction, is to show that art can be useful to study Greek-Phoenician interaction. It is stressed that ‘barbarians matter’ and that we need to use theory properly when studying art.

The first chapter elaborates on the theoretical stance of the book. Critical heuristic concepts such as culture, material culture and art are situated in a scholarly historical context, albeit in a rather summary way. Other sections in this chapter are entitled ‘A very brief introduction to the practice of Greek art history’, ‘An introduction to Phoenicia, its art and its history’ and ‘Greek-Phoenician contact studies: an introduction’. The section on the practice of Greek art history glances over the ‘fathers’ of Classical Archaeology, from Winckelmann to Beazley. The slightly longer section on Phoenicia aims to show that Phoenician studies have been even more static than Greek art history. The author summarises the main artistic output from Phoenicia and points out, perhaps a little superfluously, that we need to note that Phoenicia’s ‘most famous and lasting cultural contribution is thought to be its alphabet’ (p. 24). The section in Greek-Phoenician contact studies explores concepts such as orientalisation

¹ Johnson 2010: 261–262, fig. 13.1 and 13.2.

and hellenisation. Both terms are considered by the author to be problematic, following a - by now rather established - tradition of research.

Chapter 2 explores the topic of 'arts of contact'. Its aim is, through a discussion of two icons of Classical Art - the kouros and the picture mosaic - to deconstruct the traditional discourses on art. The chapter is divided in two sections. The first explores the origins of the kouros and the picture mosaic respectively and seeks to highlight that traditional scholarship identifies both art forms as unequivocally Greek. The second section of the chapter, called 'Art and identity' wants to undermine this notion of Greekness attached to art by stressing that we need to take into account a much greater role for patronage. Both might have been non-Greek in part e.g. a Greek apprentice training in an Egyptian workshop for the kouros or non-Greek motifs and motifs in the case of the picture mosaics. A concluding section in this chapter seeks to demonstrate that it is wrong to see these art works as exclusively Greek, by drawing parallels with the Lyre Player seals of the later Iron Age. The latter were truly widespread objects with a complex origin and used very differently throughout the Greek world. Therefore, the author concludes that the Greeks themselves had very different beliefs.

The third chapter entitled 'Exceptional Greeks and Phantom Phoenicians' discusses collective identity and the role of the concept of race in the discipline. Work done by other scholars is summarised to conclude that often racial labels are attached to art. The next two sections of the chapter look at representations of Self and Others in Greek and Phoenician art respectively. It appears to be difficult to say something about Phoenician art because there is not one category of Phoenician art. The chapter concludes that traditional art history operates on erroneous racial assumptions.

The fourth chapter on 'The rise of Phoenicianism' explores the rise and expression of collective Phoenician identity. Before the Achaemenid period, there was no evidence for a strong collective Phoenician identity. Monumental inscriptions sometimes provide evidence for city-ethnics and sometimes even hint at immigrants, but overall, it appears that a lot of mixing and matching was going on. Some elements, however, appear to have been confined to the region. Coins also provide evidence for city-ethnics. Some symbols and weights were seemingly specific to the region. The various city-states interacted closely together and the incorporation into the Persian Empire might have had an impact on collective identity. Phoenicianism seems to have been expressed more clearly by

Tyre, e.g. in its coinage depicting Kadmos handing over the alphabet to the Greeks. Interesting is the author's suggestion that trade restrictions during the Persian Wars might have created different spheres of interaction in the Mediterranean, giving rise to more clearly expressed collective identities as well.

The fifth chapter dedicated to 'Hybridity, the middle ground and the conundrum of mixing' compares two more examples of Greek and Phoenician art, one from Sidon, the other from Delos, to claim that it is wrong to see everything in terms of hellenisation and the loss of Phoenician identity. The case studies are used at the same time to explore the validity of postcolonial concepts to describe the art of contact. Martin uses the Alexander sarcophagus from Sidon to demonstrate the shortcomings of the concept of 'hybridity'. Martin rightfully stresses that hybridity is more a product of problematic scholarly taxonomies than that it is a useful concept. Hybridity always operates with the assumption that, at the basis, there are two pristine cultures. In an object, such as the Alexander sarcophagus, it is impossible to distinguish between Greek and Phoenician. The various stylistic elements work together, and we also need to see to consider the piece within the Phoenician tradition of sculpted monumental sarcophagi - a tradition which incorporates elements from Egyptian, Persian and Greek art. Therefore, the Alexander sarcophagus cannot be seen as evidence of the hellenisation of Phoenicia. In fact, despite the clear connections to the Macedonians, the monument might as well have expressed a non-Greek political message to the Sidonian public.

The Slipper Slapper group from Delos is used to promote, according to the author, the more useful concept of 'middle ground'. Rather than looking at the group in isolation, the author argues that it is important to consider it in its spatial context. The group was found in a complex that was identified by an inscription as the club of the Poseidoniasts. The house plan is similar to one at Boston esh-Sheikh, and its different rooms appear to have been dedicated to different gods. Room V2 was dedicated to Poseidon; V3 most likely to Aphrodite/Astarte and V1 possibly to Roma, as was an altar in room X. The Slipper Slapper group must thus be seen in the middle ground, between Greek, Phoenician and also Italian interaction.

The brief concluding chapter wants to take up two issues: the role of originality in our interpretations and the questions raised in the first chapter. With the first point, the author wishes to underline that even an artist's signature does not mean originality, as there was always mixing going on and a continued

engagement with other artists and art works, also in other media. Moving next to a conceptual level, Martin seeks to conclude that Gell's idea of art's agency is not always useful. Especially his view of an East-West divide embedded in the idea that the focus on aesthetics is a modern, Western concept, does not map very well on the Greek-Phoenician reality, according to Martin. She concludes that 'History of art of contact is less a history about facts but an exploration of what we value of the past' (p. 181).

Johnson, M. 2010. *Archaeological Theory. An Introduction*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.

If this book manages to get more pipe-smoking bearded Classical Archaeologists to engage with theory, it constitutes a very welcome addition. The accessibility of the book, with entry-level discussion of the discipline's background, short introductions to theory and specific case studies will appeal especially to undergraduates who are trying to get acquainted with more nuanced approaches to ancient art. The comparative approach adopted by the author is definitely original, although one can wonder if a more holistic view on Mediterranean art (rejected by the author in the introduction) might, in the end, not have achieved the same goal of demonstrating that the categories of 'Greek art' and 'Phoenician art' are complex.

Scholars interested in the mechanisms of Greek/Mediterranean interaction might find the book less appealing. Much of the discussion on Greek art and identity summarises only briefly the work that has been done by others before, and the book adds nothing new to the discussion. More sophisticated is the author's treatment of Phoenician art, because so little has been written about it. The author has some excellent ideas on the creation of Phoenician identity, but the discussion remains superficial, albeit stimulating. Overall, the various arguments of the book are not well integrated and a coherent narrative with a clear focus is absent: does the book compare Greek and Phoenician art, is it about the mechanisms of contact, the creation of identity, is it a theoretical essay, a (selective) chronological overview of how art mediates contact, or something else yet? The author picks up all these arguments, drops them again, sometimes revisits but not necessarily. Even though several of the critiques presented by the author are justified, the lack of focus obscures the author's original contribution. It can only be hoped that future work by the author picks up her interesting suggestions in a more elaborate and more focused discussion.

LIEVE DONNELLAN
 DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGY
 AARHUS UNIVERSITY
 l.donnellan@cas.au.dk

Hellenistic

Milena Melfi and Olympia Bobou (eds)
Hellenistic Sanctuaries between Greece and Rome. pp. xvi+326, 54 illustrations.
 2016. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 ISBN 978-0-19-965413-0. £97.00.

This volume deals with the period from 300 BC to AD 100. The sixteen chapters, all in English, arise from an Oxford conference in September 2010 taking the post-Classical polis sanctuary in Greece, Sicily and Magna Graecia as its focus. The main disciplinary emphasis is on classical archaeology and art; two chapters (Yves Lafond; Maria Kantirea) foreground epigraphy; another includes an excavator's unpublished note revealing a new inscription about Damophon of Messene (Melfi in the second of her three contributions). The chapters are not grouped thematically, although two sub-divisions stand out: one dealing with broader topics and regions, and the other focused on a particular polis or sanctuary.

In the former category, two chapters discuss Hellenistic patterns of dedication, especially of sculpture. Joannis Mylonopoulos takes divine images (including, but not limited to, so-called cult statues) and offers a nuanced analysis of Hellenistic trends, emphasising that what are sometimes seen as Hellenistic innovations, such as 'effeminacy' in the depiction of male divinities, are often anticipated in earlier sculpture or the 'minor arts'. She gives good reasons for qualifying a modern notion that the Hellenistic placing of temple statues increasingly emphasised 'aesthetic delight' (p. 122). On the other hand, in an (editorially unintentional) demonstration of how difficult it is to generalise about Hellenistic art, Olympia Bobou, on grounds that are also persuasive, points to Hellenistic sanctuaries as increasingly the setting for statuary 'not immediately connected to the worshipped deity' (p. 190), citing *i.a.* Herondas's well-known fourth mime, where the response of 'Kokkale' and 'Kynno' to offerings in the temple is, precisely, aesthetic. Aestheticism and religiosity were not of course mutually exclusive, and, for the later period, as well as Pausanias, noted by Bobou, Aelius Aristides is informative on the ancient experience of viewing sacred statues.¹

Yves Lafond looks at religious euergetism in the Peloponnesian poleis of the first centuries BC to AD and rightly concludes that the civic elites had now come to dominate 'polis religion', although this conclusion perhaps needs more reflection on reasons why and, specifically, on the Roman context (the reviewer returns to this point below). Annalisa Lo Monaco's good chapter on Roman magistrates and Greek sanctuaries includes illumination of the notorious Greek civic practice of rededicating to Romans older statue monuments: she argues that in honorific terms what mattered were the prominence of the location and 'the fame of the artist', whose signature was left on view – an insight surely, if true, into Roman taste as well as Greek expediency.

Of the chapters focused on individual sites, three discuss archaeological work in progress: Björn Forsén on the Arkadian sanctuary of Artemis Lykoatis; Elisabetta Interdonato on the Kos Asklepieion (see now her book, *L'Asklepieion di Kos: archeologia del culto*, L'Erma di Bretschneider, Rome 2013); and Lorenzo Campagna on the Santa Caterina site in Taormina. As for the rest, two focus on Hellenistic cult in respectively Kameiros (Luigi M. Caliò) and Demetrias (Sofia Kravaritou). Maria Kantirea's chapter operates as a case study (Lykosoura) in the type of euergetism discussed by Lafond. Jessica Piccinini plausibly re-identifies Dakaras's miscellaneous 'temples' at Dodona as Hellenistic treasuries offered by states in NW Greece. Melfi studies the commissions of the Messenian sculptor Damophon from cities on Greece's Adriatic coast as far north as Butrint. Finally, two papers offer contrasting views of the impact on older Greek cults of Roman colonisation at, respectively, Corinth (Melfi again) and Tauromenium (Campagna), the former impact seen as essentially benign, the latter not so.

Two authors misdate (pp. 5–6; 20) the famous inscription about the Andania Mysteries, which, more recently, the late Christian Habicht confirmed must be assigned to AD 23/24:² that is, the context for this extraordinary cultic initiative is, not Late Hellenistic, as used to be thought, but Early Imperial. This datum bears on a more general point. Melfi rightly gives prominence in her introduction to current approaches to so-called 'polis-religion', although these tend to focus on Archaic and Classical times. Increasingly researchers are now turning the spotlight on Greek civic religion under

¹ See Petsalis-Diomidis 2010

² Habicht 2015. in *AΞΩΝ*. Studies in Honor of Ronald S. Stroud, Athens 2015, 515–529: cp. BÉ 2016 no. 207

Roman domination, as this collection itself shows.³ Some of the fundamental modes of Graeco-Roman acculturation are touched on here, not least by Melfi herself: e.g. in seeing subordinate poleis using Greek cult to communicate with the dominant power, and the agency of ‘the taste of the Romans’ in shaping Greek cultic changes (p. 104; also pp. 249–50, a discussion that perhaps could be taken further, to suggest the moralising impact of the Augustan regime on Greek cults of Aphrodite previously practising sacred prostitution). What is needed now, this reviewer ventures to suggest, is a larger, theorised, study of this Roman context, one problematizing, not only polis religion, but also Greek – for want of a better term – ‘Romanisation’.

A. J. S. SPAWFORTH
BRIGHTON, U.K.
tony.spawforth@ncl.ac.uk

- Galli, M. (ed.) 2014. *Roman Power and Greek Sanctuaries. Forms of Interaction and Communication* (Tripodes 14). Athens: Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene.
- Habicht, C. 2015. Die in Messene verwendete Ära, in A. P. Matthaiou and N. Papazadarkas (eds) *ΑΕΩΝ. Studies in Honor of Ronald S. Stroud*: 515–529. Athens: Greek Epigraphic Society.
- Petsalis-Diomidis, A. 2010. *‘Truly beyond Wonders’: Aelius Aristides and the Cult of Asklepios*. (Oxford Studies in Ancient Culture and Representation) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roman

Jane E. Francis and Anna Kouremenos (eds) *Roman Crete. New Perspectives*. pp. ix+262, b/w and colour illustrations. 2016. Oxford: Oxbow Books. ISBN 978–1–78570–095–8 hardback £ 50.

This volume was instigated by a panel on *Roman Crete* presented at the *Roman Archaeology Conference* in Frankfurt, Germany in March 2012. The current book comprises a selected number of papers from the RAC panel, to which are added seven other articles. Totally, the volume is consisting of 13 articles, plus a foreword written by Hugh Sackett, and an introduction and an afterword, where the editors present an account of the previous archaeological and historical research on Roman Crete, summarize the outputs of the volume papers, and propose directions for future research.

Chronologically, the focus of the volume is the Roman imperial period (1st–3rd centuries AD). Some articles, however, extend to the late Hellenistic and late Roman periods, or even into the Early Byzantine age (8th and 9th centuries AD).

Thematically, the volume contains a variety of subjects. Broadly speaking the 13 articles discuss matters concerning economy and trade, urbanism, climate, art and architecture. As Jane Francis notes in the introduction, ‘this total represents a cross-section of the variety of Cretan material evidence, history and interpretations available to date’. Clearly, the scope of the volume was to present as much as possible new material for Roman Crete.

In the first article of the book François Chevrollier discusses the relationship between Crete and Cyrenaica, the two parts of the double province, united from the middle to second half of the 1st century BC till the beginning of the 3rd or even the early 4th century AD. Chevrollier argues that commercial exchanges between the regions are barely attested via the material evidence, but according to him, it is wrong to assume that the two regions were ignorant of each other, since ancient contacts go back to Minoan times. Coin and pottery circulation, as well as epigraphy, attests dynamic relations just after the union, i.e. during the 1st century BC and the 1st century AD, which decline from the end of the 1st century onwards.

Martha Baldwin Bowsky in her article ‘A context for Knossos: Italian Sigillata stamps and cultural

³ Also, e.g., Galli 2014.

identity across Crete' uses the circulation of the Italian Sigillata in Crete and the Greek East, as evidence for trade and economic integration of the cities, and as evidence of acculturation of the local elites. She examines the provenience, chronology and distribution patterns of the examined ceramics, and tries to analyze the reasons behind the Italian Sigillata boom in the 1st–2nd century AD. She finds the explanation in the decline of local pottery production and in the local elite's 'self-Romanisation', expressed with the desire for Italian-style artefacts. Although the title of her article is focused on 'cultural identity' this point is not satisfactorily developed. (Perhaps the title is very resonant for the material under examination). However, her analysis on the attested examples of Italian Sigillata is very detailed and the reconstruction of the distribution patterns and exchange networks inside and outside of Crete is very illuminating.

In the third article of the volume, Anna Kouremenos brings us to a different context. Via an iconographic analysis she narrates the development that the double axe, one of the most typical symbols of Minoan Crete, underwent from Bronze Age to Roman times. Although, as she admits, 'the rather eclectic mix of artefact categories depicting the double axe [...] raises more questions than it answers', she convincingly concludes that from a mostly religious symbol during the Bronze Age, in the Roman period the double axe has evolved to a multi-faceted but mostly apotropaic symbol.

In a fascinating paper, Jennifer Moody analyses the climate in the southwest Aegean (Crete included) from the Hellenistic till the Byzantine period (3rd/2nd centuries BC – ca. 1000 AD). She uses tree-rings, pollen, microfossils, speleothems, geomorphology and ancient texts for this exercise, and compares her evidence with data from central Europe and the eastern Mediterranean. Although in the conclusions she states that 'the influence of external socio-political forces on the region in the form of conquest and war seem to overwhelm any adaptations or reactions to climate change', her results actually seem to fit the human history attested in the southwest Aegean during this time span! In the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC the climate was cold resulting in less land available for cultivation than had been in the past. From 100 BC to 200 AD (the so-called Roman optimum) the climate was characterised by stability and warming temperatures, which have lengthened the growing season and allowed frost-sensitive crops like olives to be grown at higher altitudes. From 200 AD onwards climate instability and low temperatures

occurred, while the 8th – 9th centuries AD were less evaporative. Comparisons between the situation in southwest Aegean with central Europe and eastern Mediterranean for the most part concur but, of course, with some regional divergences.

Jane Francis discusses apiculture in Roman Crete. The author presents the main archaeological evidence for apiculture on the island, namely the ceramic beehives, and poses questions relating to the contribution of apiculture to the economy of Crete in the Roman period. Export of Cretan honey to Italy is archaeologically attested, and Roman texts provide evidence for the movement of honey and wax off Crete to other Mediterranean centres. Francis, using both literary and archaeological data, tries to identify the boundaries between family subsistence and export for the honey and wax production.

Pavlina Karanastasi, in her article on Roman imperial sculpture from Crete, makes the common mistake to connect regional economic prosperity with the concentrated capital in individual urban centres and families. The decisive factor, she argues, for Crete's prosperity was the Italian settlers, who 'were accustomed to high living standards with good quality housing and imported household objects'. Starting from this principal it is not surprising that her conclusions note that although the number of flourishing cities decreased in the Roman era, compared to Hellenistic times, there is an increased distribution of sculptures in large urban centres in Crete. Besides that, Karanastasi offers a comprehensive view of the local and imported sculpture in Roman imperial Crete.

The next article, written by Michael Milidakis and Christina Papadaki, is dedicated to a single item, namely an attic marble support from Roman Kissamos depicting a boar in relief. The authors investigate the style of the relief and present an iconographic analysis of the subject in Greek and Roman art.

Vanna Niniou-Kindeli and Nikos Chatzidakis present a preliminary (but also detailed) report from their excavation and restoration work on the theatre of Aptaera. This report is more than welcomed as the theatre of Aptaera is the only excavated Greek theatre (with Roman modifications) in Crete. It is interesting that, according to the present archaeological data, by contrast to the numerous Roman theatres attested on the island, pre-Roman theatres are identified only in Gortyn, Lato, Lytto, and Aptaera. The authors argue that this must be coincidental due to the lack of excavations or to

the total destruction of the pre-Roman phases of the theatres by the Roman renovations. Although in theory nobody can refute this scenario, the fact is that in mainland Greece, Roman modifications to Classical-Hellenistic theatres have not obliterated the older phases of the buildings; on the contrary the Roman interventions were limited, usually identified in the stage buildings or in the orchestras and the lower parts of the *cavea* (the latter in the cases of the transformation of the orchestras of the theatres into arenas). Financial reasons would constitute a serious objection to the destruction of an already standing building for its replacement by an entirely new one. The presence of many, entirely new, Roman theatres in Crete must be probably explained to the lack of (remarkable) pre-Roman theatres on the island; a phenomenon which if true triggers challenging research questions.

Enzo Lippolis summarizes the results of the long-term research of the Italian Archaeological School in Gortyn and he presents an archaeological narration of the urban development of the city from the early Hellenistic period till late Antiquity. With good descriptions and illuminating maps, Lippolis makes clear to the reader how Gortyn was transformed from a medium-sized city in Hellenistic times, to a Roman megalopolis of ca. 100 ha inhabited area in Antonine and Severan periods, and equipped with numerous public buildings. Gortyn, the capital of the double province of Crete and Cyrenaica, attracted from early on the attention of scholars, thus producing the results that we enjoy today. Aspects on long-term urban developments, like that described for Gortyn, are sadly lacking for most of the Cretan cities.

In the next article, Scott Gallimore offers a meticulous and interesting paper on Crete's economic transformation in the Late Roman Empire, using the amphora record as a primary economic proxy. He refutes the scenario of Crete's economic failure after the end of the 3rd century AD and proves that the export economy of the island continued to flourish into the late Roman period. Apart from the free-market exchange attested in the entire Roman age (1st – 7th centuries AD), the significant shift that he identifies from Early to Late Roman times, is that while in the early centuries the island 'used' the Alexandrian grain trade to export its goods towards Italian markets, in the late Roman period and especially during the 6th and 7th centuries the island became part of the military *annona* supplying the military forces stationed around the Black Sea.

In the penultimate article of the volume entitled 'Theatres, plays and the 3rd century crisis', George

Harrison drafts evidence for the economic and cultural activities on the island to challenge (not in the clearest way I have to confess) the perception of a 3rd century decline.

Lastly, Anastasia Yangaki offers an analytical and up-to-date presentation of the ceramics that circulated on the island during the late Roman and early Byzantine periods (4th – early 9th centuries). Yangaki touches upon issues related to the current state of evidence and new directions, and she goes on, beyond typo-chronological seriations, to matters of fabrics and trade networks. Of particular interest is the continuous ceramic sequence attested in Crete after the end of the 7th century, and the plentiful evidence for the 8th, which comes in sharp contradiction with the scarce material of the 4th – 5th centuries.

The collection of the aforementioned articles offer a significant boost to the study of Roman Crete. The articles are written by experts in the field and the pluralism of the contributions makes this book attractive to a wide range of scholars. But herein lies also the problematic point of the volume. The book is not thematic and it lacks a synthetic interpretation. It includes papers like Moody's on climatic change, as well as papers like that of Milidakis' and Papadaki's on a single marble table support. I suppose this is the price paid for the many research directions included in the volume.

Furthermore, some areas have been especially outlined in comparison to others. For example, the economy of the island as evidenced by the ceramics, has been discussed in almost half of the volume papers. Urbanism and settlement patterns, on the other hand, are strikingly lacking. This topic is represented only by the discussion of Gortyn. But Gortyn was just one of the c. 23 cities which were active in Roman Crete, and plus it was the province capital. We would like to be able to compare the 'story' of Gortyn with the fate of some other (second rank) cities of Roman Crete.

Despite the aforementioned weak points, which to an extent is not the responsibility of the editors but of the research gaps, *Roman Crete. New Perspectives* is undoubtedly a book of reference for Roman Crete and it has much to offer not only on a regional level, but also to Roman studies in general.

MICHALIS KARAMBINIS
HELLENIC MINISTRY OF CULTURE
mkarambinis@gmail.com

Walter Scheidel (ed.). *The Science of Roman History: Biology, Climate, and the Future of the Past*. pp. xiii+258, 26 b/w figures, 7 tables. 2018. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press. ISBN 978-0-691-16256-0 hardback \$35.00; paperback \$24.95.

Human history and natural history are intrinsically connected and new scientific advances are increasingly re-shaping our understanding of the Roman environment, which has significant implications for Roman historians. This is the premise laid out in the introduction of this volume. Despite its title, it does not seek to explore all of the numerous and varied ways in which scientific approaches have informed scholarship on antiquity; there is no discussion of new archaeometric techniques now applied to archaeological materials as standard, or indeed of remote sensing or dating techniques. Climate and biology, as the sub-title explains, are the focus here. The broader aim is to test the fertility of the intersection between archaeo-historical research on the one hand and natural-scientific studies on the other.

In Ch. 1, Kyle Harper and Michael McCormick begin with that most current of environmental topics – climate. What is provided is a summary of the key new techniques for understanding climatic shifts, notably those drawing on dendrodate and ice core data. Some clear results emerge. First, the Roman empire flourished in a period of solar stability. The same is true regarding volcanic activity, which was generally low to moderate between the mid 1st c. BC and the 6th c. AD. This is not unique to the Roman imperial period, of course, and indeed the graphs used to support this assertion show similar lows in the last five centuries BC too. But it is the graph that combines tree ring and ice core data,¹ which most clearly shows the distinctive stability of the first four centuries AD especially. Data from Alpine glaciers also suggests this period was comparatively warm, at least up to the 3rd c. AD, while speleothem data indicate a similar pattern, followed by much greater variability thereafter. The earlier part of this period has come to be known as the ‘Roman Climate Optimum’ (RCO) but from c. AD 150 changes can already be noted, most strikingly in the Nile valley where optimum floods become scarcer after this date. The idea of a ‘Late Antique Little Ice Age’ (LALIA) in the 5th and 6th c. is generally accepted here, though a recent survey of the evidence quite

rightly points to a number of methodological issues not fully explored in this contribution.² The challenge for historians and archaeologists remains understanding the impact of these changes, which will not have been uniform across the area of the Roman empire; there is a danger of an overly deterministic approach to these emerging datasets.

In Ch. 2, Marijke van der Veen turns to archaeobotany, but specifically ‘human-plant interactions’, with an emphasis on food supply. Here five themes are explored: production; distribution; preparation; consumption; and disposal. In the first of these, van der Veen summarises new advances in genetic research to explore changes in crop varieties as well as techniques for identifying increases in agricultural production. The movement of commodities but also the pests that consumed them – such as grain beetles, which are found in Britain only after the Roman conquest – are discussed with regard to distribution. The value of geographically distinct markers, such as the seeds of foreign weeds, in assemblages of wheat in Britain and France shows how close attention to accidental inclusions can point to the long-distance movement of cereals. Van der Veen has a real gift for highlighting key aspects of the discipline that historians might not have appreciated, and the conclusions they can provide. But like many contributions in this volume, the conclusions end up reading like a justification of archaeobotany – a neat encapsulation of its utility – rather than a clear statement about the direction the discipline is taking or its implications for broader historical questions.

Michael MacKinnon’s paper in Ch. 3 provides a similarly ‘broad overview’. Again, the contribution attempts to show what the particular discipline – in this case zooarchaeology – can do for our understanding of Roman history. There are some wonderful details here, notably on the spread of different species in the Roman period and, perhaps more surprisingly, late antiquity (such as the introduction of the rabbit to Italy and the re-introduction of the porcupine to Sicily and southern Italy). This is an extremely useful chapter for any student working on methodologies within classical archaeology.

Ch. 4 is the first of four chapters dedicated to human biology, and focuses on bones and teeth (Alessandra Sperduti, Luca Bondioli, Oliver E. Craig, Tracy Prowse and Peter Garnsey). It begins with a discussion of how the data that can be acquired from bones have been used by historians, especially economic

¹ Fig. 1.5, using data from Salzer and Hughes 2007.

² Sessa 2019.

historians. The key point here is that attempts to connect increasing stature to economic growth in the early Roman imperial period have often failed to consider the primary evidence rigorously enough; the estimates that exist to date need to be updated and continually tested (and there is overlap here with Ch. 5). Among the rigorous datasets pointed to are the skeletons from Velia and those from the vaults and beach at Herculaneum, which provide an interesting contrast with the human remains from Pompeii. Particularly welcome is a discussion of the prospects of isotope analysis in the future, as well as its necessary limitations.

Human growth and stature are turned to more directly in Ch. 5 by Rebecca Gowland and Lauren Walther. Here the focus is very much on what can and should be measured to estimate stature and where the pitfalls are. Crucially, the authors demonstrate that the stature of Roman males in Italy has probably been overestimated and that elsewhere, such as Roman Britain, average heights of men seem to drop in the Roman period. Differential body proportions across the area of the empire mean that long bones are not always a suitable basis for calculating stature. The authors propose studying children more intensively to consider health status and indeed for Roman Britain the data indicate that children exhibited stronger growth up until the age of five than eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Londoners, though after this period the patterns reverse.

DNA is touched on in Ch. 4 and 5 but only fully explored in Ch. 6 (Noreen Tuross and Michael G. Campana). The first third of this chapter explains the biochemistry of ancient DNA and explores the history of DNA research, while in the remaining chapter a series of examples of its application are provided. Sadly only half of these examples apply to the Roman world, such are the scarcity of studies using DNA research. The utility of DNA evidence for exploring the origins and spread of ancient plagues, notably to the Plague of Justinian, provides a point of useful discussion, however. DNA is also the subject of Ch. 7 (Roy J. King and Peter A. Underhill) but again the focus here is on explaining the technique and considering ways ahead; only a handful of evidence relating to Roman populations is discussed.

The focus of this volume is certainly selective. There are some unfortunate gaps: the sole archaeobotanical contribution is on food supply, when a discussion of other aspects of the environment, e.g. forestation or fuel, could have been useful; there is little discussion of palynology or charcoal analysis, for instance, except to flag them up as areas of important

research. Harper and McCormick, in Ch. 1, in fact, point to questions of wood supply for timber and fuel as a field of enquiry, as does van der Veen in Ch. 2. There is also little mention of soil science – except a note that this ‘once received attention from historians.’

Overall, this volume brings together many of the key players in these various fields. The writing is uniformly excellent and it is sufficiently well-illustrated. It represents a good overview of the state of the field and provides a clear explanation of the various techniques and disciplines covered and their potential. It will be extremely useful for students and could be used alongside, for instance, Susan Alcock and Robin Osborne’s edited volume on *Classical Archaeology* for core undergraduate classes on the Roman world.³ More generally, however, it is not always clear who the intended audience for this volume is. Much of it reads like an attempt to convince ancient historians of the utility of certain scientific techniques – almost all of which are well established in archaeology. In this sense, it reads in places like Ray Laurence’s short, and very useful, *Roman Archaeology for Historians*, but with a more scientific bent.⁴ However, there is also a danger that some of these papers set out with the goal of ‘explaining’ to historians the datasets available to them. Archaeologists and historians are more than once contrasted and several comments are made about the ‘tendencies’ of historians, as if they are a group easily categorised. Worryingly, for both historians and archaeologists, there seems to be an acceptance running through sections of this volume that the job of the latter is to provide the data and the former the ‘context’. Considering the desire for *consilience* expressed in the introduction to this volume, some further discussion of the shifting, and increasingly porous, disciplinary boundaries between ancient history and classical archaeology might have been useful.⁵ While it might be true that ‘(few) historians... are aware of stable isotope analysis’, many classical archaeologists are very familiar with the tools employed, and sources used, by historians on a regular basis (such as historical demography and epigraphy – two examples described in this volume as being cards up historians’ sleeves). The editor is careful to note that a survey of the kind can only ever be a ‘snapshot’ of the current state of the field, such is the speed with which scientific research develops, and already new approaches to the climatic data discussed here are showing this to be the case. The contributions here

³ Alcock and Osborne 2012.

⁴ Laurence 2012.

⁵ For relevant discussions, see the papers in Sauer 2004.

highlight a range of approaches and their potential, but what they mean for broader discussions of Roman history remains to be seen.

BEN RUSSELL
UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH
ben.russell@ed.ac.uk

- Alcock, S.E. and R. Osborne (eds) 2012. *Classical Archaeology*, 2nd edn., Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Laurence, R. 2012. *Roman Archaeology for Historians* (Approaching the Ancient World). London and New York: Routledge.
- Salzer, M.W. and M.K. Hughes 2007. Bristlecone pine tree rings and volcanic eruptions over the last 5000 yr. *Quaternary Research* 67.1: 57–68.
- Sauer, E. (ed.) 2004. *Archaeology and Ancient History. Breaking down the Boundaries*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Sessa, K. 2019. 'The new environmental fall of Rome: a methodological consideration'. *Journal of Late Antiquity* 12.1: 211–255.

Tamara M. Dijkstra, Inger N.I. Kuin, Muriel Moser and David Weidgenannt (eds) *Strategies of Remembering in Greece under Rome (100 BC – 100 AD)* (Publications of the Netherlands Institute at Athens VI). pp. 190, b/w and colour illustrations. 2017. Leiden: Sidestone Press. ISBN 978–90–8890–480–6, paperback € 34.95, hardcover € 95.00, PDF e-book € 9.95.

This collective book is the result of a conference 'Strategies of Remembrance in Greece under Rome,' held at the Netherlands Institute at Athens in October 2016, and it stemmed from three research projects run in Germany and the Netherlands, in which the editors participated. It consists of 11 articles (two papers presented at the conference are not included in the volume), and geographically it is focused on the Roman province of Achaëa.

The present volume, clearly inspired by exemplary publications of a similar kind,¹ questions the view that the period of the 1st century BC and the 1st century AD was one of economic, political or cultural decline and weakness for Greece, pointing to the cultural vitality and the persistence of traditional

forms of power, as the editors note in their introduction. 'It seeks to show that even though the cities of ancient Greece underwent major political and cultural transformations during this time, it was also a period of great dynamism, innovation, and adaptation.' Moreover, it seeks to establish 'how communities and individuals of Roman Greece used their cultural and historical legacy to engage actively with the increasing presence of Roman rule and its representatives' (p. 13).

That the 1st century BC and the 1st century AD was a period of great dynamism is sure, self-evident and already known (it suffices to remind ourselves of the historical facts that took place on Greek soil and the consolidation of Rome in Greece). It is also sure, despite the editors' questioning, that the 1st century BC and the 1st century AD, was, actually, a period of economic and political weakness for the Greek cities. Economically, in this period the Greek cities were still suffering the consequences of the turbulent situation of late Hellenistic times, while politically they have definitely become subjects of Rome. The use, thus, of the 'engagement' of the cultural and historical legacy of the Greeks, as a counterargument against the view of the political and economic weakness of the Greek cities in the 1st century BC and the 1st century AD, cannot stand. What is interesting, however, is the cultural aspect of this engagement.

The editors have divided the eleven articles of the volume into four sections: the first, entitled 'Building Remembrance,' focusses, according to the editors, on urban and provincial landscapes. It includes three articles, but the first, 'Roman Greece and the Mnemonic turn. Some critical remarks,' by Dimitris Grigoropoulos, Valentina di Napoli, Vasilis Evangelidis, Francesco Camia, Dylan Rogers and Stavros Vlivos, has basically nothing to do with the theme of this section. It is an introductory article which offers a keynote on the subject and creates the framework in which the rest of the contributions (not only of the section but generally of the volume) move. Discussing Greece as a whole and also retrieving evidence from the rest of the empire, the authors illuminatingly conclude that valorisation and mobilisation of the past were neither unprecedented in earlier Greek self-perception, nor unique amongst other conquered societies of the empire. As they note, '[b]y the time of the Roman conquest Greek communities had already developed the frameworks, elements and specific practices through which perceptions of the past were shaped and materialized'. Under Roman rule the tradition of commemoration has been reproduced and, additionally, has acquired a special

¹ Alcock 2002; Spawforth 2012.

significance due to the importance attached to Greek culture within Roman imperial ideology: this is, as the authors note, what differentiates Achaean from other provincial cultures.

The second article of the section 'Strategies of remembering in the creation of a colonial society in Patras' written by Tamara Dijkstra, discusses (a) how the transfer of the cult of Artemis Laphria from Kalydon to Patras functioned as a unifying religious focus that was acceptable for both the local inhabitants and the colonists, (b) the way in which Augustus 'copied' the local foundation myths and presented himself as a modern *oikist* of Patras, and (c) how the consolidation of the Italian colonists in the social hierarchy of the city was expressed through their burials in cardinal locations. Although the matters Dijkstra points out are interesting, the deviation here is that the author does not describe how 'the communities of Roman Greece mobilized their past as a political resource to respond to change,' as the editors clearly state in their introduction (p. 13), but she actually presents evidence of change from the pre-colonial to the colonial status of Patras, employed by Augustus and the new settlers.

The same, more or less, applies to the last article of the section by Catherine Vanderpool and Paul Scotton, on the Julian basilica in Corinth. The authors propose that this massive building, erected on the east end of the Forum, was a clear statement of Rome. The basilica was the first and most prominent building that challenged the still standing and imposing Archaic temple of Apollo. The sculptural programme within the basilica contained more sophisticated elements related to the subject of the volume, as it accommodated statues of Augustus's sons interpreted as Classical Peloponnesian heroes and statues of the imperial family as Hellenistic generals. Despite this common phenomenon of Hellenic influence (many times discussed, and in this volume outlined by Grigoropoulos *et al.*), the Julian basilica was not the result of the mobilisation of the Greek past as a political resource by the Greek communities, but 'the local response to Augustus's empire-wide effort to give physical structure to the new political order,' as the authors state (p. 63).

The second section of the volume is entitled 'Competing with the Past' and focuses on uses of the past as these were expressed in associations and agonistic festivals. In the first article of the section we find the first clear elements related to the subject of the volume, i.e. acts of remembering initiated by *the Greeks* as a response to the changes occurring with the advent of Rome in this part of the

Mediterranean. Benedict Eckhardt examines private associations in Roman Greece and he convincingly shows that while in other regions of the empire these associations shared features characterized as provincial responses to imperial ideologies, in Greece these features were limited, and detected mainly in the colonies. What he, interestingly, shows is that the private associations of Roman Greece seek to continue and revive terminology clearly referring to the Classical period and to engage in mythologizing organisations of the past. The author characterizes the Greeks of the Roman period as 'reluctant Romanizers' and he concludes that 'Greeks were not immune to the challenges posed by an imperial framework surrounding private corporate organisation, however much they chose to cultivate the differences' (p. 80).

In the second article of the section, Zahra Newby examines the commemoration of the Persian Wars and particularly the battle of Salamis by the Athenian *Ephebeia* in the Roman period. This paper is interesting, but again it is not exactly serving the scope of the volume, if this was to identify strategies of remembering initiated by *the Greeks*, as a political response to the Roman impact: firstly, as the author illuminatingly presents, the memory of the Persian Wars was continuous, through verbal and visual means, without interruption since the 5th century BC through Hellenistic and Roman times. Thus it would be wrong to conceive the celebration of the Persian Wars in the Roman period as a 'response' to Roman domination: the Athenians continued to do what they used to do since the 5th century BC. Secondly and more importantly, it has been argued that Athens' revival of the memory of the Persian Wars and particularly the battle of Salamis, might have been provoked by Augustus, who used the battle of Salamis as a parallel to his own naval victory at Actium.² If this is true, it would be more correct to see the commemoration of the battle of Salamis by the Athenian *Ephebeia* not as an Athenian mobilisation of the past which has been used as a response to the Roman domination, but rather as a (Roman-promoted) means which served the imperial ideology.

Similarly, the return of the Isthmian games to Corinth, which Lavinia del Basso discusses in the last article of the section, was not initiated by the old Corinthians, but by the new settlers and magistrates of the Roman colony, to legitimate themselves as inheritors of the Greek city and to increase the prestige of the colony amongst the Greek world. It is also telling, as the author states,

² Spawforth 2012.

that after Actium the Isthmian games was the only Panhellenic festival associated with the Caesarean games, creating thus a link between Greek traditions and imperial ideology (p. 102).

The third section of the volume, 'Honouring Tradition' examines the honorific practices of communities in Roman Greece for local elites. In the first article of the section Johannes Fouquet presents three intra-mural burials in the Peloponnese, namely the heroon of the Saithidai in Messene and two Roman heroa on the agorae of Mantinea and Argos, which originally accommodated local Classical heroes and were then reused as monuments in honour of their descendants. Although Fouquet's article is to the point of the volume, the subject is not sufficiently developed. At the end of the article the reader remains just with the evidence of the presence of the burials. Some more interpretative commentary would be needed here.

In the next article Christopher Dickenson discusses 'Public statues as a strategy of remembering in early imperial Messene.' The author presents in detail the large statuary assemblage of the city, dividing the material into two categories: statues of locals and statues of Roman rulers, using examples coming from the three major public spaces of Messene: the agora, the sanctuary of Asklepios and the gymnasium. Although Dickenson's article is more an outline of the early Roman statuary of Messene than a contribution on the subject of the volume, the author pinpoints the multifaceted perspectives that public statuary can open up. As he concludes, 'The array of statues that strung out through the public spaces of an ancient city like Messene constitutes a rich and ever evolving tapestry of civic memories through which local identity was expressed and defined, through which power relations within the local community were negotiated and contested and through which sense was made of relations to higher powers [...]' (p. 140).

Lastly, David Weidgenannt, in a clever article, approaches Greek honorific culture from a different angle. Based on examples from Boeotia, the Argolid and Arcadia from the 2nd century BC to the 1st century AD, he tries to show that the honorary decrees and honorary inscriptions that cities used to dedicate to local *euergetes*, were not only acts of remembering, but also strategies for future actions. The language used in these inscriptions targeted the 'commitment' that the *euergetes*' behavior would continue in the same way, beneficial for the city. It aimed, thus, to the construction of the 'eternal benefactor,' as the author notes (p. 145). The critical element in this procedure, without

which this contribution would be outside the scope of the present volume, is the lineage of these benefactors. They were descendants of, apparently, noble families with a tradition of *euergetism*; a fact which is outlined in the civic honorific acts. In this way, these honorific practices are transformed from, purely speaking, commemorative acts to acts of remembrance of local ancestors.

The last section of the volume is dedicated to Athens. Inger Kuin, in the first article of the section, and one of the most interesting of the volume, reveals how political changes occurring in Athens in the 1st century BC were 'anchored' to traditions of the Athenian past. The hoplite general Athenion renewed the Athenian democracy based on old decisions of the old Areopagus, while Sulla, regardless of whether he delivered a new 'Athenian constitution' or laws after the sack of the city in 86 BC, certainly intervened in the political system of Athens, being compared (probably by local initiation) to the tyrannicides Harmodius and Aristogeiton; this on the grounds that with the sack of Athens Sulla defeated the Mithridatic 'tyrant' Aristion, who in 87 BC had replaced Athenion in the post of hoplite general. In a methodological discussion, the author shows that the reference to pre-existing structures was considered a 'prerequisite' for the successful implementation of any political innovation in the ancient world, and thus she shows that the remembering of the past has been drafted in for the political changes occurring in Athens during the Roman conquest.

Finally, Muriel Moser, in the last article of the volume, gives an interesting reading on the reused statues dedicated by the Athenian demos to Roman politicians in the period between the sack of Sulla and the reign of Nero. The author persuasively concludes that the numerous Classical-Hellenistic monuments rededicated in Roman times, were a mark of special respect and distinction for the honoured person. These reused monuments were far more impressive than the newly made, and more importantly, they have carefully preserved the signatures of the famous artists of the past. Art from Classical Athens was highly respected among the Roman elites, and thus these statues had an important antiquarian value. But beyond that, the reused monuments played with memories of the admired Classical past and implied a comparison between the honorand and the Athenian citizen who originally had been represented. 'In these monuments,' as Moser concludes, 'the past was remembered in a careful, strategic manner in view of gaining Roman support and favour for the city,' and 'at the same time, the reuse of private monuments

as public honours also powerfully asserted the demos' authority over the Acropolis, a crucial place of Athenian memory and remembering.' (p. 179).

Overall evaluation of the volume: undoubtedly, the authors of the 11 articles have tried to touch upon a difficultly caught subject; the task was ambitious. In some cases there is an overlapping in the material presented, while the sections are ill-defined; their sophisticated titles do not help their clarification. Moreover, although Inger Kuin and Muriel Moser state in the volume's concluding remarks that the assembled cases studies were spread over a wide geographical area (p. 185), the places which have been extensively discussed in the volume are Athens, Patras, Corinth, Messene, Argos and Mantinea. But in the Peloponnese and central Greece there were more than 120 cities active in Roman times. Having this in mind, the aforementioned selection remains fragmentary.

As to the question as to whether this volume achieves the goals set by the editors, this depends on whether the subject of the volume was, generally, strategies of remembering in Greece under Rome, or if the target was to show how 'the communities of Roman Greece mobilized their past as a political resource to respond to change,' as the editors clearly state in their introduction (p. 13). If the answer is the first, then the volume has definitely achieved its task. If the answer is the second, in this case only some of the contributors have managed to correspond (namely Eckhardt, Fouquet, Weidgenannt, Kuin and Moser; I also highlight the article by Grigoropoulos *et al.* which offers a well-defined framework on the subject). In fact, a large number of the volume contributions present evidence for 'strategies of remembering' employed not by the Greeks but by the Romans, which served imperial ideology and propaganda. It remains open whether the authors failed to detect examples initiated by Greek communities or if this situation reflects, indeed, a historical reality. If the answer to this question is the latter, then this weakens the central idea (on which this volume is actually built), of the mobilisation of the Greek past by local communities against the political changes occurring in Greece with the advent of Rome.

Lastly I disagree with the opinion of the editors, expressed both in the introduction and their concluding remarks, that the 'strategies of remembering' (whether or not they have been successfully presented in this volume) can function as a response to the traditional view of the weakness of Greece in this time-span. Nobody has argued that the Greek cities (as a whole) ceased to exist in Roman times and nobody has denied their continuity;

and indeed, Greece was a place of great vitality, dynamism and cultural experimentation in Roman times, as the editors correctly stress (p. 183). This, however, cannot erase the political and economic weakness that, undoubtedly, the majority of Greek cities experienced between 100 BC and 100 AD.³

MICHALIS KARAMBINIS
HELLENIC MINISTRY OF CULTURE
mkarambinis@gmail.com

- Alcock, S.E. 2002. *Archaeologies of the Greek Past. Landscape, Monuments, and Memories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bintliff, J. 2012. *The Complete Archaeology of Greece. From Hunter-gatherers to the 20th century A.D.* Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Karambinis, M. 2018. Urban networks in the Roman Province of Achaia (Peloponnese, central Greece, Epirus and Thessaly). *Journal of Greek Archaeology* 3, 269–339.
- Rizakis, A.D. 2014. Town and country in early Imperial Greece, in J. Bintliff (ed.) *Recent Developments in the Long-Term Archaeology of Greece* (Pharos Supplement): 241–267. Leuven: Peeters.
- Spawforth, A.J.S. 2012. *Greece and the Augustan Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Georgios Deligiannakis. *The Dodecanese and the Eastern Aegean Islands in Late Antiquity, AD 300–700*. pp. xxii+232, b/w illustrations. 2016. Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN 978-0-19-874599-0 paperback £105.

This substantial book derives from Deligiannakis' doctoral thesis, and for this reason it is bibliographically updated until 2006, although it has been published 10 years later in 2016. It focuses on a particular chronological period – Late Antiquity (300–700) – during which insular communities played a major role on multiple levels. Despite the fact that it places a particular focus on the Dodecanese and the Eastern Aegean Islands, the author adopts a broader geographical perspective, using comparative material from both island (Crete, Cyprus, Cyclades etc.) and mainland regions (Asia Minor, Greek mainland etc.). This factor,

³ See, for example, Bintliff 2012: 310–336; Rizakis 2014; Karambinis 2018.

combined with the synthetic approach employed by Deligiannakis, which brings together a wide range of historical and archaeological evidence, offers valuable insights into insular communities of the Aegean world during Late Antiquity.

The introductory Chapter 1 provides the reader interesting keys to a better understanding of the aims and methods of this research. It also briefly presents some basic information about the Dodecanese (geography, historical topography, history of research) and the structure of the book. Chapter 2 offers an excellent summary of the administrative and political history of the Province of the Islands, which included, *inter alia*, the Dodecanese and the Eastern Aegean Islands. Based on epigraphic and literary evidence that span a wide chronological spectrum ranging from the late 3rd to the end of the 7th c., this chapter provides a useful historical background concerning administrative reforms, Persian hostile activities, Arab-Byzantine struggle for supremacy in the Mediterranean Sea, and internal conflicts.

Chapter 3 focuses, mainly, on the Christian and, secondarily, on the Jewish communities in the Islands from the 1st to the 7th c. The author discusses the fundamental and complex changes in insular societies as a result of the gradual spread of Christianity and the growth in the power of bishops. Combining island ecclesiastical history and archaeological evidence, he proposes that the Dodecanese and the Eastern islands adopted Christianity at an earlier stage compared to other Aegean Islands. Although brief, because of the limited material at hand, the sub-chapter about the Jewish communities summarizes the relevant available information from the Aegean islands. The following Chapter 4 illustrates interesting stories of interaction between Christianity and Paganism in an island context through the study of ancient sanctuaries' late history and afterlife, as well as the examination of the phenomenon of ancient temples' conversions into Christian churches and early monasticism. By combining material from various islands, Deligiannakis demonstrates the complexity of the process of Christianisation and transition to a new cultural identity in the Aegean insular communities. Island diversity and local particularities resulted in the survival of the pagan religion well into 5th and 6th c., and, consequently, in the efforts of the ecclesiastical authorities to convert the island population into Christians. One of the main contributions of this chapter is the discussion of early monasticism. Despite the limitations, combining evidence from different places, this summary can offer the grounds upon

which the monastic archaeology in the Aegean during Late Antiquity can be discussed in the future.

Chapter 5 constitutes the main body of this book and seeks to shed more light on aspects related to the Late Antique archaeology of the Dodecanese. It leaves aside traditional views that focused only on the study of religious architecture and proposes a critical and synthetic approach exploring both urban centers and the countryside. By beautifully combining a wide range of data, Deligiannakis traces the general patterns of urban topography in the cities of Rhodes and Kos, and contributes to a better understanding of Late Antique urbanism in the Mediterranean insular world. Based mainly on the monumental architecture and textual sources, he discusses a wide range of issues concerning the islands' countryside, such as rural economy in relation to the role of the state, agricultural labour policies, and bio-archaeologies. He connects the phenomenon of construction of churches with the society that built them, raising interesting questions. He also critically discusses the relation of the distribution of churches with economic prosperity and economic growth. Using the region of Mesanagros (Rhodes) as a case study, the author seeks to reconstruct the settled landscape of the countryside and identify the relations between the different types of settlements. If more case studies from various regions of the Dodecanese had existed in this chapter, the book would have benefited greatly. By comparing evidence from several insular regions, the complex settlement trends, that developed in the islands of the Aegean during Late Antiquity, can be better understood and interpreted. At the same time, it is possible to bring forward regional diversities and the role of the landscape in the development and evolution of the settlement patterns in the same island or between different islands. One of the great values of this chapter is the special focus on the investigation of the small satellite islands. An astonishing fieldwork project carried out by the author at the site of Palatia (island of Saria) offers valuable insights into the 'lesser' island communities of the Aegean, shedding more light on their role within the Late Antique Mediterranean world.

The following Chapter 6 deals with the economy of the Dodecanese and the role of the islands in the dense maritime commercial network of the Eastern Mediterranean world with particular focus on the 5th and 6th c. Once more, by successfully combining a broad body of archaeological evidence and textual sources, Deligiannakis moves from the local to the regional and, eventually, to the inter-regional context, offering an interesting window

into exploring the islands' role and identity within the Late Antique Mediterranean world. He demonstrates the involvement of the Dodecanese as stopping points on the *annona* system for the provisioning of the lower Danube. Taking into account the concept of insularity, he concludes that the economies of these islands are largely dependent on external parameters rather than internal, and thus they are more sensitive to socioeconomic and political changes in the wider Mediterranean world.

In correspondence with this approach, Chapter 7 is dedicated to the 7th c., a period of fundamental transformations at multiple levels. Based on different types of material culture and avoiding traditional views, the author offers a fresh approach to the effects of the Arab raids on the islanders' life, shedding more light on the complex sequence of changes between the 7th and the 9th c. He notes that, despite dramatic changes, the Islands managed to function effectively within the new circumstances pertaining to the Aegean and retained high levels of human activity. Chapter 8 summarizes the conclusions of this book. The final part of the book offers an extremely useful archaeological gazetteer of the Dodecanese, accompanied by plates and illustrations. It is a valuable tool for archaeologists studying a variety of issues, such as architecture, sculpture, built environment etc.

In sum, the importance and relevance of the book under review extend far beyond the Dodecanese and the Eastern Aegean Islands. It will be particularly valuable for scholars interested in the investigation of Mediterranean island communities during Late Antiquity. Deligiannakis offers a fresh approach to various aspects of insularity, connectivity, integration, built environment and material culture in the Late Antique Mediterranean islands. In this respect, it fulfils the aim to produce a partial historical narrative of this region and its environs during Late Antiquity. Despite serious limitation posed by the material and other restrictions, this book further expand the horizons of island archaeology and broadens our perspective and knowledge on Late Antique insularity. Given the fact that it is not possible to cover thoroughly all details, it provides a solid ground upon which future research on the Dodecanese and the Eastern Aegean Islands can be based. Finally, in terms of methodology, this book stresses the need to combine archaeological data and textual sources, which is (even today) not taken for granted in scholarly approaches of Late Antiquity.

KONSTANTINOS ROUSSOS
INSTITUTE OF MEDITERRANEAN STUDIES/FORTH
roussos@ims.forth.gr

Medieval

Philipp Niewöhner (ed.). *The archaeology of Byzantine Anatolia. From the end of late antiquity until the coming of the Turks*. pp. 480, b/w and colour illustrations. 2017. Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN 978-0-19061-046-3 hardback £100.

Until not long ago, the history and archaeology of Anatolia had traditionally been dominated by Roman-oriented studies. The surge of interest in Byzantine remains of the last decades has contributed considerably in shedding light on later phases, clarifying the development of important processes that had so far been understudied, like the evolution of urbanism. Invaluable review-like studies and groundbreaking discoveries such as those at Amorium, have helped re-draw a picture of Byzantine Anatolia that is not merely one of decline, collapse and urban shrinkage. All this has translated into a large corpus of secondary literature that is difficult to navigate by non-specialists that approach the topic for the first time.

The *Archaeology of Byzantine Anatolia* provides an overview of general trends in archaeological studies on Byzantine Asia Minor. The chronological focus of the volume is wide, covering the six centuries between the fall of Rome in the West and the arrival of the Turks (late 5th–late 11th centuries). The introduction by the editor sets the background by providing the reader with a short history of research, an overview of the main themes considered by the contributions, the geographical and chronological boundaries of the volume, the structure of the work as well as clarifications on spelling and specific terms. The decision to focus on the 5th–11th centuries is explained as being motivated by the desire to follow the development of Roman tradition in the Byzantine period, which is a recurring theme in all the chapters. The periodisation followed by the volume is unusual but justified clearly by the editor (Early Byzantine Period: 5th–7th centuries; Invasion Period: 8th century; Middle Byzantine Period: 9th–late 11th centuries).

The thirty-eight chapters that follow this introduction are collected in two separate sections, namely 'Syntheses' and 'Case Studies'. The former includes contributions dedicated to specific themes in Byzantine archaeology that, thanks to the extensive state of research and relatively rich archaeological record, allow for general

summaries: 'Historical Geography', 'Transport and Communication', 'Urbanism', 'Human Remains', 'Coins', 'Rural Settlements', 'Fortifications', 'Houses', 'Monasteries', 'Churches', 'Rock-cut Architecture', 'Funerary Archaeology', 'Ceramics' and 'Small Finds'. Notes on wider themes such as societal trends or trade are to be found scattered in the volume. The level of detail and, therefore, length of text, varies from chapter to chapter. This imbalance has to do with the availability of the evidence – unsurprisingly, the chapter on churches by Buchwald and Savage is one of the longest. Several of these contributions, such as the one on urbanism by Niewöhner, push the chronological boundaries of the work into the Roman and late Byzantine period; only a few, for example that on ceramics by Vroom, step out of Anatolia to contextualise the evidence.

The section on 'Case Studies' includes twenty-four chapters and is dedicated to the history and archaeology of a selection of relevant sites, most of which being urban settlements. The majority of contributions in this section present the most notable remains of each site from the oldest to the latest. The focus is mostly – but not solely – towards architecture, *in primis* churches, but also city walls and dwellings. The book concludes with a bibliography and two indices on sites and natural features mentioned in the text.

Overall, this is an invaluable contribution to the history of Anatolia and Byzantine archaeology. The book is written with an eye towards non-specialists, therefore unusual terms are followed by a full explanation and complex phenomena are described in a clear and concise way. Yet, the experienced archaeologist working in Asia Minor or adjacent regions will find this book an equally invaluable companion. The chapters are written by authoritative scholars in the field and also include data on recent or ongoing fieldworks as well as well-drawn plans and photographs of artefacts and excavations. Because of the diverse array of themes covered by the book and the wide use of written sources, historians will find this work equally useful.

EMANUELE E. INTAGLIATA
CENTRE FOR URBAN NETWORK EVOLUTION
(URBNET), AARHUS UNIVERSITY
e.e.intagliata@cas.au.dk

Sharon E. J. Gerstel (ed.). *Viewing Greece: Cultural and Political Agency in the Medieval and Early Modern Mediterranean* (Studies in the Visual Cultures of the Middle Ages 11). pp. 364, colour illustrations. 2016. Turnhout: Brepols. ISBN 978–2503–56643–6 paperback €75.

The present volume is a collection of essays resulting from a number of events (conferences, classes, lectures) that took place in parallel to the exhibition *Heaven and Earth: Art of Byzantium from Greek Collections* (2013–2015). The exhibition was first presented in Washington, DC, then in Los Angeles, and finally, a reduced version travelled to Chicago.

This publication contains thirteen substantive essays that explore a variety of subjects, focusing on the art, architecture, and topography of medieval and early modern Greece, through the use of an equally wide range of approaches. They offer a nuanced view of objects, some of which were also presented in the Washington/Getty exhibition, exploring the meaning of those objects to people and providing new approaches to the study of Byzantine Greece. The material studied in the essays ranges in date covering the whole period of Byzantine artistic production. Nevertheless, contrary to the exhibition itself, which moves between objects of religious and secular importance, there is an apparent predominance of articles in this book examining works of religious use. As such, objects of secular importance are poorly represented in this volume and the readers do not enter into the spaces of everyday life.

The introduction, written by the editor, Sharon E. J. Gerstel, provides the reader interesting keys to a better understanding of how this book related to the aims of the exhibition and how the essays derived from the events. It also offers an excellent summary of the articles. The thirteen contributions brought together for this volume, written by Greek and international authors, are separated into five clusters that revolve around a similar theme, echoing the volume's title.

The first chapter encompasses three essays offering important insights into the ideological roots of religious art through its interaction with hymnography and philosophical writings, as well as through the examination of aspects of materiality. Father Maximos Conostas seeks to re-approach the theoretical meaning of the bilateral icon of the Man of Sorrows and Virgin Hodegetria, proposing a conceptual link between

the icon and a collection of ecclesiastical poems known as the Stavrotheotokia. This relationship offers a fresh approach to the interaction between Middle Byzantine poetry and religious art. The Stavrothorakia, as the author argues, constitutes a literary analogue of bilateral icons. Carr's paper explores the materiality of icons and the reflections of the urban cult of icons on regions beyond Constantinople, through the importance of mimesis. Combining a careful reading of texts and a critical approach to religious objects, the author investigates the interaction between the core and periphery and illustrates the role played by replicas in the diffusion of images of the Virgin, as a medium of the Miraculous. Maguire's essay, the title of which echoes the exhibition's title, investigates the influence of the philosophical writings of Pseudo-Dionysios on religious architecture and the later Byzantine authors. It offers an insightful approach to the churches' interior space in order to locate the place of the terrestrial and heavenly realms. By beautifully combining a closer look at floor pavements, wall mosaics and written sources, Maguire suggests that the decoration of the lower parts of the church reflects terrestrial creation while the upper parts of the building illustrate the greater splendour and the transcendence of heaven.

The second chapter seeks to shed more light on aspects related to workshops in two important urban centers of the Greek lands, Thebes and Thessaloniki, offering regional overviews. The two papers of this section focus on different periods of Byzantine history and on various types of objects that unearthed through rescue excavations. Apart from the examination of local workshop practices, both studies explore the society that produced the objects. Gerousi-Bendermacher offers a new interpretation of a mosaic pavement from Thebes through the analysis of the inscriptions and the preserved representations, as well as based on comparative material and legal sources. Although there is some limited but extremely important information about local workshop practices, this study mainly discusses the technical, artistic, prosopographic and cultural aspects of the mosaic. Antonaras and Gerstel reconstruct the history of two objects of high artistic value from Thessaloniki – an enameled gold bracelet, and an embroidered textile – dated to different centuries of the Byzantine period. Through a fresh and tantalizing approach, based on written sources, comparative material and historical information, they present a charming time travel from objects' manufacture, and their period of use up to their afterlives and their discovery during modern times. As such, this

paper touches upon a vast range of issues, such as urban life and transformation in different periods of time, artistic and social networks, local workshop practices and the relations between Thessaloniki and other regions.

The third chapter contains two papers that leave aside traditional views of byzantine iconography and propose new synthetic approaches exploring relations between the core and periphery. Parani discusses the late 13th century wall painting of the procession of the icon of the Virgin Hodegetria in Constantinople represented at the katholikon of the Blacherna Monastery (Arta). Through a new reading of the dresses of the represented figures, she considers the 'historicity' of this famous mural and integrates it within the local and wider historical and social context that produced it. This paper offers valuable insights into issues of social stratification, gender studies, cultural and artistic networks, and political and ecclesiastical agency. Kappas examines the relations between core, namely the local centers of Monemvasia and Mystras, and periphery, analyzing wall paintings, sculptural decoration and architecture of the churches of the medieval village of Kastania. Convincingly and making interesting proposals and comparisons, he highlights the evolution of this relationship during the 13th and 14th centuries through the existence of artistic and cultural networks. He also highlights issues associated with local workshop practices such as the movement of painters and patterns. This reconstruction of cultural geography contributes to better understanding the ways in which small communities express their local responses to decisions that have been made in the centres.

Tracing political, military and economic networks, the next chapter focuses on the islands, through the interaction between Western Europe and Greece in the Early Modern period. However, one would have expected a closer look at the small islands and an insight into insular communities during the Byzantine era. Della Dora's essay explores island books, the so-called *insularii*, integrates them into their historical and political context, and offers the reader insights into the circumstances that led to their production. Islands are considered as interpretative tools for redefining Venetian identity in a rapidly changing world. Fortini Brown explores the role of the Venetian Loggias on the islands of Crete, Corfu and Cyprus. She views these public structures as living spaces with a multipurpose character (political, commercial, and social) and as spaces of interaction that linked Venice with its colonies. Roberts' essay examines the role of the

island of Rhodes in the early modern visual culture through the study of prints. The author explores how the different narratives that connected Rhodes with Western Europe influenced the printed books for antiquarians and travellers.

The last portion of this publication contains the three essays of the final chapter, written by the curators, which directly connect this volume with the exhibition. McMillan Arensberg discusses the background of the exhibition, the various challenges for the organizers, the criteria for the selection of the works of arts to be lent to the exhibition, its organisation and thematic structure. She also presents the installation of the exhibition in the National Gallery's West Building and how Heaven and Earth interacted with the permanent collection. Hart discusses the exhibition hosted by the Getty Villa, focusing on the different challenges for the organizers, compared to the National Gallery, as well as the different proposed solutions to overcome the obstacles. Despite the different museological approaches, the curators agree that the fundamental concern of both the National Gallery and the Getty Villa was to offer the viewers the opportunity to experience Greece's Byzantium with all their senses. Cormack, based on his own experiences of curating, discusses issues concerning the 'success' of an exhibition. Comparing Heaven and Earth with previous exhibitions related to Byzantium, demonstrates its different starting point, questions, challenges, obstacles, and aims. As such, he places Washington/Getty exhibition into a broader discussion on how the large-scale history of Byzantium can be presented (multicultural or national perspective) and how Byzantine art is experienced by viewers, the public and the specialist. Furthermore, he focuses on four objects that reflect the aims of the exhibition.

In sum, the volume under review provides a useful collection of essays which are faithful to the exhibition's focus on Greece's Byzantium and simultaneously they are not based solely on the objects presented in the Washington/Getty exhibition. In this respect, this publication fulfils its original aim to expand the scope of the exhibition. The essays consider the Greek lands as an integral component of Byzantium's historic development, which played a key role in the making of the Byzantine idiom. This book offers a regional approach to Byzantine art and architecture, viewing Greece as a dynamic space that was part of wider commercial and political networks and acted as core and periphery at the same time. This perspective contributes to better understanding a multi-ethnic

and multicultural empire by viewing Byzantium through its different compartments.

KONSTANTINOS ROUSSOS
 INSTITUTE OF MEDITERRANEAN STUDIES/FORTH
 rousos@ims.forth.gr

Multiperiod

Gavin McGuire. *Minoan Extractions: A Photographic Journey 2009–2016 Sissi Archaeological Project*. Viii+168 pages, 137 black and white photographs. Text in English and Greek. 2017. Oxford: Archaeopress. ISBN 1784916366 £30.00.

Yannis Hamilakis and Fotis Ifantidis. *Camera Kalaureia: An Archaeological Photo-Ethnography – Μια αρχαιολογική φωτο-εθνογραφία*. pp. 170, full colour throughout. Full text in English and Greek. 2016. Oxford: Archaeopress. paperback ISBN 9781784914127 £30.00. hardback ISBN 9781784914134 £55.00. epublication ISBN 9781784914141 Open Access.

Gavin McGuire's recently published photographic exposé of the Sissi Archaeological Project is a creative attempt at providing his own personal glimpse, as both archaeologist and photographer of the project, including the daily interactions between the people working at the site, place, and time. The publication is far from being an 'ethnography' of the project, and 'reads' more like a documentary, whereby the text (with each chapter presented first in English and followed by the same in Greek), provides a guided and structured narrative framework within which the selected photographs, all of them in black-and-white, merely provide the tangible evidence of the day-to-day activities and the space within which the archaeology is taking place.

The book, which is presented simply but elegantly in its paperback version of 167 glossy pages, resembles more a traditional exhibition catalogue than a photographic journal. This is not the kind of photo-book that intends to stir up emotions in the viewers or to incite ideas, perceptions, feelings, ideals; it is rather about archaeology as action, as seen through his lens, by the archaeologist-photographer/author. The photographs are all created by McGuire himself, who uses as his approach '...the 'decisive moment' or photography on the sly...' to capture the momentary event as it happens, without any setups or props. The images in this volume, selected by him and his artist wife, were minimally tinkered with (pp. 40–44). All of the photographs (including the covers) are technically black-and-white (in reality trichrome, as shades of

grey are dominant throughout), and laid out on a single page, providing captions (in both English and Greek) and technical characteristics below each one. The book is divided into five distinct parts, and is prefaced by a dedication to Harry Burton, the photographer of Howard Carter's excavation of the Tomb of Tutankhamun in the 1920s.

Part One begins with a brief history of Bronze Age Kephali at Sissi (authored by the director of the archaeological project, Professor Jan Driessen) and a list/catalogue of other Minoan sites on Crete and beyond, which are seen as connections to it. It is followed by a somewhat superficial (and in parts confusing/awkwardly written) overview of the development of photography and its uses in archaeology as another form of documenting and recording the past. An equally confusing chapter outlining the objectives of the author/photographer and his photographic approach '...about place, time; spontaneity of action and expression with all their ambiguities and imperfections...' (p. 40) follows, describing the methods/photographic techniques used, and providing a general overview of the book and the groups of photographs selected. However, the author is hardly forthcoming as to the precise aims/objectives of his publication, and he does not provide any clues as to his targeted audience (possibly including archaeologists, artists, the local community or general public, and perhaps the 'insiders' of the Sissi Archaeological Project?). The final chapter in this part of the book is even less illuminating, and it is (surprisingly) dedicated to the restoration of the old schoolhouse at Sissi by the Belgian School at Athens and its efforts at raising funds to transform it to an Aegean research centre, enabling 'a wide range of specialists...the opportunity to better understand the Bronze Age Minoan community at the Kephali...' (p. 58). A website address for the fund raising is provided at the end of the chapter, as well as social media and contact details, undoubtedly a not so subtle 'nudge' for contributions by readers. It is difficult not to imagine, although the author does not indicate so, that the book was intended as a fundraising project for such a cause! The chapters are each presented in English first, followed by the same in Greek, a noble attempt at engaging an international and local audience, although quite problematic with regards to the Greek translation, and something I will expand on a little further.

On a more positive note, the greatest strength of the book are the photographs themselves. In Part Two we are presented with glimpses of the daily activities undertaken by the team of specialists at the site, including excavation, survey, flotation,

recording, conservation, public outreach, resting and lunching, and general interacting with each other and with the site itself. The photographs could be from any excavation site and of any archaeological project and team, and this aspect of the book gives it a special appeal to a broad audience; the archaeologist/specialist can relate to every aspect of this interaction, while the curious layperson is provided with a set of images as the closest tangible experience they can get of an archaeological site other than being there. The photographer succeeds in capturing the moment of the interactions between the individuals hard at work at the site, as well as the depth of time, which is being revealed through the removal of layers of soil through these interactions. The focus of the interaction, centred almost always on people rather than on the landscape or the material remains alone, provides the human dimension of the whole archaeological experience, reminding the viewer that people and culture are the main protagonists in the discipline of archaeology. Thus, while the site as place and the landscape as backdrop are always present, specific aspects of them or details of the associated material culture are not easily identifiable in the photographs. What are shown are unidentifiable walls of unidentifiable structures/buildings, undistinguished pieces of pottery, very few recognizable artefacts and/or features, undoubtedly in a conscious attempt to 'conceal' their identity and avoid bringing unintentional attention to them, rather than to the people. Unglamorous, hard, meticulously tedious work under the scorching sun, quite unlike the usual image of archaeologists presented in popular culture. No extraordinary human beings seeking treasures from the past, the archaeologists at Sissi are captured just as they are: dedicated and enthusiastic, hard-working team players in mundane activities, but with the promise of extraordinary results in unraveling their own glimpses of the past.

Part Three of the book continues in the same style, but now the subject shifts to the investigations of the Minoan cemetery at the site by a team of bioarchaeologists. The photographs here present a different dynamic '...connecting with 'time, mortality and memory'...', rejoining the dead with the living...' (p. 42), reminding us that nothing is forever and that death is a common destiny we share with all peoples then, now, and into the future. Is the photographer aware of the different emotions and sensitivities these photographs may stir up in different viewers? In capturing the moment, there seems to be quite a disconnect between the specialists and the subjects of their investigation, who are obviously portrayed as another type of

artefact, exposed to the surface to be studied. Yet, human remains are not artefacts, and exposing them after centuries of being buried in the ground raises all sorts of questions, including those of an ethical and metaphysical nature. Ritualistic burial is more than simply disposal of the remains, and it implies certain values regarding death and, often enough, ideas concerning the afterlife, as well as a sense of respect towards the dead. In the archaeology of Greece and the broader Mediterranean region, such issues are hardly ever being discussed and may not even be of concern, but those of us exposed to archaeologies elsewhere, especially concerning indigenous populations, are sensitised to consider the impact this kind of work may have on local communities.¹ The book may not have a reason to deal with such issues, but one wonders as to what the impact, if any, of these images actually has on the villagers at Sissi. Are the locals just as disconnected with these 'ancestors' and as desensitised as the specialists studying them? Throughout the whole book, the only glimpse we are offered is that of the photographer/archaeologist, and there is no attempt to include within it any interactions beyond those with the professional team(s). Again, the question is raised as to whom this book is actually aimed at?

In Part Four, McGuire is now concerned with the activities of conservation/restoration away from the site itself and back at the dig's storage facility. He makes a good point when earlier in his book he claims: 'Photographically it (preservation) is often one of the most ignored archaeological sciences during the excavation season...' The opening photograph (p. 133) is indeed symbolic of most excavation store rooms, packed to the top of the ceiling with boxes/crates of artefacts representing the years of excavation and the enormous amount of material uncovered and retained (as many are also discarded on site), and the effort that has gone into preserving them for the future and for further research. From washing, to drying, to recording and describing, cataloguing, drawing, photographing, or simply tagging and putting them in a bag or box and finally storing them, artefacts embark on a new journey of their own from the moment they are unearthed. And all this is part of the unsung work of the archaeologists who alongside scientists of conservation, are also responsible in preserving those remnants of the past that have survived the test of time only to be 'rediscovered' in all kinds of shapes and forms.

¹ For examples of such concerns look at Licata and Monza 2017; Walker 2007; Fossheim 2012.

The final part of the book appropriately captures the activities that mark the end of the excavation season, another aspect of archaeology that is not widely discussed outside the discipline. What happens to a site once the season is over? How do archaeologists 'tidy' things up and what measures do they take to protect the site in their absence until the next season? More importantly, what happens to a site once the archaeologists leave for good, not to ever return again once the research is over? What role does the state and/or local communities play in safe-keeping and/or promoting the site as a local attraction, and how have the archaeologists contributed in the design of an appropriate heritage management plan? These and many other questions come to mind, while the selection of photographs here offer only some non-descript views of the process of closing down a site, in this case temporarily with the promise of returning, as indicated by the title of the chapter: *Au Revoir*.

McGuire's overall attempt to document, through glimpses of the various interactions among people, place, and time, the daily works of the Sissi Archaeological Project as he himself experienced and captured them over a decade at the site, is quite commendable. But while his photographs are arguably quite striking (black, white, and grey are quite effective in highlighting the dominant protagonists: people, landscape, and earth/finds representing time), the captions provided often distract the reader and sometimes 'annoy' with their innuendo. In addition, there are many examples throughout the book where the mostly literal translations into Greek appear quite awkward, and even erroneous. The chapters in Part One are especially problematic in this regard, something that could have been avoided through a more thorough editorial process and careful translation.² In broader terms, even the non-literal translations present issues in meaning, such as in the title of the book: 'Minoan Extractions' which implies a forceful removal/taking away, while its Greek version is a more positive rendering of subtracting, taking away a part of something. This discrepancy may in fact be intended as a metaphor, reflecting two different meanings (archaeological excavation as a destructive and simultaneously revealing process) rather than an error in translation, but if so, the non-bilingual reader certainly misses the point! There are many such examples, especially in the captions, where the meaning is lost in the translation, e.g. 'Shooting

the Shooter/Απαθανατίζοντας την απαθανάτιση' (p. 29); 'Subtle Changes/Διακριτική Ανασκαφή' (p. 70), 'The Queen of Tough Books/Η βασίλισσα των σκληρών βιβλίων' (p.94). Regardless of which of the two languages a reader uses, it seems that many of the 'clever' captions are intended for those directly involved in the project who are able to understand the broader context and/or the 'inside jokes,' while the same also applies to some of the photographs themselves (a characteristic example is the back cover photo). Despite these shortcomings, the book, described in its title as a photographic journey, certainly offers an alternative and creative visual approach in documenting and presenting selected interplays between archaeologists and the Bronze Age site of Kephali at Sissi.

The book by Hamilakis and Ifantidis offers a very different visual and ideological approach from that of McGuire, with their photo-ethnographic presentation of the site of Kalareia and its sanctuary of Poseidon on the island of Poros. Thus, it would be quite unfair to compare these two individual works as it could be argued that each represents a different genre of publication: one being a single-voiced photographic album of archaeological activities on an archaeological excavation site, and the other a photographic essay reflecting a complexity of interwoven multi-vocal and multi-temporal ideas and perceptions as perceived and experienced by the authors. Suffice to say that beyond the use of a camera as a recording device and the subject being that of an archaeological excavation in Greece, the two volumes share very little in common.

Those familiar with Hamilakis' multitude of publications (and not just archaeologists and anthropologists) would not at all be surprised at yet another provocative, highly emotive contribution, this time teamed up with Fotis Ifantidis. In fact, this is not the first time the duo have collaborated together;³ it is however, their first joint book publication. It is also closely modeled on Ifantidis' 2013 pioneering experimental publication of his photographs from the excavations at Neolithic Dispilio, but with a very different and much more multivocal focus, and a strong interdependence between image and text. In *Camera Kalareia*, Ifantidis' photographs are combined with Hamilakis' broad range of ideological concerns in producing a rather astonishing 'cultural artefact!' What cannot be emphasized enough in words is complemented by the pictures, and what the pictures cannot scream loud enough, or the eye cannot clearly

² To name just a few examples: 'Στο πόδι βήματῶ for 'In the Foot steps' (p. 2), 'ἡ δημιουργία ενός σύνθετου δικαστηρίου' for 'the creation of a court-centred complex' (p.10 and 6), and the entire paragraph four on p. 30, which reads awkwardly with many grammatical errors.

³ See Hamilakis and Ifantidis 2013; Hamilakis and Ifantidis 2015; Hamilakis, Anagnostopoulos, and Ifantidis 2009; Ifantidis 2013.

see, the words make up for. This may in fact be considered by some as one of the main flaws of the book, as the reader/viewer is 'directed' to think or react a certain way, as the position/views of the authors are intentionally made quite explicit. I would argue that this is in fact one, if not the biggest strength of the book: in its attempt to persuade and present a certain narrative, it tantalizes, provokes, questions, and most importantly, it challenges us to think outside the box. And this is only because the authors have chosen through their own loud voices, their own gaze, and their own ideological position to also be sensitive to and inclusive/ accepting of different views and opinions (as they themselves perceive them) across space and time. This is not a coffee-table book one can pick up and randomly look at its pages and come up with some sort of meaning (although one can certainly try to do so: intentionally, no page numbers are provided). Instead, the book presents a story line of its own (in fact many parallel story lines), connecting the images and the text from beginning to end, threading them together. An unavoidable symbiosis between word and image, which clearly places this book within the genre of photo essays.

The book is presented in hard copy in 170 pages (as mentioned, none of them numbered), and with mostly full colour photographs (with a few exceptions of black-and-white), which vary in size and layout; some photographs are full-page size, while others stretch across the gatefold, many feature montages, and a few contain only writing. The text in consistent font (possibly Andale Mono) is provided first in English and then in Greek, and it too, is inconsistently arranged across the pages. The art of the arrangement of both the images and the text is quite effective, with the words full of meaning, reading like poetry, alongside the photographs. The viewer is often throughout the book forced to also consider the white, blank spaces, sometimes within the pages containing only text, or within the images themselves, or even within pages of both images and text and in the form of white rectangular boxes of various sizes. Are these meant to be read as 'insertions' or 'extractions', or both? Are they simply reminders that the images/the words/the narrative itself, are all incomplete? That there is more to the story than what is told and what is seen?

The essay is divided into eight thematic units (I will refer to them as chapters) with a short introduction on the medium of the photograph and its potential in establishing archaeological narratives through evocative creative practice in the form of photo-ethnography. It resulted as part of a broader long-

term ethnography project revolving around the excavation of the Sanctuary of Poseidon in Kalaureia on the island of Poros '...investigating perceptions, ideas and practices around the remnants of the Sanctuary, antiquities, and material culture more broadly, by the people who live in Poros and in the surrounding communities, by tourists, and by other groups and people who have taken active interest on the site and its environs. It is also an opportunity for archaeologists, anthropologists, and others to reflect on alternative conceptions of material heritage by various groups and people, and to produce shared spaces of interaction and dialogue.'⁴ The themes of the book are presented as part of a journey to the site undertaken by the authors who act as travel guides speaking in the first person but also addressing and engaging the reader (in the second person) as an active travel companion.

The first chapter, *Itineraries*, begins with the short journey by sea from the mainland to the island, followed by a road trip to the site itself highlighting some of the encounters along the way: a blending of a modern and contemporary landscape as experienced by the contemporary traveller and that of an ancient one seen through ancient literary references and tangible material connections to them and the perceptions of early modern travellers. A sensorial journey, where 'every perception is full of memories.'⁵ Especially telling is the image of a roadside shrine and the one with painted white crosses along the side of the road, marking different types of memories connected with this landscape. The road sign pointing to the Temple is a powerful reminder of the disconnect between the 'now' and the 'then', and the different meanings of place: '... you are going to the 'Temple', not the sanctuary, nor the ancient city of Kalaureia.' The authors want us to think about the distinction, especially in the context of present-day tensions regarding asylum seekers of a different type and the global refugee crisis, when they continue: 'Have you forgotten that the place you are about to visit was also an asylum in antiquity? That people who were fleeing persecution found here a 'sanctuary' in the true sense, a safe haven? Does Bilal, the young man from Pakistan who wanted to sell contra-band CDs to you as soon as you got off the boat, know about this?' The chapter closes with the observation that the visitor, who has now arrived at the site is 'experiencing a 21st century landscape, not an ancient, nor even a 19th century one,' thus further emphasizing the disconnect between the present and the past.

⁴ Authors' own words in introductory chapter.

⁵ Authors' own words.

The next chapter is concerned with the experience of physically being at the archaeological site, highlighting the various boundaries and barriers strategically positioned at controlling how visitors negotiate their movements around the site and how they are restricted from accessing parts of it. Here, the authors are intentionally poking fun at the Greek state's current and quite recently adopted philosophy (post-1990s) on-site management and conservation, whereby most of the archaeological sites have undergone a radical transformation, following very detailed (and expensive) heritage management studies undertaken mostly by architects in consultation with Greek heritage officials (with very little input by field archaeologists or other professionals, and almost no community consultation).

The implementation of these studies' management plans, most of which are generously funded by the European Union with minimal contributions by the Greek state, theoretically follow European (and international) standards and guidelines on heritage management both for protecting the sites and monuments and to provide a satisfactory (and educational) visitor experience, such as including access to persons of special needs and toilet facilities. The reality is that many of these standards are either poorly adhered to or non-existent, and many sites suffer from the absence of a long-term management plan and lack of funds (evidenced in many sites and museums by broken-down multimedia aides, worn-out pathways, holes in fences, missing or worn-out signs, closed toilets, inaccessible ramps for wheelchair access, etc.). The authors miss the opportunity here to make a point of these issues common at many sites (perhaps not relevant at the site of Kalaureia?), although Hamilakis elsewhere has extensively examined the tensions that characterise many of the processes of monumental topographic production and contested access to cultural resources.⁶ In *Camera Kalaureia* the authors focus their attention on the barriers artificially erected to keep people out, also symbolizing the real tension between state archaeologists and the community at large. In their words: 'How come an apparatus that claims to retrieve archaeological lands from private ownership in order to offer them to the public, erects so many boundaries?' Inconsistencies in the way archaeological assessments concerning development applications are conducted, even corruption on the part of government officials and private developers, pending land expropriations that seem to take forever, and a long-standing tradition of colonial-style attitudes regarding both

archaeology and heritage practices in Greece, are responsible for the existence of a general mistrust of all archaeologists (Greek and foreign) by local communities and the general public. This point is made very clear by the authors with the telling of the story of the school teacher and her students who crossed the rope to see what the archaeologists were finding in the trench. 'Directors and trench supervisors shouted loudly at her; children started crying; words were exchanged; 'you come here to dig our antiquities, and you would not even let us see what you are finding?' The images in this chapter are dominated by those showing ropes, fences, doors and locks, ending with the most powerful one, in black-and-white, of the barbed wire spread across two pages with the caption: 'The tragedy of the commons? Or close-up archaeology not for commoners?''⁷

The tone changes in the next chapter, where the emphasis now shifts from the 'vistas and beautiful landscapes' to the archaeological 'traces': the cultural remains from bygone times. Here, the authors acknowledge the often under-represented, ignored, or more precisely, the selectively unnoticed remnants of human activity from the recent past. 'The rubble and the mudbrick here are not ancient but they too have stories to tell, although not the ones you may want to hear.' Archaeology in Greece is precisely its literal meaning: the study of ancient things, initially meaning anything of pre-Roman date, and now generally accepting later periods, with increasing attempts to include the post-medieval and more recent past.⁸ In the case of Kalaureia, like so many other archaeological sites in Greece, the emphasis is on the classical period, the temple itself, despite the fact that most of it no longer exists. 'Not a single stone in place, only the temple's negative imprint on the ground; an absence, an apparition; and yet more evocative and more present than most.' The authors intentionally select obscure images of what remains of the temple: 'And here it is; the Temple you were longing for', forcing the reader to compare these with the previous images of traces of more recent and rather vibrant activities on what used to be, at one moment in time, an agricultural landscape of semi-permanent habitation, alongside a pine forest exploited for its resin. The story of the Arvanitic family that settled here amongst the ruins of the temple in the late 19th century adds another layer to the history of the site, albeit not one considered significant enough for the public

⁷ For a more detailed examination of such tensions see Hamilakis 2008.

⁸ Since its inception, the present journal provides a platform for such important research.

⁶ Hamilakis 2007.

and/or national imagination. Once again a topic that Hamilakis has been quite vocal about.⁹ Finally, the image of the rusted key ‘nailed on the wrinkly skin of an olive tree...a nail that pierces through the chrono-stratigraphy of trees...and a key that cannot find a door to open...’ is a powerful reminder of the ephemerality of settlements, of human presence, of memory. The point is driven further in the following chapter, where through the person of Mr. G.M., ‘A jack of many trades, not least a skilled archaeological technician...’one of the former residents ‘...who was evicted by the archaeological service from the site...’ the authors present us with alternative interactions and different experiences, different interpretations, different memories concerning the site: in most cases untold stories and missed opportunities for archaeologists. Those of us working on archaeological sites in Greece know someone just like Mr. G.M., unsung hero-workmen, who get things done through the day and find solutions to everything, carriers of local knowledge, our link to the community.

In *Re-collections*, the authors reflect on their own emotions and experiences at the site as archaeologists; the mundane daily activities of excavation, documenting, assembling, classifying: scientific procedures, and hard work under the scorching sun. Here the authors take the opportunity to position the archaeologist, who finds his/her own meaning and purpose in the whole experience: ‘Trees, stones, people, all immersed in ambient light; a temporary sensorial assemblage, recalling multiple affective and mnemonic moments’, against the perceptions of the local people, ‘shaped by the national memories of the classical’ and with prescribed expectations that dismiss anything but the monumental.’ Elsewhere, Hamilakis has positioned himself explicitly within the broader discourse of nationalism and the deployment of antiquity in shaping national identities where he identifies a process of imagining through ‘a framework of ideas, beliefs, and notions, which permeates all aspects of the lives, minds, and bodies of people.’¹⁰ And while state mechanisms continue to actively engage in defining and maintaining the national imagination, archaeology as a discipline world-wide, is also struggling with its own imagining identity. Whether classical archaeology, historical archaeology, indigenous archaeology, ethno-archaeology, etc., the concerns and pressures of representing or adhering to specific academic/philosophical ideals (processualist, post-processualist, post-modernist, feminist, Marxist, etc.) are just as real. For example,

Kaplan illustrates clearly how archaeological work at the site of Ancient Corinth has been heavily influenced by ‘the conceptual terrain created by a century of foreign travel to the area, predating comprehensive excavations there’ in the late 19th century.¹¹ Using the concept of the ‘gaze’ as a means of viewing the ancient past, she emphasises the profound effects of interrelated ‘gazes’ over centuries of visitors to the site, from Pausanias to the present, which have helped in formulating many of the ‘culturally mediated views’ of the site.¹² She analyses three interrelated types of gazes: the literary gaze, which dominates early descriptions and illustrations of the ruins influenced by the ancient writers; the archaeological gaze, which closely follows the development of archaeology as a discipline interested more in the material remains and less in the literary sources; and the imperial gaze, closely connected to the other two gazes and reflecting attitudes of cultural imperialism in asserting certain values and significance to ancient monuments. Unlike Hamilakis and Ifantidis, who although aware of their own reflective views are also inclusive and multivocal in their approach to the archaeology of Kalaureia, Kaplan views modern archaeologists at the site of Corinth quite negatively, insisting on maintaining anachronistic views (shaped through the gazes mentioned above) ‘in spite of the influence of reflexive archaeology and multicultural discourse.’¹³ According to Kaplan, their views of the site are in contrast to those of the local inhabitants, who see things that the archaeologists don’t, and vice versa. Unfortunately, she sees no conciliation between the two, at least not for now: ‘These three gazes also resonate with the landscape that has been archaeologically created in Ancient Corinth. A twenty-four acre area in the centre of the community has been cleared of its top layers and fenced off as an archaeological site. Local inhabitants have to go around the site in order to conduct their daily business. Although the site dominates the settlement, I was told that many have never been to it except for a single trip as schoolchildren. The archaeology remains invisible to many local inhabitants.’¹⁴

By contrast, an attempt at bringing together these different positions, experiences, and perceptions, is presented by Hamilakis and Ifantidis in the chapter *Encounters*, which obviously highlights ‘Kalaureia in the Present’ the archaeological ethnography component of the Kalaureia Research

⁹ Hamilakis 2003.

¹⁰ Hamilakis 2003:54.

¹¹ Kaplan 2010.

¹² Kaplan 2010: 100.

¹³ Kaplan 2010:101.

¹⁴ Kaplan 2010:101.

Program.¹⁵ Here, ‘stories of the ancient past mingle with stories from the recent past’. The image of the ‘commensality of a dig: a temporary sensorial assemblage made of workmen, workwomen, archaeologists, olive trees, multi-temporal stones, and the bread and cheese bought this morning from the town’, reinforces Hamilakis’ position on temporality and memory.¹⁶ The stories and the memories continue in the final two chapters of the book. In *Overwritings*, 19th century and more recent graffiti incised or painted on the marble stones, along with the entries and signatures on the excavation’s visitors’ book, all contribute to the continuing narrative of the site. In *Dispersals*, where the authors are approaching the end of their ‘journey’, we are confronted once again by national ‘nostalgia’ and selective appropriation of antiquity as a form of local expression and identity. From the foundation of the Poros Museum in 1958, to replica statues at the city hall, to ‘confused’ combinations of prehistoric/classical architectural elements in private residences, the people of Poros define their daily existence, their identity through a mismatch of symbols of an entrenched national imagination.

Camera Kalaureia is a fresh, non-conventional, creative, and highly evocative archaeological photo-ethnography, combining all in one of Hamilakis’ ideological standpoints on archaeology, heritage, and the body, and against colonialism, nationalism and modernism, with Ifantidis’ masterful craft of the lens. Aimed at a broad audience, academic and not, the book does not merely present a visual alternative for ideas and interpretations in archaeology; it is also an artefact and agent, a contributor in the cultural production of the discipline itself. As a potential research tool, it is yet to be seen whether conventional archaeology is ready to take on the challenge.

LITA TZORTZOPOULOU-GREGORY
THE AUSTRALIAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE AT
ATHENS
ZACHARITSA 17
lita.gregory@sydney.edu.au

Fossheim, A.H. (ed.) 2012. *‘More than just bones’- ethics and research on human remains*. The Norwegian National Ethics Committees.

¹⁵ The program also maintains a free access online photoblog of the images published in the book, as well as others that were not included, encouraging viewers to leave their comments. At the time of writing this review, the last photo entry was in January 2018, and there were issues with accessing most of the comments. <https://kalaureiainthepresent.org>

¹⁶ Hamilakis 2013.

- Hamilakis, Y. 2008. Decolonising Greek archaeology: indigenous archaeologies, modernist archaeology, and the post-colonial critique, in D. Damaskos and D. Plantzos (ed.) *A Singular Antiquity*: 273–84. Athens: The Benaki Museum.
- Hamilakis, Y. 2003. Lives in Ruins: antiquities and national imagination in modern Greece, in S. Kane (ed.) *The Politics of Archaeology and Identity in a Global Context*: 51–78. Boston: AIA.
- Hamilakis Y. 2007, *The Nation and its Ruins: Antiquity, Archaeology, and National Imagination in Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hamilakis Y. 2013. *Archaeology and the Senses: Human Experience, Memory, and Affect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hamilakis, Y. and A. Anagnostopoulos and F. Ifantidis 2009. Postcards from the Edge of Time: Archaeology, Photography, Archaeological Ethnography (A Photo-Essay). *Public Archaeology* 8(2): 283–309.
- Hamilakis, Y. and F. Ifantidis 2013. The Other Acropolises: Multi-temporality and the persistence of the past, in P. Graves-Brown, R. Harrison, and A. Piccini (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook on the Archaeology of the Contemporary World*: 758–781. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hamilakis. Y. and F.Ifantidis 2015.The Photographic and the Archaeological: The ‘Other Acropolis’ In P. Carabott, Y. Hamilakis and E. Papargyriou (ed.) *Camera Graeca: Photographs, Narratives, Materialities*: 133–157. Ashgate Publishing..
- Ifantidis, F. 2013. *Archaeographies: Excavating Neolithic Dispilio*. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Kaplan, L.G. 2010. ‘Writing Down the Country’ Travellers and the Emergence of the Archaeological Gaze, in A. Stroulia and S.B. Sutton (ed.) *Archaeology in situ: sites, archaeology and communities in Greece*: 75–108. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Licata M. and F. Monza 2017 Ethical Issues in palaeopathological and anthropological research experiences. *Acta Biomed* 88 N.3: 315–318.
- Walker, P.L. 2007. Bioarchaeological Ethics: A Historical Perspective on the Value of Human Remains, in M. A. Katzenberg and S.R. Saunders (ed.) *Biological Anthropology of the Human Skeleton*: 3–39. Second Edition. Hoboken (NJ): John Wiley and Sons.

Joseph G. Manning. *The Open Sea. The Economic Life of the Ancient Mediterranean World from the Iron Age to the Rise of Rome*. pp. 414, b/w photos. 2018. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. ISBN 978-0-691-15174-8 \$35.00 / £27.00.

In M.I. Finley's *The Ancient Economy*,¹ the Hellenistic period is studiously and deliberately avoided. Finley's avowed reason for doing so was that this period saw the coexistence of two distinct economic sectors, an 'ancient' (viz. Graeco-Roman) and an 'Oriental' sector (Finley 1999 [orig. 1973]: 183). The former could be understood (so Finley argued) as a unified whole stretching from the time of Homer to that of Justinian; what bound it together was an elite mentality that remained, in his view, remarkably stable over time. Forty-five years on, the picture looks strikingly different. Manning's thesis, which synthesises much recent work on ancient economic history, entails both blowing apart Finley's unified ancient economy into many regional economies, and joining them together into a broader, interconnected Eurasian world focused on the Mediterranean Sea and encompassing far more than just Greece and Rome (however broadly defined), by plotting a dense web of connections that sped ideas, people, and objects across this expanse.

Manning's purpose is partly evangelical: to persuade his readers that the ancient Mediterranean was open; but also that an 'open' methodology – that is, a hybrid not just of the history and archaeology of different regions but also one inclusive of the social and hard sciences (from economic sociology to palaeoclimatology) – is crucial to progress over the coming decades. This, he argues, will be achieved more easily if economic historians adopt the team-based approach standard in publications in the social sciences. The suggestion is apt and timely, and the scope of the volume provides a much broader historical canvas against which studies of Graeco-Roman economic history can be considered; it also adds chronological depth, showing how the unified Mediterranean economy under Rome was built on foundations laid incrementally during the preceding centuries. The focus on the Mediterranean puts Manning's work in the tradition of scholars such as Braudel, Horden, Purcell, and, more recently, Broodbank.² His aim is not comprehensive coverage: the Eastern

Mediterranean world (broadly defined to include Greece, Anatolia, Egypt – Manning's own special interest – and Mesopotamia) gains the lion's share of attention; less is said on the west, (e.g., Iberia, Carthage, Italy, and the Adriatic; Israel and Cyprus, though in the east, can be added to this list). But as he points out (p. xiii), 'comprehensive coverage would be sheer folly', and his foci are more than sufficient for breaking out of the rut of intellectual path dependence that has long led scholars to treat Greek and Roman history as distinct subjects that can be treated without much reference to the wider world.

Manning has two main aims. The first is to explore recent developments and trends in the study of Mediterranean economies in the first Millennium BC, providing a kind of snapshot of the state of the debate. The second is to provide a broad account of human experiences in the Mediterranean within this timeframe, as well as a framework for understanding economic change over the long term. The book is divided into two parts: Part I ('History and theory') and part II ('Environment and institutions.').

In chapter 1 Finley's book is reckoned an end to the substantivist-formalist debate rather than a stimulus to new work (one could push this criticism further: Finley's work in several respects blocked progress in ancient economic history for a generation). Manning then proceeds to unpack a dizzying variety of new methodologies that might be used in driving the subject forward. These include the economics of Thomas Piketty, behavioural economics, neural economics, game theory, complexity theory, cultural evolutionary theory, multilevel selection theory, and Granovetter's economic sociology (to name a few). There is some good discussion (pp. 27–31) of Deirdre McCloskey's criticisms of New Institutional Economics (NIE) as producing the sort of exsanguinated economic history in which real human beings scarcely feature yet models and figures abound.³ In his wide-ranging discussion of these various theories, Manning shows his mastery of a vast bibliography. However, the newcomer to the topic might have found a bit more discussion on the origins of the debate over the ancient economy useful by way of orientation; for Manning picks up the debate with Finley (pp. 10–16), and although he refers to Bücher, Meyer, Weber, Hasebroek, and Polanyi, a couple of pages on their contributions would have helped set the scene for neophytes,

¹ Finley 1973.

² Braudel 1949; Horden and Purcell 2000; Broodbank 2013.

³ Some NIE-inspired work on antiquity has taken this approach, though that does not necessarily make it bad history, e.g. Pirngruber's (2017) work on Babylonian prices, a very valuable contribution.

who, after all, are part of the demographic to which the book has been marketed (it is more than likely that one will find a copy given a browse in e.g. any Waterstones or Blackwell's of reasonable size).⁴ To those familiar with the basic terms of the debate, however, chapter 1 will prove of great value, a rich fund of ideas by a scholar whose breadth of knowledge of the specialist literature can be matched by very few others. Indeed, here and in the subsequent chapters Manning more than achieves his first goal of exploring recent trends in the subject. I learned a great deal; and for any graduate student embarking on a research project on the ancient economy, the volume serves as an excellent entry-point into the subject's ever-mushrooming bibliography.

Chapter 2 begins by sketching out the political tectonics of the second and first millennium BC, showing the changing configuration of empires and states in Eurasia before delving into the webs of 'connectivity' that linked them together. Manning provides a time-lapse picture of economic and political development from the late Bronze Age onwards: empires fall, but cities grow and compete intensively for resources. The growing importance of iron – whose sources were far more widespread and commonly available than copper and tin – meant that the metal supply was less susceptible to monopsonic capture by great empires, feeding into a more general expansion, where trade networks (especially those of the Phoenicians and Greeks) darted outwards across the whole length of the Mediterranean Sea. The spread of colonies and settlements reconfigured trade routes and politics. Egypt, too easily treated as an immutable monolith, underwent intense internal change, especially the re-orientation towards the delta region under the Saïte dynasty which saw too the establishment of Naucratis and intensified contacts with the Greek world. Manning self-consciously evokes (p. 54) Polybius' idea of the *symploke*, the weaving-together, of the Mediterranean world through political changes. This is followed (pp. 58–9) by a useful discussion of the uneven and generically diverse character of the evidence for these various economies.

Chapter 3 analyses conceptual, spatial, and temporal boundaries, looking at several different periodisations and gauging their utility. Manning argues (pp. 82–4) that technology can alter timescales: if we think of change in the Neolithic as

being catalysed by cross-cultural interactions, then we are looking at a long, slow process; introduce shipbuilding technology that speeds these interactions up, however, and one can see why in the Iron Age a lot of change is compressed into a much shorter time interval. The rest of chapter 3 discusses geography and regions, engaging with the debate over whether we should define the Mediterranean as a distinctive region; Manning opts for a wider, Eurasian canvas, but with the Mediterranean as its focal point. One can see in the discussion here the real changes that have occurred in the study of ancient economic history in the last twenty years,⁵ and Manning synthesises well these recent trends: gone is the reticence in talking about trade and the profit motive that characterises Horden and Purcell's⁶ book; in many instances the term 'connectivity' is synonymous with trading activity, rather than acting as a euphemism to obscure it. There emerges a picture of regional fragmentation where local climatic and geographical features are emphasised (as per Horden-Purcell); but this is supplemented by trade-driven interconnectedness and market exchange, terms largely avoided by Horden and Purcell. One idea not explored in detail, though, is Bresson's emphasis on gains in productivity achieved by regional specialisation, which is a powerful tool for explaining growth.

Chapter 4 treats land and labour. Manning begins by breaking down the old-fashioned contrast between land tenure in the Greek world as based on private holdings and in the 'Oriental' world as based on institutional holdings, that is, those of palaces and temples. Private, alienable land was common across the Near East in the Iron Age, growing in importance over time. Land held by institutions in Egypt and the East was often comprised of individual family farms leased out on a sharecropping basis, and there was scope for trading in plots of land. Manning queries the euphemistic term 'redistribution' associated with institutional holdings and provides a more granular picture of how these operated, including market transactions alongside the demands of the 'command' branch of the economy. He focuses in particular on Egypt, with whose land tenure system he is particularly familiar; he turns next to Mesopotamia, and rightly underscores the diversity of agricultural systems there. In northern Mesopotamia, whose agricultural systems were based largely on dry farming, owner-occupier farms were more common and institutional landholdings less dominant than in Babylonia to the south, where

⁴ The clearest road map to the early stages of the debate is pp. 21–129 of Paul Christesen's unpublished PhD thesis; Bresson 2016: 1–27 is very accessible too.

⁵ On the Greek side, stimulated especially by Bresson 2000.

⁶ Horden and Purcell 2000.

⁷ Bresson 2016: 339–51.

the maintenance of canal systems saw greater institutional involvement. He also draws attention to the market-garden belt that surrounded Babylon and other Mesopotamian cities and supplied urban markets. This section provides an admirable digest of the work of Michael Jursa and his team in Vienna⁸ as well as the work of other Near Eastern specialists.⁹

Manning's discussion of labour provides a good anatomy of the various legal arrangements and labour forms in existence across ancient Eurasia. Less is said about how these were organised within the social structures of ancient societies – for example, class relations and the various forms of labour exploited by elites to maintain their position of dominance. On Greek slavery, Manning supplies an able digest of much recent work, but in my view some of these widely-held positions require modification or rejection. On p. 127 Manning writes that 'Ancient categories with the exception of Roman law were fluid between the various kinds of dependent labour and slavery.' This position has a distinguished pedigree going back to Westermann and Finley,¹⁰ but is contradicted by the evidence of legal documents, which show that the co-existence of legal slavery and slave metaphors did not lead to 'blurring' of status boundaries, and that the Babylonians and Athenians were just as able as the Romans to make razor-sharp legal status distinctions.¹¹ The notion (p. 132) that slaves on Crete had special rights does not rest on firm evidence;¹² and Descat's fantastically overblown figures for the slave population of Athens in the late fourth century, endorsed by Manning on p. 132, are vitiated by demographic and linguistic considerations.¹³

Chapter 5 introduces readers to the cutting edge of research on scientific research on past climates. Whereas older approaches veered towards environmental determinism and the idea of unchanging climatic constraints, new work looks at human adaptations to environmental factors as well as environmental change and its impact. Manning sets out how work in this field has been transformed in the last forty years, discussing the various forms of proxy data that allow us to track climate change

over time; and its effect on historical change is discussed in relation to the Bronze Age collapse and the effect of volcanic activity on the level of inundation of the Nile. In turn, he suggests, failure of the inundation may explain in part the foreign policy of the Ptolemies in attempting to keep within their aegis rain-fed territories (Cyrenaica, Anatolia, Syria), and links environmental changes to the development of Hellenistic inter-state politics.

Chapter 6 treats 'the birth of economic man.' Following recent trends, Manning rightly underscores that aiming at just satisfying wants, viz. bare subsistence, would have been suicide since harvests were unpredictable. Even subsistence farmers had to aim at overshooting their bare needs, and when it worked out they were left with a surplus. Starting out with the household unit and its various forms, Manning remarks (p. 181) that 'the image of autarkic households, independent and self-sufficient, producing little surplus, and not exchanging in the market, is an image derived primarily from literary texts like Hesiod's *Works and Days*, Homer, and Aristotle.' Manning is perfectly correct in writing this, but it is worth noting that it is an image derived from a *misreading* of all of them, especially by Finley and his school: van Wees¹⁴ has shown that the Homeric *oikos* is heavily geared towards surplus production in order to generate the resources needed for engaging in a highly competitive elite culture where gift-giving and material display were crucial; moreover, a holistic reading of the *Works and Days* shows a medium-sized mixed farm geared towards surplus production and integrated with market exchange and overseas trade. And Harris has shown that in Aristotle's discussion of *oikonomike* and *chrematistike* in the *Politics*, the philosopher himself admits that his own view of *oikonomike* as distinct from *chrematistike* and concerned with satisfying basic needs (i.e. self-sufficiency) is out of step with popular beliefs: as Aristotle notes, many people thought that household management and making as much money as possible were the same thing.¹⁵ Manning discusses (p. 183ff) the Hekanakhte letters from the Middle Bronze Age as a case study for getting past the stereotype of the pre-modern self-sufficient subsistence household; these documents show strategic economic decisions being made, including both considerations of risk and the desire for (and achievement of) profit through selling surplus production, viz. market exchange. The discussion considers not just economic actors qua individuals, but states too.

⁸ Jursa 2010.

⁹ Such as Cornelia Wunsch's studies of the Egibi archive; summary in Wunsch 2007.

¹⁰ Westermann (1955): 42–3; Finley (1964): 238.

¹¹ Dandamaev 1984: 67–80; Lewis 2018: 25–92.

¹² Lewis 2013; idem 2018: 147–65.

¹³ Bresson 2016: 459–60; Lewis 2018: 295–305. Later, on p. 176, Manning cites Scheidel's estimate of Athens' slave population at 50,000, which is unrealistically low; double that figure is needed even for the less populous 4th c.

¹⁴ Van Wees 1992: 25–58; 2009.

¹⁵ Arist. *Politics* 1257a3–4; Harris and Lewis 2015: 26–7.

Chapter 7 deals with the evolution of economic thought in antiquity. Manning points out that we do not have the same sort of reflective analysis of ‘economic’ phenomena in Babylonian writings that we do in Xenophon or Aristotle, and that economic thought in such societies has to be reverse-engineered from practices: what do empirically-observable practices imply about the level of abstract understanding of economic life? Indeed, the whole chapter deals with economic thought from the vantage point of practices rather than discourses, keeping the issue of what was going on in the minds of ancient individuals at arm’s length. Pp. 195–202 provides a useful survey of the monetisation of the Iron Age Mediterranean, charting the use of *Hacksilber* (already in use in New Kingdom Egypt) and its gradual replacement by coinage; Manning does a good job here of underscoring the uncertainty surrounding the invention of early electrum coinages in Lydia.¹⁶ Pp. 202–15 deal with the legal framework that enabled economic growth. Law is important because merchants will not be likely to take risks and engage in trade if private property rights are not clear and enforceable, and if contracts are not fairly enforced by an impartial third party.¹⁷ Incremental growth in literacy rates improved access to the law.¹⁸ Legal realities as they unfolded on the ground are best captured in trial records: Manning provides an illuminating case study from Ptolemaic Egypt on pp. 212–15.

Chapter 8 analyses the problem of growth and the performance of ancient economies. One of the key achievements of this chapter is to situate recent work on growth in Greek and Roman economies against a wider backdrop, taking into its purview Egypt and Babylonia. In explaining Graeco-Roman growth, some scholars have pointed to comparatively egalitarian forms of government; these are not to be dismissed as contributory factors, but evidently the reasons for growth were more complex, as we find comparable growth in the Iron Age Near East, where different kinds of political regime flourished. Manning also provides a useful intervention on the debate over technological change, the alleged absence of which Finley used to argue against economic rationality in antiquity. More recent work has shown that there was a great deal of technological change and transfer of technical ideas in antiquity,

but mainly of incremental minor improvements rather than the sort of spectacular leaps of the Industrial Revolution. Later in the chapter (p. 227ff), Manning turns to market exchange, and argues (against Polanyi) that early examples of trade (e.g. the Kanesh merchants in Anatolia) are genuine examples of market exchange rather than state-directed trade. He goes on to argue, rightly in my view, and following recent trends in Greek, Roman and Babylonian economic history, that the evidence for prices responding to fluctuations in demand and supply is incontestable. A wide exploration of market exchange, long-distance trade, market integration, and the formation of prices in the Hellenistic period follows, with discussion of the role of associations and the evidence of amphoras.

The volume ends with a short conclusion drawing together the various arguments set out in the preceding chapters; ‘In a very real way’, Manning writes, ‘the civilisations that grew up around the Mediterranean basin were like the gears of the Antikythera mechanism: some were small, others larger, each turning at different rates, but part of an interconnected whole.’ (p. 263.) As a whole, the book must be judged a success, especially in its first objective of providing the reader with an idea of what the debate looks like at present, and a sense of where it might be going in the near future. Manning has digested a colossal amount of scholarship, and whilst specialists in this or that region or topic might quibble about minutiae, this in no way detracts from the sheer amount of erudition and labour that has gone into viewing the economies of Iron Age Eurasia as an interactive whole. This book deserves to be on the shelf of anyone looking to see past the disciplinary boundaries of Graeco-Roman history and to understand how these civilisations fitted into a wider world

Although the book lacks the thematic tidiness of Broodbank’s volume (the connection of themes is often not quite clear and the overall structure of topics a little random), the book is generally well produced. I spotted only a few typos: p. 206: ‘axones’ not ‘axiones’; p. 210: ‘central tenet’, not ‘tenant’; p. 236, ‘cloth’ not ‘clothe’; p. 264 ‘sheer richness’ not ‘shear richness’; p. 266 ‘unnaturally’ not ‘unnatrually.’

DAVID LEWIS

THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH
david.lewis@ed.ac.uk

¹⁶ See further de Callatay 2013.

¹⁷ See further Harris 2006: 141–280; idem 2015.

¹⁸ Manning focuses on scribes in Egyptian temples who could be paid to draw up contracts; it is worth adding that for Athens, the pessimistic view of W.V. Harris 1989 has been overturned by Pébarthe 2006 and Missiou 2011; more recently still, Langdon 2015 has published evidence for literate herdsmen in Attica in the 6th c. BC.

Braudel, F. 1949. *La Méditerranée et le monde méditerranéen à l’époque de Philippe II*. Paris: Lib. A. Colin.

- Bresson, A. 2000. *La cite marchande*. Bordeaux: Ausonius.
- Bresson, A. 2016. *The Making of the Ancient Greek Economy: Institutions, Markets and Growth in the City-States*. Tr. S. Rendall. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Broodbank, C. 2013. *The Making of the Middle Sea. A History of the Mediterranean from the Beginning to the Emergence of the Classical World*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Christesen, P. 2001. Society and Economy in Archaic and Classical Greece. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Columbia.
- Dandamaev, M.A. 1984. *Slavery in Babylonia. From Nabopolassar to Alexander the Great (626–331 BC)*. Tr. V.A. Powell. Revised edition. Dekalb IL: Northern Illinois University Press.
- De Callataj, F. 2013. White gold: an enigmatic start to Greek coinage. *ANS Magazine* 2013 issue 2: 7–17.
- Finley, M.I. 1999 [original 1973]. *The Ancient Economy*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
- Harris, W.V. 1989. *Ancient Literacy*. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.
- Harris, E.M. 2006. *Democracy and the Rule of Law in Classical Athens*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, E.M. 2015. The legal foundations of economic growth in ancient Greece: the role of property records, in Harris, E.M., Lewis, D.M. and M. Woolmer (eds) *The Ancient Greek Economy: Markets, Households and City-States*: 116–46. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, E.M. and D.M. Lewis. 2015. Introduction: Markets in Classical and Hellenistic Greece, in Harris, E.M., Lewis, D.M. and M. Woolmer (eds) *The Ancient Greek Economy: Markets, Households and City-States*: 1–37. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Horden, P. and N. Purcell. 2000. *The Corrupting Sea. A Study of Mediterranean History*. Oxford and Malden MA: Blackwell.
- Jursa, M. .2010. *Aspects of the Economic History of Babylonia in the First Millennium B.C*. Münster: Ugarit Verlag.
- Langdon, M. 2015. Herders' graffiti, in Matthiou, A. and N. Papazarkadas (eds) *Axon: Studies in Honor of Ronald S. Stroud*: 49–58. Athens: Greek Epigraphical Society.
- Lewis, D.M. 2013. Slave marriages in the laws of Gortyn: a matter of rights? *Historia* 62.4: 390–416.
- Lewis, D.M. 2018. *Greek Slave Systems in their Eastern Mediterranean Context, c. 800–146 BC*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Missiou, A. 2011. *Literacy and Democracy in Fifth-Century Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pébarthe, C. 2006. *Cité, démocratie et écriture. Histoire de l'alphabétisation d'Athènes à l'époque Classique*. Paris: de Boccard.
- Pirngruber, R. 2017. *The Economy of Late Achaemenid and Seleucid Babylonia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Wees, H. 1992. *Status Warriors: War, Violence and Society in Homer and History*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben.
- Van Wees, H. 2009. The economy, in Raaflaub, K. and H. van Wees (eds) *A Companion to Archaic Greece*: 444–67. Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell.
- Westermann, W.L. 1955. *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society.
- Wunsch, C. 2007. The Egibi family, in G. Leick (ed.) *The Babylonian World*: 232–43. New York and London: Bloomsbury.

Matthew P. Maher. *The fortifications of Arkadian city states in the Classical and Hellenistic periods*. pp. xiii, 426, 155 b/w illustrations. 2017. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press. ISBN 978–0–19–878659–7 hardback £90/\$125.00. 978–0–19–109021–9 e-publication £85.50 /\$124.99.

Matthew Maher's monograph on the fortifications of Arkadian city states is (although not mentioned in the book) based on a PhD dissertation at the University of British Columbia (Vancouver) in 2012. It is a very welcome volume, because it supplies the growing interest in both the history and archaeology of Arkadia as a central Greek region and in ancient fortifications in a regional scope. As Maher writes in his introduction, he sees his study in the light of the 'move away from traditional stereotypical interpretations of a poor and isolated Arkadia towards a view of a moderately prosperous region whose inhabitants generally followed the same patterns of social, political, and cultural development seen elsewhere in ancient Greece' (p. 1) – a move that only can be appreciated.

The book starts with an introduction (pp. 1–16), including subchapters on aims, sources and evidence, previous research on Greek fortifications, Arkadian regional focus, the chronological range, limitations of the study, methodology and the organisation of the book. As for the aims (p. 3), the book's overall objective is 'a comprehensive and detailed survey

of the historical development of Greek military architecture and defensive planning specifically in Arkadia from the Classical period to the Roman arrival in Greece'. The collected data are supposed to meet five primary objectives: an accurate chronology of the fortifications, an understanding of their relation to the local topography, a detailed catalogue of the fortified Arkadian poleis, a regional synthesis and the connection of the observed patterns to historical reasoning. The main sources for the study are previous archaeological research and personal observations, but also written sources and historical research (pp. 3–5).

Maher's section on the research history of Greek fortifications (pp. 5–8) includes nearly exclusively general studies on Greek fortifications, while important conference volumes, some of which have been landmarks in the study of ancient fortifications, are missing.¹ The surprised reader is also told that the author only knows of two studies of fortifications on a regional scope (the ones of Catherine Typaldou-Fakiris on Phokis and of Nadia Coutsinas on Crete),² while he does not seem to be acquainted with e.g. the various publications of Claire Balandier on different regions, the excellent studies of Sylvian Fachard on the territory of Eretria and of Judith Ley on Akarnanian fortifications, the work of Elke Richter on the Triphylian fortifications (which is particularly critical, as Triphylia became a part of Arkadia in the early 4th c. BC, see below), with Yannis Lolos' documentation of the fortifications in the territory of Sikyon and with Mikko Suha's regional studies in Thesprotia, only to mention some important examples.³ The regret that 'although it appears that the advantages of studying fortifications on a regional level have long been recognized, little has been done to advance the discipline in this regard' is repeated in the section on the Arkadian regional focus (p. 8). Surprise is just as high when there is no mention of recent work on fortifications in general, for instance the two books of the international network on ancient fortifications 'Fokus Fortifikation' including also several chapters and articles on the regional study of fortifications.⁴

¹ Most importantly Leriche and Treziny 1986.

² Typaldou-Fakiris 2004; Coutsinas 2013.

³ Balandier 2002, 2016; Fachard 2012; Ley 2009, 2010; Richter 2014, 2015; Lolos 2011, 181–267; Suha 2009, 2011, 2016.

⁴ Mütth *et al.* 2016; Frederiksen *et al.* 2016. If the reason for this neglect is that the author handed in his manuscript before the publication of these volumes (in December 2015 and February 2016), he could always have consulted the preliminary results (including regional studies on different levels) on the network's homepage. (The reader may forgive me for mentioning this lack, having been one of the directors of this network.)

That the chronological scope (pp. 9–11) does not start with the Archaic period is due to the fact that there are no extant remains of fortifications that can undoubtedly be dated to these times (pp. 9–10), although one would not necessarily agree with the author's statement that the dawn of the fortified *polis* in Arkadia therefore is to be dated to the Classical period, considering the fact that old walls can be quite elusive. Concerning the limitations of the study (pp. 11–13), the fact that Triphylian fortifications are left out is justified with Triphylia having become part of Arkadia only in the early 4th c. BC, although it was said before that 4th- and 3rd-c. BC fortifications form the bulk of the study anyway (p. 10). Furthermore, the author's statement that Arkadian extra-urban fortifications 'would not significantly contribute to the overall focus of this book – that is, the fortifications of Arkadian *poleis* themselves' (p. 11) is not acceptable as such. The principal misunderstanding here concerns the meaning of *polis*, which as a very well-known fact does not only consist of a main settlement, but also of its territory around. Like this, the fortifications of a polis per definition include those of the main settlement as well as its hinterland. And a regional study of fortifications should normally include both, city-walls as well as extra-urban fortifications, in order to get the whole picture and to be able to interpret regional relations and concerns in fortification properly. In this sense, the title of the book is misleading.

Concerning methodology (pp. 13–15), the author expresses a most welcome critical attitude towards masonry forms as dating criteria and favours a holistic approach, including all sorts of available evidence for establishing chronologies. One would, however, have wished for a more thorough discussion of the doubtful reliability of different dating methods (except from excavation) and some detailed information on the methods of on-site data collection, documentation and study.

The main part of the book consists of two components, the first part being somewhat curiously captioned 'Methodology', although it is a synthesis of the development of fortifications in general and Arkadian fortifications in particular, the second part being a catalogue. The first part starts with a chapter on 'Arkadia, City Walls and the Polis' (pp. 19–29). Here, proper historic-geographical maps would have been important; the very simple map on p. 21 (Fig. 1.1), where rivers and borders almost cannot be told apart, and the Google Earth map on p. 24 (Fig. 1.2), which does not provide enough information and is not easily legible as to its geographical features, are not adequate. Maher's

thoughts on the Arkadian *polis* are based on the Copenhagen Polis Centre's excellent work on Greek *poleis* in general and Thomas Heine Nielsen's book on Arkadian *poleis*,⁵ which are undoubtedly the best authorities in this question. It would nevertheless have been valuable to discuss if the results of the present study match the picture or if fortifications can contribute any new details to the definition of *polis* status. In chapter 2 on 'Arkadian Fortification Types and Construction' (pp. 30–43), we learn that from the beginning, defensibility obviously was the main motive for the choice of site (p. 31). Arkadian city walls are classified into three geographical types, which do not show any sequential evolution: the 'acropolis type', the 'horizontal type' (the only examples being Mantinea and Tegea) and the mixed 'uneven type' (pp. 32–33). The discussion of building materials and construction techniques (pp. 34–36) is limited to the choice between mudbrick and stone as building materials, while there is no discussion of the differences in stone materials and their implications, e.g. on masonry forms and construction techniques. Other practical construction issues, for instance the employment of different workshops with various backgrounds and their implications on construction techniques and typology of the individual components are not included either. The sections on masonry (pp. 38–43) are informed by the great and traditional misconception that masonry forms are the product of chosen 'styles' and not – as in the vast majority of cases – dictated by practical conditions of the available material. For this reason, the term 'masonry styles' is generally inadequate here. The author's initial criticism of dating through masonry forms is unfortunately non-committal, he still accepts Scranton's outdated study from 1941 as a valuable base or develops his own chronological thoughts on the base of masonry 'styles'.

Although for most of the flanking buildings of Arkadian walls, it cannot be determined if they were towers or open platforms (which is nowhere even mentioned), the discussion of the flanking buildings in chapter 3 on the 'Tactical Development of the Constituent Parts of City Walls' (pp. 44–60) is limited to towers (pp. 47–48), not including any other sorts of flanking devices like open platforms, wall projections or jogs. As to gates, defining courtyard gates as their own category (called 'gatecourt' type) next to frontal (axial) and overlap (tangential) gates (pp. 49–50) is a good idea, but it would still have been important to sub-differentiate within this type between frontal and overlap concepts, as these result in clearly different architectural

forms. As for the development of fortifications in answer to the spread of catapults in the 4th c. BC (pp. 55–60), one misses a discussion of the changes in embrasures and the addition of second storeys of towers as major aspects of this development. The notion that the balance between attackers and defenders of a wall was more or less even (p. 60) is not the predominant scholarly opinion: normally a far greater advantage is seen on the defender's side.⁶ In general, chapters 2 and 3 provide some valuable information for the study, but are in their essential parts too much summaries of fortification handbooks without including specific knowledge of individual sites. The characteristics of Arkadian fortifications, which should have formed the main body of the whole first part of the book, appear too often only in the form of ancillary remarks.

In chapter 4, which is a 'Topographical, Architectural and Historical Analysis', Arkadian city walls are finally taken into focus. We learn for instance that there is a roughly even distribution of fortified cities over the inhabitable areas of Arkadia (p. 61), which – not surprisingly – at the level of the individual site nevertheless is a product of local topography (pp. 65–67). At least one of three natural defensive variables is exploited by all sites: elevated terrain included in the circuit, surrounding mountains or local watercourses (p. 67). The mountainous Arkadian landscape did not allow otherwise, anyway. It is, however, noteworthy that every walled city relies on some watercourse protecting at least one of its flanks (pp. 69–70). Although the masonry forms of the curtains are nowhere consistent, Maher detects 'interesting spatial and chronological patterns' in their distribution (pp. 74–75), which at a closer look are not well enough supported by examples, though, and should be reduced to a general prevalence of polygonal over trapezoidal forms throughout all phases. That 'proximity appears to have played a role in the type of masonry employed' (p. 75), if true at all, would as well be linked to this fact, but would first and foremost have to do with the geological similarity of the stone material used, a factor which is totally neglected – nevertheless, the circuits using predominantly trapezoidal forms do not seem to follow any geographical rule. Concerning chronological patterns, the fact that most of the fortifications are not dated in a reliable way makes Maher's attempts quite uncertain from the beginning. As to towers, the observation that round tower shapes only appear in larger circuits of the uneven or horizontal types (although dependent on the preservation of tower remains) might to a lesser degree be explained by the accessibility of these

⁵ Nielsen 2002.

⁶ Ducrey 1986; Müth *et al.* 2016, 3.

sites from many directions, as assumed by Maher (p. 79) – dead angles at rectangular towers being easily reduced by the right forms of openings – than by the more elaborated and expensive construction, which could be borne more easily by larger poleis, a fact that is not considered. That the regular spacing of towers mostly replaces the strategic spacing around the late 5th/early 4th c. BC is a clear tendency, but cannot be called the ‘general rule’ (p. 82), as Kleitor and Theisoa Karkalou are clear exceptions (Table 4.3). Most of the other observed patterns regarding towers seem to be supported by too few examples.

Also in the case of gates, the discerned patterns are not always convincing. That five of seven examples of frontal gates were constructed in polygonal masonry (p. 85) would rather have to do with the general prevalence of polygonal masonry forms in Arkadia than with the polygonal masonry granting this vulnerable gate type an impression of strength – quite a debatable presumption in itself. In the particular case of gate B in Gortys, where the rest of the circuit shows predominately trapezoidal forms, this has to be seen in connection with the fact that its blocks are considerably larger than usual in this circuit, which could indicate a change in raw material. In any case the size of the blocks would be much more important for the impression of strength than the masonry form. The established geographical and chronological patterns (pp. 85–86) seem difficult to hold due to the limited number of preserved examples, although it seems reasonable that courtyard gates as the most monumental and costly gate type only appear in the largest Arkadian settlements. For the Arkadian gate in Messene, which is used as a main comparative example, Maher unfortunately uses the date suggested by Scranton in 1941 (late 4th/early 3rd c. BC), obviously not being aware of this having been contradicted many times and by new research and publications on the city wall of Messene from 2004 onwards.⁷ That acropolis-type fortifications almost exclusively use frontal gates and do not make more use of overlap gates sounds surprising (pp. 85, 87), but could be a particularly Arkadian choice, if not due to the state of preservation. The ‘ramp gate’ appears here quite suddenly as a fourth type (p. 87), without having been introduced in the corresponding section in chapter 3 and without being properly characterized and distinguished from the other types. For posterns (pp. 87–90), the same reservation of only accidentally preserved or known remains is valid. The fact that posterns are mostly not marked in the maps of the catalogue

makes it difficult to use them for following the text. The defensive role of posterns is overestimated in some cases, for instance concerning the two posterns at Phigaleia (89), which lie on a high and steep ridge and not in the proximity to any possible lines of approach, i.e. in a part of the circuit that – against the opinion of the author – cannot be considered as particularly vulnerable. Outworks are rare in Arkadian fortifications (pp. 90–91), the only examples being known at Phigaleia and Mantineaia.

It appears a bit astonishing that the ‘Chronological Summary’ (pp. 91–93) is presented in the form of notes, although this provides a certain clarity. The following section about ‘Historical Probability’ (pp. 93–97) discussing the different fortifications in their proposed historical context is characterized by some good reasoning. The Arkadian League is seen as a major catalyst for a boom in fortification building in the early 4th c. BC (pp. 94–95), although the individual reasons of cities to fortify themselves should never be underestimated and could have been considered to a higher degree. An explanation for the fortification of several sites that were already voted to participate in the *synoikismos* of Megalopolis is convincingly found in a strategic change of plan (pp. 95–96). Further factors are justifiably seen in threats to inner security by Orchomenos and its allies on the one hand and in a peaceful relation to Elis on the other hand. It is to be appreciated that the author advises caution about concluding on one grand defensive strategy. A regrettable flaw is nevertheless that the literature used again is not up to date. Concerning one of the central points in this section, Epameinondas’ supposed influence on the foundation and fortification of Mantineaia and Megalopolis closely together with Messene, Maher does not seem to be acquainted with the legitimately critical views on this theory, in 2014 supported by James Roy with more arguments.⁸ Moreover, there is a certain danger of circular argument in this section, as the dates of some walls have been established using historical arguments or the development of siege warfare.

Chapter 5 (‘The Fortifications of Arkadian City States’: pp. 98–101) finally is a short summary of the main results of the study. The first ten lines of this chapter represent, strangely enough, an exact copy of the start of the section ‘Arkadian Regional Focus’ on p. 8, as has already been noted by another reviewer⁹ – in this way the wrong statement that there has not been done much research yet in terms of regional studies of fortifications is unfortunately

⁷ Müth 2010, 2014, Müth *et al.* 2016, 278–85; Giese 2010, Schwertheim 2010.

⁸ Demand 1990, 107–119; Roy 2014.

⁹ Rönnlund 2018.

repeated a third time. Also the conclusion that it appears that the region of Arkadia was 'a moderately prosperous one whose inhabitants followed generally the same patterns of social, political, and cultural development seen elsewhere in ancient Greece' is quasi a literal copy of a passage in the introduction (p. 1).

The catalogue (pp. 103–394) with its 19 entries comprises by far the largest part of the book. The entries are composed of sections on location, *polis* status, history, local topography, natural defences, fortification type, preservation, construction, a summary of tactical components, comments, a section on the overall defensive planning, a chronological summary, chronological arguments and a bibliography. This enables an integrative approach, and the reader learns about many interesting details here, which for a good part were not easily accessible until now. It is evident that a great amount of work has been dedicated to this part of the book, and by collecting all sorts of scattered information around these important Arkadian city walls and by presenting them all together in an organized manner it constitutes one of the main merits of the study.

There is a lack, however, of more detailed information on many levels, for instance on the precise localisation and size of the settlements within the walls, on the state of preservation of the individual parts of the circuits, on constructional and architectural characteristics (e.g. rock varieties used, stone dressing, locking possibilities of gates or posterns etc.) The number and quality of illustrations is not satisfactory either: the topographical and fortification maps – often printed in too small, not well-readable or even (in the case of Fig. C8.4/ p. 220: Mantinea) illegible size – do not show enough details, and many place names or important wall features are not marked on them. Moreover, one would have wished for many more photographs illustrating important features of the individual walls, for instance of parts for which different chronologies are proposed. The presented pictures are sometimes not informative, as it is for example the case with fig. C8.5 (p. 221: Mantinea), where hardly more than one block layer can be distinguished between high grass.

The contributions would also have benefitted much from more thorough autopsy: in some cases, it is very evident that the author has not been all around the circuit, but merely discusses the opinions of other researchers, which is for instance the case in Phigaleia, where the possible location of gates in the southwest has not been checked personally

(p. 303 with n. 39), in Megalopolis, where he relies on information of the Ephorate about no remains of the walls being visible today (p. 236 n. 28), and in Mantinea, where he was not able to find the polygonal portions, although some are clearly extant and accessible without difficulties (for instance adjacent to gate G in the southeast). Had he seen them personally, he would have observed that they are harmoniously interwoven with the trapezoidal parts and therefore do not hold at all as remains of an older phase, as proposed (pp. 228–229). Moreover, they are just as high as the trapezoidal sectors, i.e. too high for any mudbrick superstructure to have been inundated in 385 BC by the Spartans. As in this case, also in others chronological arguments are again too often based on masonry forms and thus cannot bear up, for instance Theutis (pp. 357–359) or Gortys, where typological indications for a later date are dismissed in favour of stylistic dating (p. 181). The theory of the original circuit there having already included the 'South Fort', which in that way would never have been an independent unit (pp. 184–185), is on the contrary convincing.

More comparisons to fortifications from other regions would have enriched the study enormously. One of the few comparanda named is Messene, but this is based on outdated information and literature and used in a too general way for comparative dating (e.g. in the case of Phigaleia, p. 309). It is sometimes a bit difficult to follow the tactical reasoning, as for instance in the case of 'Tower 2' of the 'South Fort' of Gortys (p. 179), where the possibility of oblique openings is not taken into consideration when characterizing it as useless for flanking, or in Phigaleia, where there is inconsistency in the description of the main approaches to the city in the text and Fig. C14.8 (pp. 306–307) and where there is no discussion of the surprising fact that flanking structures are only to be found in the north-western sector. It is very obvious that these structures were all aligned along the most important approach to the city from the area of Megalopolis, while other, equally or even more endangered areas have not been protected by a single tower, which clearly proves their representative function in addition to their defensive purpose.

Concerning form and style of the book, it is a solid bind with a handsome print, the familiar high quality of Oxford University Press publications. Lists of figures and tables, the bibliography and the index provide a good usability. The texts are generally well-written and easy to read, although characterized throughout by all too many repetitions and gratuitous literal quotes. The use of Greek instead of anglicized forms of ancient names

is pleasing. The first part of the book includes some helpful tables and 3D-reconstructions made by the author. A very welcome supplement to the catalogue is the 'Appendix of Other Attested Fortified Arcadian *Poleis*', offering valuable information and bibliographies on sites the evidence for which is not as clear as for the ones included in the catalogue.

All in all, Maher's book certainly enhances the knowledge of city walls in Arkadia, a great part of which were only poorly known before, and assigns them a deserved place in archaeology. In this way, the goal to help revising the picture of a remote and underdeveloped Arkadia and lift it into the scope of an ordinary Greek region is attained. Besides this, strong points of the book are the intense discussions of the relation between fortifications and topography and the detailed tactical considerations.

Fortifications, however, offer a lot more levels of information and interpretation, and here the chance has been missed to fully exploit the scope: the relation of the fortifications to their material resources (stone varieties and quarries, mudbrick production), practical aspects of the building process (workforce, building procedure, investment) as well as non-defensive functions like urbanistic and representative or other symbolic functions have been totally left out. Even the regional aspects have not been fully deployed, being hampered by the exclusion of extra-urban fortifications, which would have allowed for an integrative investigation of interrelations and communications. Comparisons to other regional fortification patterns have not been tried at all, which deprives the study of one of its main potentials.

The methods of investigation would have gained considerably by more thorough autopsy, by more detailed architectural study and by the application of modern tools like GIS and viewshed analysis. The lack of detailed and up-to-date literature is deplorable; in lieu thereof, the author's veneration of Frederick Winter's study of 1971, which was of hallmark value in its time, but today is outdated in quite some aspects, is very obvious. The great old handbooks and overviews of the 1970s¹⁰ represent the principal and often the only actors in the notes throughout, where new studies should have been consulted – the rather popular-scientific work of Fields 2006 is not adequate to replace them. Ancient sources are employed to a welcome degree; an adequate source criticism, however, would have added to their value. An important issue is that many results of the study, although apparently

consistent, are based on the chronology of the single fortifications, which remains unreliable.

Nevertheless, although it has missed quite some of its chances Maher's study is still an important collection of information on Arkadian fortifications and as such forms a decent base for further research on the topic.

SILKE MÜTH

NATIONAL MUSEUM OF DENMARK
silke.muth-frederiksen@natmus.dk

- Balandier, C. 2002. La défense des territoires à Chypre de l'époque archaïque aux invasions arabes (VIIIe siècle av. n. è.-VIIe siècle de n. è.) *Dialogues d'Histoire Ancienne* 28/1: 175–206.
- Balandier, C. 2016. Étudier l'organisation défensive d'une région et son évolution : pour une archéologie historique des fortifications. Question de méthode, in Frederiksen *et al.* 2016: 417–434.
- Coutsinas, N. 2013. *Défenses crétoises : fortifications urbaines et défense du territoire en Crète aux époques classique et hellénistique*. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne.
- Demand, N.H. 1990. *Urban Relocation in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Flight and consolidation. Bristol: Classical Press.
- Ducrey, P. 1986. Les fortifications grecques. Rôle, fonction, efficacité, in Leriche and Tréziny 1986: 133–142.
- Fachard, S. 2012. *La défense du territoire. Étude de la chôra et de ses fortifications* (Eretria: Fouilles et recherches 21). Gollion: Infolio.
- Fields, N. 2006. *Ancient Greek Fortifications: 500–300 BC*. Oxford: Osprey.
- Frederiksen, R., S. Müth, P.I. Schneider and M. Schnelle (eds) 2016. *Focus on Fortification: New Research on Fortifications in the Ancient Mediterranean and the Near East. Papers of the conference on the research of ancient fortifications, Athens 6–9 December 2012* (Fokus Fortifikation Studies 2). Oxford: Oxbow.
- Giese, J. 2010. Bautechnische Beobachtungen am nördlichen und nordwestlichen Mauerabschnitt in Messene, in Lorentzen *et al.* 2010: 85–95.
- Lawrence, A.W. 1979. *Greek Aims in Fortification*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Leriche, P. and H. Tréziny (eds) 1986. *La fortification dans l'histoire du monde grec. Actes du colloque international Valbonne, décembre 1982*. Paris: Éditions du CNRS.
- Ley, J. 2009. *Stadtbefestigungen in Akarnanien: ein bauhistorischer Beitrag zur urbanen Entwicklungsgeschichte einer antiken Landschaft*. Berlin: self-published.

¹⁰ Next to Winter: Lawrence 1979; McNicoll 1997, which is based on a PhD dissertation from 1971.

- Ley, J. 2010. Stadtbefestigungen als historische Quellen. Ein bauhistorischer Beitrag zur urbanen Entwicklungsgeschichte Akarnaniens, in Lorentzen *et al.* 2010: 45–55.
- Lolos, Y. 2011. *Land of Sikyon. Archaeology and History of a Greek City-State*. Princeton, NJ: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Lorentzen, J., F. Pirson, P.I. Schneider and U. Wulf-Rheidt (eds) *Aktuelle Forschungen zur Konstruktion, Funktion und Semantik antiker Stadtbefestigungen. Kolloquium 9./10. Februar 2007 in Istanbul* (Byzas 10). Istanbul: Ege Yayınları.
- McNicoll, A.W. 1997. *Hellenistic Fortifications from the Aegean to the Euphrates*. With revisions and an additional Chapter by N.P. Milner. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Müth, S. 2010. Fortifikationskunst und Repräsentation an der Stadtmauer von Messene, in Lorentzen *et al.* 2010: 57–83.
- Müth, S. 2014. The Historical Context of the City Wall of Messene. *Proceedings of the Danish Institute at Athens* 7: 105–122.
- Müth, S., P.I. Schneider, M. Schnelle and P.D. de Staebler (eds) 2016. *Ancient Fortifications: a compendium of theory and practice* (Fokus Fortifikation Studies 1). Oxford: Oxbow.
- Nielsen, T.H. 2002. *Arkadia and its Poleis in the Archaic and Classical Periods* (Hypomnemata 140). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Richter, E. 2014. Leiten – Lenken – Limitieren: die Stadtmauern in Samikon und Platiana (Triphylien), in D. Kurapkat, P. I. Schneider and U. Wulf-Rheidt (eds) *Die Architektur des Weges: gestaltete Bewegung im gebauten Raum. Internationales Kolloquium in Berlin vom 8.-11. Februar 2012* (Diskussionen zur archäologischen Bauforschung 11): 39–55. Regensburg: Schnell and Steiner.
- Richter, E. 2015. Vergleich und zeitliche Einordnung der triphyliischen Stadtmauern in Platiana, Samikon und Vrestos (Triphylien, Griechenland), in: M. Bachmann, U. Wulf-Rheidt, H. Bankel and A. Schwarting (eds) *Bericht über die 48. Tagung für Ausgrabungswissenschaft und Bauforschung vom 28. Mai bis 1. Juni 2014 in Erfurt*: 161–168. Stuttgart: Koldewey-Gesellschaft.
- Rönnlund, R. 2018. Review of M. Maher, *The Fortifications of Arkadian City-States in the Classical and Hellenistic Period*, Oxford 2017. *American Journal of Archaeology* 122. www.ajaonline.org/book-review/3644.
- Roy, J. 2014. Emplekton Technique in Fortification at Ithome/Messene, Megalopolis, and Mantinea: the work of Theban military engineers? *Proceedings of the Danish Institute at Athens* 7: 123–131.
- Schwertheim, U. 2010. Monumentale Hofttore in Messene, in Lorentzen *et al.* 2010: 97–106.
- Scranton, R.L. 1941. *Greek Walls*. Cambridge/Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Suha, M. 2009. The Fortification Walls of Agios Donatos, in B. Forsén (ed.) *Thesprotia Expedition I. Towards a Regional History* (Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 15): 119–132. Helsinki: Foundation of the Finnish Institute at Athens.
- Suha, M. 2011. Further Observations on the Hellenistic Fortifications in the Kokytos Valley, in B. Forsén and E. Tikkala (eds) *Thesprotia Expedition II. Environment and Settlement Patterns* (Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 16): 203–224. Helsinki: Foundation of the Finnish Institute at Athens.
- Suha, M. 2016. The Walls of Elea. Some Thoughts Concerning Their Typology and Date, in B. Forsén, N. Galanidou and E. Tikkala (eds) *Thesprotia Expedition III. Landscapes of Nomadism and Sedentism* (Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 22): 311–339. Helsinki: Foundation of the Finnish Institute at Athens.
- Typaldou-Fakiris, C. 2004. *Villes fortifiées de Phocide et la IIIe guerre sacrée 356–346 av. J.-C.* Aix-en-Provence: Presses de l'Université de Provence.
- Winter, F.E. 1971. *Greek Fortifications*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Histories of ancient painting

Jerome J. Pollitt (ed.) *The Cambridge History of Painting in the Classical World*. pp. xxii+477, 237 b/w illustrations, 140 colour plates, 6 maps, CD-ROM. 2014. New York: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-86591-3 hardback £190, US\$250.

Reconstructing a single coherent history of painted images over almost two and a half millennia and across a wide variety of cultural contexts in the Mediterranean and Europe is a daunting task, especially today, at a time when the notions of diversity and multiplicity play a crucial role in the study of classical antiquity. The editor Jerome J. Pollitt introduces this study as the first attempt, after Mary Hamilton Swindler's 1929 *Ancient Painting*,¹ to provide a comprehensive and up-to-date survey of

¹ Swindler 1929.

ancient Greek and Roman panel and mural painting from the Bronze Age to Late Antiquity, and to offer a critical assessment of past and current research on the paintings' style, technique, iconography and sociocultural context. This ambitious study gathers nine essays by world-leading experts in different areas of ancient painting and is an essential tool for both students and specialists.

Ancient painting is a fast-growing field of research. In the 20th century Minoan paintings were discovered in houses at Thera, Classical and Hellenistic painted tombs were uncovered in a number of sites in Macedonia, Thrace and southern Italy, and murals have been found in disparate parts of the Roman Empire. These and many other astonishing discoveries have been prompting scholars to investigate new evidence and revise old assumptions.² In addition, collections of painted fragments, often kept in museum storage for several decades, and archive photographs have been studied alongside new finds.³ Research on ancient painting has benefited enormously from the development of innovative methods of analysis, conservation treatments and digital technologies, which have not only advanced our knowledge of materials and techniques, but have also shed light on the relationship between the paintings and their spatial, archaeological and sociocultural contexts.⁴ Polychromy has played a key role in the study of classical art since the 18th century, and the first decade of the 21st century has seen a renewed interest in the topic, with a number of exhibitions and interdisciplinary studies that have brought together art historians, archaeologists, conservators, scientists and philologists to explore the meanings and uses of pigments and colour across different media.⁵ Classical antiquity was a world full of images and scholars of ancient painting have traditionally privileged the figural over the decorative. Numerous studies have offered sophisticated reconstructions and interpretations of paintings and viewers' experiences, often with the aid of ancient literary sources.⁶ This long-standing focus on iconography

has more recently been accompanied by a growing interest in decorative schemes and by a more general shift towards contextual and archaeological approaches.⁷ Figural and decorative motifs, with their stylistic features, are now increasingly considered within a multimedia decorative environment and they are explored in connection with surrounding architecture, sculpture and other surface decorations.⁸ Finally, our knowledge and understanding of ancient painting is shaped also by their modern reception. This applies especially to Etruscan and Roman paintings, many of which were discovered, copied, collected and forged since the 17th century.⁹

This overview shows how in 2014 the time was mature for a long-awaited and much-needed study on ancient painting. Pollitt's comprehensive approach is a welcome complement to the dominating trend in current scholarship, which tends to focus on a single site, region or time period.

From Survey to History

Besides providing a comprehensive survey of ancient painting, the main goal of this volume is to reconstruct the history of painting in the classical world. The focus on 'painting in the Classical world' rather than 'Classical painting' is especially important, in that it emphasises that Greco-Roman painting should not be considered in isolation from other pictorial traditions that developed in mixed contexts or on the periphery of the classical world. In doing that, it addresses a readership made of Aegean, Classical and Near Eastern archaeologists, art historians and cultural historians, and encourages a conversation between them. While inevitably maintaining a Hellenocentric and Romanocentric approach, editor and authors repeatedly insist on the cultural diversity of the classical world and attempt to define its geographical and chronological boundaries in relation to the Greco-Roman pictorial tradition (x). Paintings from Etruria, Thrace, Anatolia, Egypt and Israel are therefore discussed alongside Greco-Roman evidence. Yet, broadening the scope of the investigation is only a starting point to reconstruct the history of ancient panel- and wall-painting. A *history* presupposes the existence of a thread of

² New evidence and interpretations are often published in the proceedings of the meetings organised by the *Association Internationale pour la Peinture Murale Antique* (AIPMA) and the *Associazione Italiana Ricerche Pittura Antica* (AIRPA).

³ E.g. Clarke 2015; Breccoulaki, Davis and Stocker 2015; Burlot and Roger 2017.

⁴ E.g. *Herculaneum Conservation Project* (Wallace-Hadrill 2006; Piqué, MacDonald-Korth and Rainer 2015) and *Oplontis Project* (Clarke and Muntasser 2014; Clarke 2015).

⁵ E.g. Tiverios and Tsiafakis 2002; Cleland, Stears and Davies 2004; Brinkmann and Wünsche 2004; Panzanelli, Schmidt and Lapatin 2008; Bradley 2009; Grand-Clément 2011; Jockey 2018.

⁶ See for example the studies on the impact of Ovid on ancient Roman painting (Ghedini and Colpo 2012; Knox 2014; Wallace-Hadrill 2018) or the use of ancient literary sources to fill the gap

in our knowledge of Archaic and Classical painting (Pollitt 1990, 34–6, 95–112, 154–82; Lydakis 2004, 107–89).

⁷ Moormann 2016; Mols and Moormann 2017.

⁸ On painting and architecture, see for example Palyvou 2012. On images of statues in Roman painting, Moormann 2008. On painting and other surface decoration, Lepinski and McFadden 2015.

⁹ E.g. Moltesen and Weber Lehmann 1991; Burlot 2012.

continuity, as well as the possibility to follow it closely, or at least reconstruct it. The contributors to this study are therefore confronted with three overarching questions. Firstly, are we dealing with a single and continuous artistic tradition? In the preface, Pollitt asserts that, at least from the end of the 8th century BC, 'the answer to this question would seem clearly to be yes' (xi) and that, to some extent, such continuity in the art of painting may be traced back to the Bronze Age. Secondly, how are different pictorial experiences connected with one another? In other words, what can we learn from the paintings' style, technique and iconography about the circulation of artistic and cultural models across time and space? Thirdly, do we have enough evidence to tell the history of ancient painting in the classical world? While the corpus of ancient painting has grown significantly over the last few decades, many aspects of its history remain virtually unknown: nothing survives of the panel- and wall-paintings by Classical masters discussed by Plato and Pausanias, Hellenistic evidence comes almost exclusively from elite funerary contexts and our understanding of Roman painting derives by and large from Pompeii and Herculaneum. In order to compensate for these gaps, the authors adopt an interdisciplinary approach and integrate wall painting with literary sources, vase painting, textiles, illustrated papyri and books, mosaics and other surface decoration.

The corpus of paintings examined in this volume is vast and heterogeneous, spanning two millennia and covering the entire Mediterranean and beyond. The book is organised in nine chapters that follow a straightforward chronological structure, dividing the material into four main periods: Bronze Age, Archaic and Classical, Hellenistic and Roman. Within each time period the paintings are then grouped based on their geographic and cultural contexts: chapter 1 discusses Aegean painting during the Bronze Age; chapters 2 and 4 examine literary sources and vase painting in an attempt to supplement and interpret the scanty archaeological evidence available for Archaic and Classical mural and panel painting in the Greek world; chapter 3 surveys Etruscan and Greek paintings in Italy from the 7th to the end of the 5th century BC; chapters 5 and 6 focus on Hellenistic paintings in the Eastern Mediterranean and Italy, respectively; chapter 7 bridges the Greek and Roman sections of the book and is concerned largely with literary sources, looking at the place of wall painting in the history of ancient art criticism; finally, the last two chapters (8 and 9) follow the development of Roman painting from the Mid-Republican period to Late Antiquity.

Minding the Gap

One of the major challenges in trying to reconstruct the history of ancient Greek painting is the discrepancy between the scanty archaeological evidence available for the Archaic and Classical periods and the wealth of information supplied by literary sources. How can these be reconciled? The first four chapters approach this issue from different angles: exploring the antecedents of Classical painting, combining literary evidence with vase painting, and looking for elements of Greekness in non-Greek contexts.

The volume opens with a chapter on Aegean painting in the Bronze Age,¹⁰ a tradition that the author, Anne Chapin, claims may be considered in many ways 'foundational to the later artistic achievements of Classical Greece' (60). Chapin begins by introducing Aegean geography and chronology and then looks at the rise of pictorial painting on Minoan Crete in the 2nd millennium BC. The discussion proceeds chronologically from Minoan to Cycladic and Mycenaean painting, and Chapin provides a thorough review of individual paintings, tackling long-standing problems of dating and iconography, as exemplified by the 'Saffron Gatherer Fresco' and the 'Priest-King Fresco' at Knossos (11–13). One of the many merits of this chapter is that it provides a lucid analysis of the factors that led to the emergence and decline of pictorial painting in the Aegean and of the connections between different pictorial traditions. In particular, Chapin argues that frescoes recently discovered in Egypt, northern Israel and Syria show how itinerant artists working at a variety of sites in the Eastern Mediterranean contributed to the formation and diffusion of an Aegean style and technique (27–28).¹¹ This suggests that human mobility and technological transfer played a key role in the development of this artistic tradition, thus elucidating the place of Aegean painting within the broader cultural phenomena of Minoanisation and Mycenaeanisation.¹² Pictorial vase painting is also well-integrated into the discussion.¹³ In the conclusion, Chapin comes to 'the significance of Aegean painting for later Classical art' (58), a question crucial to the broader scope of the book. She introduces some of the features shared by Aegean and Classical painting, namely pursuit of

¹⁰ Immerwahr 1990; Morgan 2005; Brecoulaki, Davis and Stocker 2015.

¹¹ On itinerant painters in Aya Irini, Morgan 2019, 726–32. On painting and Creto-Egyptians relations in the 2nd millennium BC, Bietak 2005.

¹² Nikolakopoulou and Knappett 2016, 102–15. See also Gorogianni 2016, 143–8.

¹³ On the relationship between vase painting and wall painting in the Aegean during the Bronze Age, Vlachopoulos 2013.

naturalism and iconographic subjects like athletes, anthropomorphic deities and chariots. While her suggestions are thought-provoking, the discussion is brief and since this question is not picked up in later chapters it remains unclear what place Bronze Age painting had within the history of painting in the classical world.

Jeffrey Hurwit (chapter 2) and Mark Stansbury-O'Donnell (chapter 4) take upon themselves the daunting task of filling the gap in evidence left by Archaic and Classical painting in Greece. Taking a cautious and rigorous methodological approach, Hurwit offers an insightful and honest assessment of our current knowledge and understanding of Archaic panel- and wall painting. He identifies three categories of material to take into account: free paintings from sanctuaries and cemeteries in mainland Greece (painted plaster fragments, terracotta and wooden panels, and grave stelae),¹⁴ Greek polychrome vase painting,¹⁵ and murals from Anatolia and Etruria. While wooden *pinakes*, like the Pitsa plaques, may offer us precious insights into the lost art of Greek panel-painting,¹⁶ from a technical standpoint terracotta *pinakes* are ultimately nothing more than flat vase paintings. Hurwit suggests that they were most likely commissioned to vase painters, which introduces the crucial question of what relationship existed between vase- and free-painting in the Archaic Greek world. Challenging a commonly held assumption that Greek vase painting reflected and derived from large scale free-painting,¹⁷ Hurwit convincingly argues for an interdependence between these two arts, in which free painter and vase painter potentially shared the same iconographic repertoire and stylistic vocabulary. The final part of the chapter discusses a selection of murals from Archaic Lycia, Phrygia and Etruria. Hurwit looks primarily for Greek influences in the paintings' subject matters and stylistic features. This perspective is fully justified by the scope of the chapter; yet, while Etruscan tombs are extensively discussed in chapter 3, the Anatolian ones are nowhere treated in their own right. Hurwit emphasises their hybridity and, in this respect, it may have been worth considering the painted decoration of the Tatarlı tomb (c. 480 BC). This chamber tomb was looted and excavated in 1969–1970 near Tatarlı, in the province of Afyonkarahisar, and its paintings, executed on wood, have been thoroughly studied and published.¹⁸ One of the painted wooden beams features a miniature frieze

with a multi-figured battle scene that combines Achaemenid motifs with a subject matter well-known from Near Eastern and Eastern Greek art, including Assyrian reliefs and Clazomenian painted sarcophagi.¹⁹ The model was probably an Archaic painting, but a number of stylistic features support a dating in the Early Classical period.²⁰ The Tatarlı paintings, like those from other Anatolian tombs, attest to the 'cultural interpenetration' of Phrygian, Lydian, Greek, and Achaemenid traditions.²¹ They also provide us with further elements to better understand the transition from Archaic to Classical painting.

Another source of knowledge for Greek wall and panel painting is represented by vase painting. Both Hurwit and Stansbury-O'Donnell rightly see a turning point in the first decades of the 5th century BC, when vase painters and wall painters seem to have started to work independently (89, 144).²² It becomes therefore significantly more challenging to detect 'reflections' of Greek monumental painting in vase painting of the 5th–4th centuries BC. In chapter 4, Stansbury-O'Donnell examines vase painting and later literary testimony in order to identify the most significant achievements of Classical and Late Classical painting; among them, a new interest in expressing *pathos* and *ethos*, the adoption of *skiagraphia* ('shadow-painting') and *skenographia* (theatrical 'scene-painting'), and developments in the choice and use of colour.²³ These technical and stylistic features are discussed in connection with a rich body of red figure and polychrome vase paintings from Attica, Southern Italy and the Black Sea. The connection between South Italian vase painting and Greek wall painting remains problematic, as it is not clear to what extent Apulian or Lucanian vase painters would have been exposed to Greek wall paintings. Rather, stylistic and technical features point to a relationship with native funerary paintings from Lucania, Campania and Apulia.²⁴ Stansbury-O'Donnell acknowledges the limitations of the evidence and the methodological challenge of comparing vase and wall painting after the Persian Wars, and warns us that several of his observations apply to the conception of the picture rather than the paintings themselves.

¹⁹ Summerer 2007, 5–6.

²⁰ Summerer 2007, 7, 27.

²¹ Tuplin 2010, 190.

²² Williams 1991, 111–8.

²³ On the relationship between artistic practice, philosophy and optical theory in Classical painting, Tanner 2015. See also Brecolaki 2015 and Plantzos 2018, 105–31.

²⁴ E.g. polychrome pottery from Canosa and Arpi (van der Wielen-van Ommeren 1992; Gadaleta 2011) and the Hypogaeum of Nike at Arpi (Mazzei 2002–2003; Steingraber 2005).

¹⁴ Philipp 1994; Moormann 2011, 43–6.

¹⁵ Mertens 2006; Williams 2006.

¹⁶ Brecolaki et al. 2017, 15–23; Plantzos 2018, 86–9.

¹⁷ Robertson 1951; Schaus 1988, 116.

¹⁸ Summerer and von Klienlin 2010.

If mainland Greece left us only with a pale reflection of pre-Hellenistic monumental painting, Italy provides the bulk of the archaeological evidence. In chapter 3, Stephan Steingraber looks at Etruscan and South Italian paintings dated before 400 BC. The evidence comes mostly from burials,²⁵ although some traces of painting on plaster have been found in Temple A at Pyrgi, thus suggesting that Etruscan public buildings were also decorated with frescoes. Chronology and iconography remain controversial matters in the study of Etruscan painting. Responding to a long scholarly tradition that has often used Etruscan tomb paintings to reconstruct their historical and cultural contexts,²⁶ Steingraber argues that funerary paintings have a polysemic character and images could be adapted to fit different historical and sociopolitical assumptions. This is an important observation and one that applies to ancient funerary painting more broadly. The discussion proceeds chronologically, dividing the paintings into Etrusco-Geometric, Orientalising, Archaic, and Sub-Archaic and Classical. For each period, general remarks about architecture, iconography, style and workshops are followed by a detailed description of a selection of major tombs. The final section of the chapter is devoted to South Italian paintings, which include outstanding monuments like the Tomb of the Dancers at Ruvo di Puglia and the Tomb of the Diver at Poseidonia. Surprisingly, the latter is given only a brief description. Ever since the tomb was discovered by Mario Napoli in 1968, its frescoes have been widely investigated in connection with issues of artistic quality, religious beliefs and social and cultural identity,²⁷ but none of these matters are properly addressed in the chapter. Steingraber labels these paintings 'Greek' without explaining why and in what ways: does it mean that the paintings were executed by a Greek artist or that the deceased was of Greek descent? Recent studies have shown that the Tomb of the Diver was not a completely isolated example in fifth-century BC Poseidonia, as other painted tombs have been uncovered in urban and extra-urban necropoleis.²⁸ None of them is decorated with figural scenes, but the so-called

Tomb of the Palmettes from the urban necropolis of Arcioni deserves special mention because its covering slab features the same decorative motif framing the diving scene on the lid of the Tomb of the Diver.²⁹ While it is at times hard to label these fifth-century BC tombs Greek or non-Greek, their painted decoration provides an opportunity to reflect on the social, political and cultural interactions between Greek, Etruscan and Italic groups in southern Italy.

Hellenistic *Koine* and Local Cultures

From the 4th century BC contact between different cultures and societies across the Mediterranean became more intense and painting can help to shed light on these interactions. Stella Miller's chapter on Hellenistic painting from the Eastern Mediterranean (chapter 5) examines a rich corpus that spans approximately three centuries and stretches from northern Greece to the Black Sea, Egypt and Israel. The chapter deals mainly with funerary monuments, including painted tombs and grave stelae, but it contains also a welcome discussion of murals from houses and palaces, and brief sections on ceramics, mosaics and textiles. The analysis of the painted tombs is organised thematically around popular iconographies, such as Underworld, *symposion*, war, hunt, games and myth. As Miller herself points out, this structure is slightly loose (175), but it has the important merit of illustrating how in the Hellenistic period wall painting reflected the formation of an artistic *koine* in which stylistic vocabulary and iconographic motifs circulated across the Mediterranean and were re-elaborated and adapted to a variety of local contexts. The survey, which incorporates numerous recent discoveries, is comprehensive for Macedonia and Thrace and more selective for Egypt and the Eastern Mediterranean.³⁰ Due to the royal character of several of these tombs, a long-standing debate has focused on the historical identity of the dead and on the chronology of the burials.³¹ Stylistic features and iconographic details of the tombs' painted decoration have been used to support different theories, many of which remain conjectural. Miller presents some of these proposals, highlighting their strengths and weaknesses, but sensibly avoids getting tangled in the discussion. The chapter ends with two clear and informative appendices,

²⁵ On Tarquinian painted tombs, see recently Marzullo 2017.

²⁶ Lubtchansky (2017, 86–8) neatly summarises the emergence and development of sociological and semiotic approaches in the 1970–1980s, especially emphasising the contributions by Cristofani, d'Agostino and Cerchiai.

²⁷ Holloway 2006; Robinson 2011; Bottini 2016; Rescigno 2017; Zuchtriegel 2018b. In 2018, an exhibition and an international conference at the National Archaeological Museum of Paestum (*The Tomb of the Diver. Ritual, Art and Poetry in Paestum and the Mediterranean 500 B.C.*) commemorated the 50th anniversary of the tomb's discovery: Zuchtriegel 2018a; Meriani and Zuchtriegel forthcoming.

²⁸ Cipriani 1996; 2000.

²⁹ Cipriani 2016.

³⁰ Miller's endnotes and bibliography are extensive, and I only wish to draw attention to two important studies that have appeared after this volume was published: Marjorie S. Venit's latest monograph on funerary painting in Graeco-Roman Egypt (Venit 2015) and Consuelo Manetta's publication of painted tombs in Bulgaria (Manetta 2019).

³¹ The debate has been especially lively for Macedonian tombs: e.g. Palagia 2000; Borza and Palagia 2007; Lane Fox 2011.

on attributions and technical matters respectively. Regarding the attribution of wall paintings to specific artists or schools, usually based on literary sources and stylistic observations, it is worth mentioning a *graffito* found in the round chamber of the Alexandrovo Tomb, in Bulgaria, which has been tentatively interpreted as a signature of the artist who decorated the tomb accompanied by his self-portrait.³²

In the Hellenistic period, Greek artistic models and painters reached also the shores of Italy, where they came into contact with other traditions and took on original forms. In chapter 6, Agnes Rouveret discusses the development of funerary painting in Italy during the 4th and 3rd centuries BC. She provides an excellent analysis of several of these monuments,³³ which come from Italiote *poleis* of Magna Graecia and from Etruscan and Italic sites, placing them in the context of contemporary sociopolitical events and exploring their relationship with Greek and Roman art. The chapter looks primarily at tomb paintings and sarcophagi, whereas painted stelae are left out and polychrome vases are only mentioned *in passim*.³⁴ The first part of the chapter focuses on late Etruscan tombs and looks for element of continuity with and change from the previous tradition. An increasing presence of Greek myth (Tomb of Orcus) is accompanied by a new interest in portraiture (e.g. Tomb of the Shields) and historical narrative (François Tomb) that foreshadow later developments in Roman funerary art. An important section follows on painted sarcophagi, among which the Amazons Sarcophagus from Tarquinia stands out for its pictorial and technical quality.³⁵ The second part of the chapter looks at South Italian tomb paintings, with a particular focus on Paestum. Building on Angela Pontrandolfo's and her own studies on Paestan painting,³⁶ Rouveret summarises its iconographic and stylistic development. The notion that funerary painting was introduced in Poseidonia after the Lucanian take-over of the city in the late 5th century BC and ended with the establishment of the Latin colony in 273 BC (261

is to some extent problematic³⁷ and painted tombs seem to be attested after the Roman conquest of the city.³⁸ A close connection between South Italian funerary painting and Roman conquest can be found also in Campania and Apulia, where painted tombs first appear in the second half of the 4th century BC, as the Romans were gaining control of those regions.³⁹ A chamber tomb from Cumae, found looted in 2003, features a banquet scene on the rear wall, a subject matter not documented elsewhere in contemporary South Italian funerary painting. While Rouveret links the scene with Etruscan and Tarentine models, it should be noticed that a similar rendering of the *Totenmahl* motif is found on a group of about 20 painted funerary stelae from Lilybaeum, in western Sicily.⁴⁰ The stelae have been dated on epigraphic and stylistic grounds from the 3rd to the 1st century BC and they display local, Greek, Roman and Punic features. The banquet motif merges Sicilian models with artistic influences from the Aegean, where, as Miller discusses in chapter 3 (204), painted tombstones bearing the banquet theme became popular in the 3rd-2nd centuries BC. Like Cumae, Lilybaeum was a multicultural centre with a large Greek community and had recently come under Roman domination. The Cumaean tomb and the stelae from Lilybaeum thus seem to attest to the circulation of Greek and Eastern Mediterranean models in southern Italy during the Hellenistic period and to their re-elaboration by local elites in the wake of the Roman conquest. Rouveret concludes her chapter with a section on Apulian tomb paintings, emphasising their eclectic character, which combines Macedonian models with Italic motifs and the so-called 'Tarentine manner'.⁴¹ In this chapter, Rouveret clearly shows how Eastern and Western traditions come together in Italy, ultimately bridging the Greek and Roman chapters of this history.

Re-framing Roman Painting

The last two chapters on Roman painting are preceded by Pollitt's essay on the history of ancient art criticism and the ways in which it can contribute to our understanding of classical wall painting (chapter 7). Three main traditions are identified – truth to life, didactic utility and technical and aesthetic connoisseurship. Pollitt focuses almost entirely on the last one and discusses indirect

³² Gerassimova 2003.

³³ Recent discoveries, however, have not been included in this study. In Paestum, emergency excavations have brought to light a number of new tombs (D'Angelo forthcoming). In Campania, two painted cist tombs have been excavated at Sarno in 2002 (tombs 1799 and 1801 from Galitta del Capitano: D'Angelo 2017, 79, notes 29–30). As for Apulia, in 2009 conservation work on the façade of the Scocchera B Tomb at Canosa exposed a partially preserved frieze depicting a procession.

³⁴ On painted stelae, Pontrandolfo 1998, 234–41, figs. 14–19 (Poseidonia), Vento 2000 and Portale 2011, 49–76 (Lilybaeum). On polychrome vase painting, van der Wielen-van Ommeren 1992 and Gadaleta 2011.

³⁵ Bottini and Setari 2007.

³⁶ Pontrandolfo and Rouveret 1992.

³⁷ D'Angelo forthcoming. See also Wonder 2002; Musti 2005, 261–300; Crawford 2006, 61.

³⁸ Horsnæs 2004, 306–7; D'Angelo 2017, 82–90.

³⁹ Benassai 2001, 260–6; D'Angelo, 2017, 79–80.

⁴⁰ Vento 2000; Portale 2011, 49–76.

⁴¹ On Tarentine painting, Tiné Bertocchi 1964, 61–120; Lippolis and Dell'Aglio 2003.

evidence from treatises by ancient Greek painters that may have formed the basis of art history in the Hellenistic period. He argues that Hellenistic historians were likely responsible for passing the substance of this professional criticism to writers of the Late Roman Republic and Roman Empire, including Pliny the Elder, Cicero, Dionysios of Halikarnassos and Quintilian. Using these sources, Pollitt examines the classification and effects of colours, styles and techniques. Particularly relevant is his discussion on the four-colour palette and the opposition between *colores austeri* and *colores floridi*.⁴² He rightly observes that the distinction between these two categories was probably rather flexible and may have depended on subject matter, style an optical effect. This author wonders whether the Εἰκόνας of Philostratus the Elder should have been discussed here rather than in Roger Ling's chapter on Roman painting from the Middle and Late Empire (402–404). Some passages also dwell on *skiagraphia*,⁴³ a notion discussed both in this chapter and in chapter 4, showing how crucial a component it was in ancient art criticism. More importantly, these literary descriptions would nicely fit in with the discussion of painting in ancient art criticism and are relevant to both Greek and Roman painting. As Ling himself points out (403), the paintings described by Philostratus were not all products of the Severan Age and some could have derived from earlier periods, possibly acquired from older collections. This would further elucidate the complex relationship existing between the Greek masterpieces brought to Rome in the Hellenistic period and the Roman *pinacothecae* discussed in chapters 8 and 9.

With an admirable command of the evidence, Irene Bragantini (chapter 8) presents the reader with a clear and compelling narrative of how Roman painting developed from the Mid-Republican period to the end of the 1st century AD. What is especially interesting about her methodological approach is that August Mau's nineteenth-century classification of Roman painting into four 'Pompeian Styles' is introduced only at the end of the chapter (359–62). This choice allows her more freedom to use broad periodisations and to focus on the historical and cultural meaning of the paintings. Recent studies, however, have shown a need to reassess the concept of *Zeitstil* in Roman painting and Bragantini herself has engaged with this topic elsewhere:⁴⁴ artists and patrons sometimes deliberately deployed

earlier styles or restored paintings in order to express social prestige, thus suggesting a concept and use of 'style' that goes beyond changes in taste and chronological classification.⁴⁵ These new interpretations of the Pompeian Styles are in many ways in line with Bragantini's approach and it would have been helpful to the reader to integrate them more explicitly into the discussion. After examining elite tombs from the Mid-Republican period, Bragantini focuses primarily on domestic culture, whereas funerary painting is essentially left out.⁴⁶ The bulk of the evidence comes from Roman Italy, while the discussion of provincial painting is limited to a few examples from Gaul, Iberia and Noricum. According to Bragantini, the development of Roman painting can be articulated into three main stages. In the 2nd-1st centuries BC, we witness the formation of a 'common figurative language' (311) in which the painted decoration of Roman houses reflected the commitment of the highest strata of Roman society. The end of this phase coincides with the Augustan period. It is now that mythological subjects gained increasing popularity in domestic painting, a phenomenon that according to Bragantini originates from the capacity that myth had 'to translate into the interior of the house that climate of commitment to Augustan ideology' (326).⁴⁷ Finally, a decline of wall painting is triggered around the mid-1st century AD by changing societal demands: paintings are now found in the houses of lower strata of society, whereas the elite privilege other forms of interior decoration, such as marble revetments, mosaics and *opus sectile*. Painted tombs, especially freedman *columbaria* in Rome, may have contributed to strengthening and nuancing this sophisticated reading.⁴⁸ Labelled 'Conclusions', the final paragraph is rather an appendix discussing the organisation and training of painters and the relevance and applicability of Pompeian styles to current research on Roman painting. The latter may have been more useful at the outset of the chapter.

Roger Ling's essay (chapter 9) follows the development of Roman painting during the Middle and Late Empire. Post-Pompeian material is still often overlooked – or at least not fully appreciated – in scholarship on Roman painting.⁴⁹ In investigating the social and cultural factors that determined the fortune of wall painting after the 1st century AD, Ling

⁴² On the tetrachromatic palette, see most recently Plantzos 2018, 106–8.

⁴³ E.g. Phil. *Im.* I Proem 2; I.23.4; II.20.2.

⁴⁴ Moormann 2018. See also Bragantini 2014; Zimmermann 2014.

⁴⁵ Mols 2005; Gee 2015; McAlpine 2015.

⁴⁶ See Blanc 1998; Barbet 2001; Borbonus 2014.

⁴⁷ See also Newby 2016, 164–227.

⁴⁸ E.g. the Tomb of the Statilii from the Esquiline necropolis. Holliday 2005, 119–21.

⁴⁹ For most recent discoveries and studies, Mols and Moormann 2017; Dubois and Niffeler 2018. Important work has recently been done on paintings from Zeugma (Barbet 2005; Bergmann 2013) and Ephesos (Zimmermann and Ladstätter 2010).

faces two major challenges: many of the paintings cannot be accurately dated and the majority of the evidence available to-day comes from Roman Italy, especially the cities of Rome and Ostia. While the demand for wall painting continues throughout the Middle Empire, in both public and private contexts, a decline manifests itself in lack of invention and lower-quality technique. Painting becomes increasingly more important in the decoration of vaults and ceilings, often in combination with stuccowork and mosaic.⁵⁰ One of the most important questions that Ling addresses in this chapter is how wall painting was employed across the Empire as a way of claiming Roman identity. In this respect, Egypt and Syria represent exceptional case studies, due to their multicultural history and tradition. A discussion of mummy portraits from the Fayum region and of the paintings from the synagogue of Dura-Europos shows how Greco-Roman and local iconographies and styles could be juxtaposed or merged, creating a bilingualism that challenges traditional definitions of Classical painting. In the Late Empire, the development of painting seems to reflect the wavering stability of government and upper class patronage.⁵¹ A new classicising phase during the reign of Constantine is seen as ‘the swan song of Graeco-Roman illusionistic style in its pure form’ (419), after which wall painting gave way to other arts, *in primis* wall- and vault-mosaics and book illustration.

The Big Picture

As stated at the outset, the strength of this work lies in the breadth of its coverage and the wealth of information it contains. Each chapter is informative and intellectually stimulating, and offers a lucid overview of archaeological, artistic and literary evidence. Authors do not simply repeat or summarise discussions that have been had elsewhere, but offer new insights into matters of artistic production, cultural transmission and visual reception. Weaving together traditional and modern scholarship and approaches, they also handle carefully the gaps that still exist in the material culture. This comprehensive, well-organised and up-to-date volume is especially valuable for student readings, making materials often published primarily in languages other than English accessible to a broader readership. The book is also welcomed by specialists and serves as a convenient and useful starting point for future in-depth research on ancient painting as an artistic and cultural phenomenon.

Due to the sizable amount of evidence surviving from certain periods and areas, at times it proves difficult to combine a need for completeness with a question-based approach, so that some chapters or sections thereof tend to be descriptive in nature. There is a general attention to avoid repetitions and there are no obvious oversights or deliberate exclusions. The structure and focus of each chapter are dictated by the nature of the evidence available and by the expertise of the author. At times, however, the inclusion or omission of certain categories of material puzzles the reader: why are painted stelae and polychrome ceramics produced in Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean discussed in detail whereas those from Hellenistic Italy are almost entirely dismissed? Why are Mid-Republican and Middle and Late Imperial tombs carefully examined whereas Late Republican and Early Imperial funerary paintings are entirely left out? The authors, especially Hurwit, Miller, Pollitt and Rouveret, examine in depth the influences that different pictorial experiences exerted on each other across time and space. Yet, the unity of the volume could have been strengthened by establishing further connections between individual chapters. This is especially important in a volume whose aim is to reconstruct the history of painting in the classical world. The importance of Bronze Age painting for later developments of classical painting is introduced at the end of chapter 1, but it is not picked up later, when issues of naturalism and iconography are discussed in more detail in connection with Classical painting. In chapter 8, a reference to Paestan, Campanian and Etruscan pictorial traditions – examined by Rouveret in chapter 6 – may have helped the reader better understand early developments in Roman painting. In addition, important monuments that are relevant to different cultural contexts are mentioned in more than one chapter, without ultimately being fully discussed. This is the case of the Tomb of the Diver, briefly mentioned at the end of chapter 2 as completely indebted to red-figure vase painting (90) and in chapter 3 as ‘a rare example of pre-Hellenistic Greek monumental wall painting’ (139).

These points must not detract from the overall quality of the book, which combines depth, rigour and clarity, and will no doubt foster research in new and exciting directions. We may still be far from being able to reconstruct the history of panel and wall painting in the classical world, but focusing on multiple histories can help us enhance the dialogue between different traditions and appreciate the connectivity, diversity and transformation of ancient cultures in the Mediterranean and beyond,

⁵⁰ Joyce 1981; Clarke 1991, 266–362.

⁵¹ On Late Antique painting, Dorigo 1966; Elsner 2009; McFadden 2015.

exploring networks and transcending geographical and cultural boundaries.

TIZIANA D'ANGELO
UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM
DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS AND ARCHAEOLOGY
tiziana.dangelo@nottingham.ac.uk

- Barbet, A. (ed.) 2001. *La peinture funéraire antique: IVe siècle av. J.-C. – IVe siècle ap. J.-C.* Actes du VIIIe colloque de l'Association internationale pour la peinture murale antique (6–10 octobre 1998, Saint-Romain-en-Gal, Vienne). Paris: Errance.
- Barbet, A. 2005. *Zeugma II. Peintures murales romaines.* Paris: De Boccard.
- Benassai, R. 2001. *La pittura dei Campani e dei Sanniti.* Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.
- Bergmann, B. 2013. Wall painting, in W. Alward (ed.) *Excavations at Zeugma Conducted by Oxford Archaeology, Volume 1:* 168–177. Los Altos (CA): Packard Humanities Institute.
- Bietak, M. 2005. The setting of the Minoan wall paintings at Avaris, in Morgan 2005: 83–90.
- Blanc, N. (ed.) 1998. *Au royaume des ombres. La peinture funéraire antique IVe s. avant J.-C. – IVe siècle après J.-C.* Musée et sites archéologiques de Saint-Romain-en-Gal – Vienne. Paris: Réunion des Musées nationaux.
- Borbonus, D. 2014. *Columbarium Tombs and Collective Identity in Augustan Rome.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Borza, E.N. and O. Palagia 2007. The chronology of the Macedonian royal tombs at Vergina. *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 122: 81–125.
- Bottini, A. 2016. La Tomba del Tuffatore. *Forma Urbis* 22.11: 14–19.
- Bottini, A. and E. Setari (eds) 2007. *Il sarcofago delle Amazzoni.* Milan: Mondadori Electa.
- Bradley, M. 2009. *Colour and Meaning in Ancient Rome.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bragantini, I. 2014. La pittura a Pompei nell'opera di August Mau, *Geschichte der decorativen Wandmalerei in Pompeji* (Berlin 1882): note di lettura, in H. Eristov and F. Monier (eds) *L'héritage germanique dans l'approche du décor antique, Actes de la table ronde organisée à l'École normale supérieure le 23 novembre 2012:* 9–18. Bordeaux: Ausonius.
- Brecoulaki, H. 2015. Greek Painting and the challenge of *mimesis*, in P. Destrée and P. Murrey (eds) *A Companion to Ancient Aesthetics:* 218–236. Malden (MA) and Oxford: John Wiley and Sons.
- Brecoulaki, H., J.L. Davis and S.R. Stocker (eds) 2015. *Mycenaean Wall Paintings in Context: New Discoveries and Old Finds Reconsidered.* Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, Institute for Historical Research.
- Brecoulaki, H., G. Kavvadias, V. Kandarelou, J. Stephens and A. Stephens 2017. Colour and painting technique on the Archaic panels from Pitsa (Corinthia), in Mols and Moorman 2017: 15–24.
- Brinkmann, V. and R. Wünsche (eds) 2004. *Bunte Götter. Die Farbigkeit antiker Skulptur.* Munich: Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptotek.
- Burlot, D. 2012. *Fabriquer l'Antique. Contrefaçons de peinture murale antique au XVIIIe siècle* (Mémoires et documents sur Rome et l'Italie méridionale n° 7). Naples: Centre Jean Bérard.
- Burlot, D. and D. Roger 2017. Décontextualiser, Recontextualiser: fragments de peinture murale antique en musée, in Mols and Moorman 2017: 81–86.
- Cipriani, M. 1996. Prime esperienze italiane alle porte di Poseidonia, in M. Cipriani and F. Longo (eds) *I Greci in occidente. Poseidonia e i Lucani*, Catalogo della Mostra (Paestum, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, 27 aprile 1996): 119–139. Naples: Electa.
- Cipriani, M. 2000. Italici a Poseidonia nella seconda metà del V sec. a.C. Nuove ricerche nella necropoli del Gaudo, in E. Greco and F. Longo (eds) *Paestum. Scavi, studi, ricerche. Bilancio di un decennio (1988–1998):* 197–212. Paestum: Pandemos.
- Cipriani, M. 2016. La Tomba delle Palmette. *Forma Urbis* 21.11: 20–21.
- Clarke, J.R. 1991. *The Houses of Roman Italy, 100 B.C.-A.D. 250: Ritual, Space, and Decoration.* Berkeley (CA), Los Angeles (CA) and London: University of California Press.
- Clarke, J.R. 2015. Retrieving the decorative program of Villa A ('of Poppaea') at Oplontis (Torre Annunziata, Italy): how orphaned fragments find a home in the virtual-reality 3D model, in Lepinski and McFadden 2015: 97–108.
- Clarke, J.R. and N.K. Muntasser (eds) 2014. *Oplontis: Villa A ('Of Poppaea') at Torre Annunziata, Volume 1. The Ancient Setting and Modern Rediscovery.* New York: American Council of Learned Societies.
- Cleland, L., K. Stears and G. Davies (eds) 2004. *Colour in the Ancient Mediterranean World.* Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Crawford, M. 2006. From Poseidonia to Paestum via the Lucanians, in G. Bradley and J.P. Wilson (eds) *Greek and Roman Colonization: Origins, Ideologies and Interactions:* 59–72. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.
- D'Angelo, T. 2017. La pittura funeraria pestana tra Magna Grecia e Roma, in M. Niola and G. Zuchtriegel (eds) *Action Painting. Rito and arte nelle tombe di Paestum*, Catalogo della Mostra

- (Paestum, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, 2 giugno – dicembre 2017): 75–91. Naples: Prismi.
- D'Angelo, T. forthcoming. Greek power and Italic identity in 4th-century BC painted tombs at Poseidonia, in E. Falaschi and A. Poggio (eds) *Περὶ γραφικῆς. Pittori, tecniche, trattati, contesti tra testimonianze e ricezione*. Milan: LED.
- Dorigo, W. 1966. *Pittura tardoromana*. Milan: Feltrinelli.
- Dubois, Y. and U. Niffeler (eds) *Pictores per provincias II – status quaestionis*. Actes du XIIIe Colloque de l'Association Internationale pour la Peinture Murale Antique (Université de Lausanne, 12–16 septembre 2016). Basel: Archäologie Schweiz.
- Elsner, J. 2009. Verso il Medioevo. La pittura romana tardo-antica, in E. La Rocca, S. Ensoli, S. Tortorella and M. Papini (eds) *Roma. La pittura di un impero*, Catalogo della Mostra (Roma, Scuderie del Quirinale, 24 settembre 2009 – 17 gennaio 2010): 131–135. Milan: Skira.
- Gadaleta, G. 2011. Linguaggi e tecnica della pittura a tempera policroma nella Daunia della prima età ellenistica, in F. La Torre and M. Torelli (eds) *Pittura ellenistica in Italia e in Sicilia: linguaggi e tradizioni*: 319–330. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider.
- Gee, R. 2015. Fourth Style workshop deployment and movement patterns at Villa A ('of Poppaea') at Oplontis, in Lepinski and McFadden 2015: 127–148.
- Gerassimova, V. 2003. Preliminary study of the graffito from the Alexandrovo Tomb. *Izvestia na istoricheskaya muzey Khaskovo* 2: 177–179.
- Ghedini, F. and I. Colpo (eds) 2012. *Il gran poema delle passioni e delle meraviglie. Ovidio e il repertorio letterario figurativo fra antico e riscoperta dell'antico*, Atti del Convegno (Padova, 15–17 settembre 2011). Padua: Padova University Press.
- Gorogianni, E. 2016. Keian, Kei-noanised, Keicenaenised? Interregional contact and identity in Ayia Irini, Kea, in E. Gorogianni, P. Pavúk, and L. Girella (eds) *Beyond Thalassocracies. Understanding Processes of Minoanisation and Mycenaeanisation in the Aegean*: 136–154. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Grand-Clément, A. 2011. *La fabrique des couleurs. Histoire du paysage sensible des Grecs anciens (VIIIe début du Ve siècle av. n. è.). De l'archéologie à l'histoire*. Paris: De Boccard.
- Holliday, P.J. 2005. The rhetoric of Romanitas: the 'Tomb of the Statilii' frescoes reconsidered. *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 50: 89–129.
- Holloway, R.R. 2006. The Tomb of the Diver. *American Journal of Archaeology* 110: 365–388.
- Horsnæs, H.W. 2004. Romanization at Paestum in the 3rd c. B.C.: a note on the chronology of the PAISTANO coins and the interpretation of the wall paintings from the Spinazzo cemetery. *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 17: 305–311.
- Immerwahr, S.A. 1990. *Aegean Painting in the Bronze Age*. University Park (PA): Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Jockey, P. (ed.) 2018. *Les arts de la couleur en Grèce ancienne...et ailleurs. Approches interdisciplinaires*, Actes du colloque international (Athens, 23–25 avril 2009). Athens: École française d'Athènes.
- Joyce, H. 1981. *The Decoration of Walls, Ceilings and Floors in Italy in the Second and Third Centuries A.D.* Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider.
- Knox, P.E. 2014. Ovidian myths on Pompeian walls, in J.F. Miller and C.E. Newlands (eds) *A Handbook to the Reception of Ovid*: 36–54. Malden (MA) and Oxford: John Wiley and Sons.
- Lane Fox, R.J. 2011. Dating the Royal Tombs at Vergina, in R.J. Lane Fox (ed.) *Brill's Companion to Ancient Macedon, Studies in the Archaeology and History of Macedon, 650 BC–300 AD*: 1–34. Leiden: Brill.
- Lepinski, S. and S. McFadden (eds) 2015. *Beyond Iconography: Materials, Methods, and Meaning in Ancient Surface Decoration*. Boston: Archaeological Institute of America.
- Lippolis, E. and A. Dell'Aglio 2003. La pittura funeraria a Taranto. *Archaeologia Classica* 54: 97–158.
- Lubtchansky, N. 2017. Iconography and iconology, nineteenth to twenty-first centuries, in A. Naso (ed.) *Etruscology*, Volume 1: 79–94. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Lydakis, S. 2004. *Ancient Greek Painting and its Echoes in Later Art*. Los Angeles (CA): J. Paul Getty Museum.
- Manetta, C. 2019. *Le tombe dipinte della Bulgaria*. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.
- Marzullo, M. 2017. *Grotte cornetane. Materiali e apparato critico per lo studio delle tombe dipinte di Tarquinia*, 2 Vols. Milan: Ledizioni.
- Mazzei, M. 2002–2003. L'ipogeo della Nike ad Arpi: nota preliminare. *Annali di Archeologia e Storia Antica* 9–10: 153–158.
- McAlpine, L. 2015. Heirlooms on the walls: Republican paintings and Imperial viewers in Pompeii, in Lepinski and McFadden 2015: 167–186.
- McFadden, S. 2015. The Luxor Temple paintings in context: Roman visual culture in Late Antiquity, in M. Jones and S. McFadden (eds) *Art of the Empire: The Roman Frescoes and Imperial Cult Chamber in Luxor Temple*: 105–134. New Haven (CT) and London: Yale University Press.
- Meriani, A. and G. Zuchtriegel (eds) forthcoming. *The Tomb of the Diver: Ritual, Art and Poetry in Paestum and the Mediterranean 500 BC*, Proceedings

- of the International Conference (Paestum, 4–6 October 2018). Paestum: Argonautika.
- Mertens, J.R. 2006. White ground, in B. Cohen (ed.) *Colors of Clay. Special Techniques in Athenian Vases: 186–238*. Los Angeles (CA): J. Paul Getty Museum.
- Mols, S.T.A.M. 2005. Il Primo Stile ‘retro’: dai Propilei di Mnesicle a Pompei?, in J. De Waele, S.T.A.M. Mols, and E.M. Moormann (eds) *Omni pede stare: saggi architettonici e circumvesuviani in memoriam Jos De Waele: 243–246*. Naples: Electa.
- Mols, S.T.A.M. and E.M. Moormann (eds) 2017. *Context and Meaning*, Proceedings of the Twelfth Conference of the Association Internationale pour la Peinture Murale Antique (Athens, 16–20 September 2013). Leuven: Peeters.
- Moltesen, M. and C. Weber-Lehmann 1991. *Catalogue of the Copies of Etruscan Tomb Paintings in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek*. Copenhagen: Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek.
- Moormann, E.M. 2008. Statues on the wall: the representation of statuary in Roman wall painting, in Y.Z. Eliav, E.A. Friedland and S. Herbert (eds) *The Sculptural Environment of the Roman Near East: Reflections on Culture, Ideology, and Power: 197–224*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Moormann, E.M. 2011. *Divine Interiors: Mural Paintings in Greek and Roman Sanctuaries*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Moormann, E.M. 2016. Iconographies of Greek and Roman wall painting. Some reflections on the meaning of figural representations and decorative systems in mural decorations. *Pharos* 22.1: 143–166.
- Moormann, E.M. 2018. Beyond the four styles. Reflections on periodizations and other matters in Roman wall painting, in Dubois and Niffeler 2018: 389–403.
- Morgan, L. (ed.) 2005. *Aegean Wall Painting: A Tribute to Mark Cameron* (British School at Athens Studies 13). London: The British School at Athens.
- Morgan, L. 2019. *Keos XI: Ayia Irini: The Wall Paintings of the Northeast Bastion: Social Context and the Miniature Frieze* (Prehistory Monographs 61). Philadelphia (PA): Institute for Aegean Prehistory.
- Musti, D. 2005. *Magna Grecia. Il quadro storico*. Rome and Bari: Laterza.
- Newby, Z. 2016. *Greek Myths in Roman Art and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nikolakopoulou, I. and C. Knappett 2016. Mobilities in the Neopalatial southern Aegean: the case of Minoanisation, in E. Kiriati and C. Knappett (eds) *Human Mobility and Technological Transfer in the Prehistoric Mediterranean: 102–115*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Palagia, O. 2000. Hephaestion’s pyre and the royal hunt of Alexander, in A.B. Bosworth and E. Baynham (eds) *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction: 167–206*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Palyvou, P. 2012. Wall painting and architecture in the Aegean Bronze Age: connections between illusionary space and built realities, in D. Panagiotopoulos and U. Güntel-Maschek (eds) *Minoan Realities. Approaches to Images, Architecture, and Society in the Aegean Bronze Age: 9–26*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Presses universitaires de Louvain.
- Panzanelli, R., E. Schmidt and K. Lapatin (eds) 2008. *The Color of Life: Polychromy in Sculpture from Antiquity to the Present*. Los Angeles (CA): Getty Research Institute.
- Philipp, H. 1994. Chalkeoi Toichoi: Eherne Wände. *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 109: 489–498.
- Piqué, F., E. MacDonald-Korth and L. Rainer. 2015. Observations on materials and techniques used in Roman wall paintings of the tablinum, House of the Bicentenary at Herculaneum, in Lepinski and McFadden 2015: 57–76.
- Plantzos, D. 2018. *Η τέχνη της ζωγραφικής στον αρχαιοελληνικό κόσμο*. Athens: Καπόν.
- Pollitt, J.J. 1990. *The Art of Ancient Greece: Sources and Documents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pontrandolfo, A. 1998. L’Italia meridionale e le prime esperienze della pittura ellenistica nelle officine pestane, in *L’Italie méridionale et les premières expériences de la peinture hellénistique*, Actes de la table ronde organisé par l’École française de Rome (Rome, 18 février 1994): 223–241. Rome: École française de Rome.
- Pontrandolfo, A. and A. Rouveret. 1992. *Le tombe dipinte di Paestum*. Modena: F.C. Panini.
- Portale, E.C. 2011. ‘Iconografia funeraria’ e pratiche devozionali nella Sicilia ellenistica: il ‘Totenmahl’. *Sicilia Antiqua* 7: 39–78.
- Rescigno, C. 2017. Il viaggio del tuffatore e i giocatori di dama: breve nota a margine di due tombe campane, in C. Masseria and E. Marroni (eds) *Dialogando. Studi in onore di Mario Torelli: 321–330*. Pisa: Edizioni ETS.
- Robertson, M. 1951. The place of vase-painting in Greek art. *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 46: 151–159.
- Robinson, E.G.D. 2011. Identity in the Tomb of the Diver at Poseidonia, in M. Gleba and H.W. Horsnæs (eds) *Communicating Identity in Italic Iron Age Communities: 50–72*. Oxford and Oakville: Oxbow Books.
- Schaus, G.P. 1988. The beginning of Greek polychrome painting. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 108: 107–11.

- Steingraber, S. 2005. Fliegende Nike und berittener Krieger. Neue Grabmalereien aus Arpi beleuchten die frühhellenistische Kulturgeschichte Apuliens. *Antike Welt* 36: 72–74.
- Summerer, L. 2007. Picturing Persian Victory: The painted battle scene on the Munich wood. *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia* 13: 3–30.
- Summerer, L. and A. von Kienlin (eds) 2010. *Tatarlı: renklerin dönüşü / The Return of Colours / Rückkehr der Farben*. Istanbul: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı; Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Swindler, M.H. 1929. *Ancient Painting*. New Haven (CT): Yale University Press.
- Tanner, J. 2015. Sight and painting: optical theory and pictorial poetics in classical Greek art, in M. Bradley and S. Butler (eds) *Sight and the Ancient Senses*: 107–122. London: Routledge.
- Tiné Bertocchi, F. 1964. *La pittura funeraria apula*. Naples: Gaetano Macchiaroli.
- Tiverios, M.A. and D.S. Tsiafakis (eds) 2002. *The Role of Color in Ancient Greek Art and Architecture: 700–31 B.C.*, Proceedings of the Conference held in Thessaloniki (12–16 April 2000). Thessaloniki: Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης.
- Tuplin, C.J. 2010. The historical significance of the Tatarlı tomb-chamber, in Summerer and von Kienlin 2010: 186–195.
- Van der Wielen-van Ommeren, F. 1992. La ceramica a decorazione policroma e plastica, in R. Cassano (ed.) *Principi, imperatori, vescovi. Duemila anni di storia a Canosa*: 520–529. Venice: Marsilio.
- Venit, M.S. 2015. *Visualizing the Afterlife in the Tombs of Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vento, M. 2000. *Le stele dipinte di Lilibeo*. Marsala: Centro Europeo di Studi Economici e Sociali.
- Vlachopoulos, A. (ed.) 2013. *Paintbrushes, Wall Painting and Vase-Painting of the 2nd Millennium BC in Dialogue*, Proceedings of the Conference held in Thera, Akrotiri (24–26 May 2013). Athens: Society for the Promotion of Thera Studies.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 2006. The Herculaneum Conservation Project: Introduction. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 8.4: 187–190.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 2018. Ovid and mythological painting in Pompeii, in P. Fedeli and G. Rosati (eds) *Ovidio 2017: prospettive per il terzo millennio*, Atti del Convegno Internazionale (Sulmona, 3–6 aprile 2017): 299–312. Teramo: Ricerche and Redazioni.
- Williams, D. 1991. The invention of the red-figure technique and the race between vase-painting and free painting, in T. Rasmussen and N. Spivey (eds) *Looking at Greek Vases*: 103–118. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, D. 2006. The Sotades Tomb, in B. Cohen (ed.) *Colors of Clay. Special Techniques in Athenian Vases*: 291–316. Los Angeles (CA): J. Paul Getty Museum.
- Wonder, J.W. 2002. What has happened to the Greeks in Lucanian-occupied Paestum? Multiculturalism in Southern Italy. *Phoenix* 56: 40–55.
- Zimmermann, N. (ed.) 2014. *Antike Malerei zwischen Lokalstil und Zeitstil*. Akten des XI. Internationalen Kolloquiums der AIPMA (Association Internationale pour la Peinture Murale Antique (13–17 September, Ephesos). Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Zimmermann, N. and S. Ladstätter (eds) 2010. *Wandmalerei in Ephesos von hellenistischer bis in byzantinische Zeit*. Wien: Phoibos Verlag.
- Zuchtriegel, G. (ed.) 2018a. *L'immagine invisibile. La Tomba del Tuffatore. Nel cinquantesimo dalla scoperta*, Catalogo della Mostra (Paestum, 3 giugno-7 ottobre 2018). Naples: Prismi.
- Zuchtriegel, G. 2018b. Bringing the diver home: local elites, artisans and esotericism in Late Archaic Paestum. *Archeologia Classica* 69.8: 1–35.

Manolis Manoledakis (ed.). *The Black Sea in the Light of New Archaeological Data and Theoretical Approaches. Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on the Black Sea in Antiquity held in Thessaloniki, 18–20 September 2015*. pp. viii+290, highly illustrated in full colour throughout. 2016. Oxford: Archaeopress. ISBN 978–178491–510–0 paperback £50 ISBN 978–178491–511–7. ePdf £15.83 (excl. VAT)

That Black Sea studies have become a dynamic field over the last few years is demonstrated by this new volume, edited by Manolis Manoledakis. The book results from a workshop, organised in Thessaloniki in 2015. The title clearly states the book's ambition: collect more data and shed a critical light on them. While the book successfully achieves the first ambition of collecting new data, the second aim – introducing new theoretical frameworks – has only been achieved to a moderate extent throughout the volume. Most of the contributions remain firmly within the established interpretative boundaries and contribute little to ongoing discussions of, for example, globalisation processes in the Ancient World, to name just one omission. Only a few papers

adopt more challenging perspectives on (ethnic) identity or economic production.

In terms of the new data that the book intends to publish, the various contributions show clearly that a lot is going on in the Black Sea region, and that, increasingly, attempts are being made to systematise and synthesise evidence, rather than just presenting single or a few randomly picked objects. The broad adoption of advanced methods for site detection, data management, study of the environment and paleo-landscapes lead to very refined studies that highlight the potential of the Black Sea for the study of the Ancient World. All too long, the Ancient World has (and often still is!) been equalled to the Mediterranean, more specifically, its European part. Volumes like the present one, clearly place the Black Sea on the agenda.

As the introduction to the book states, its ambition is not to provide a comprehensive overview of the entire Black Sea region, and certain parts are absent, most notably, the Eastern Black Sea. This was not a conscious choice, but a coincidence, perhaps caused by the fact that some participants to the conference did not submit a paper. The book collects nineteen contributions that have been grouped geographically: the northern, western and southern Black Sea, completed with a short section on relations between the Pontus and the outside world. All sections are composed of a healthy mix of archaeology, written sources and epigraphy.

Dmitry Chistov presents the latest results of research into Archaic domestic architecture on the island of Berezan. The contribution provides an excellent documentation for the study of Black Sea domestic architecture and domestic architecture in the Ancient World in general. The plans and images provide the reader with a lot of detail. However, slightly confusing in the contribution is the adoption of terminology like 'colonists' house'. One often finds these kinds of (ethnic) attributes attached to material culture – a practice among many archaeologists – but one should separate interpretations like this, i.e. labels, from a discussion of the physical aspects of material culture. After all, we don't know for sure who lived in or built this house, whether it was a colonist, a native, a colonist with a native wife, a native woman with a Greek husband, the son of a mixed marriage etc.

Alfred Twardecki presents the last research executed by a team from the National Museum in Warsaw in the Bosporean city of Tyritake. Since the escalation of violence in the Crimea, fieldwork has been suspended indefinitely, and the only

contribution the team can presently make is based on the evaluation of previous results. The contribution reports that the excavations touched upon Roman and Byzantine levels and that several domestic contexts were studied. In addition, parts of an Archaic fortification could be documented. It is encouraging is that the author also reports that various World War II events, such as trenches, explosion craters and other war constructions were extensively documented, thus providing a more complete understanding of site formation processes and potentially developing a contemporary archaeological perspective on the region.

Alexey Belousov contributes to the volume with a brief paper to announce work in progress on a corpus of *defixionum tabellae* for Olbia and the Bosphorus. Once finished, the corpus will contribute, as the author states, to our knowledge of materials, palaeography, language, prosopography, the context as well as cultural identity. Importantly, the volume intends to include previously unpublished material as well. A time frame for the publication is, however, not announced by the author.

Gocha Tsetsckhladze synthesises and discusses a number of recent contributions to the study of the geography of the Bosphorus. Most notably, sustained German-Russian efforts have been able to demonstrate that the Taman peninsula was an archipelago in Antiquity and thus, that the local topography must have been very different. Discussion also surrounds the location of the Phasis river. It is difficult to match literary constructions with local topography, and a consensus cannot be reached. Tsetsckhladze subsequently synthesises and discusses the current state of research on the settlements of Golubitskaya 2, Vestnik 1 and Strelka 2, all on the Taman peninsula/archipelago. Evidence points to fortified habitation in the 6th century BCE and after. Currently, the hypothesis is that these fortifications were erected to protect Greeks from hostile natives, but Tsetsckhladze challenges this idea and states that the relations with the natives were mostly friendly. If protection was needed against an enemy, he states, it was more likely that the guilty party was the Achaemenids.

Ioannis Xydopoulos devotes his attention to the Taurians. Xydopoulos suggests that the literary depiction of Taurians as opposites to the Greeks might have started with Herodotus, even though explicit concepts of 'barbarians' were rarely used. Euripides next adopted this perspective, probably because he used Herodotus as a source. Xydopoulos observes that the sharp antithesis between Greeks and Taurians seems to relax in Hellenistic literature,

when Greek heroes are depicted as ancestors to the Taurians.

David Braund studies the relation between Deukalion and Scythia in the work of Lucian. The use of the ethnic Scythian for Deuklaion is peculiar and Braund explores a number of possible cultural meanings that could explain the choice. A possible explanation could be that the Scythians were a land-based group of people, in contrast to Deukalion. Another connection could possibly be Deukalion's father Prometheus, who is characterised as Scythian in Herodotus. In the absence of obvious links, Braund explains that the subtle playful nuances of Lucian remain difficult to disentangle.

The section of the Western Black Sea is opened by a most excellent paper on nomadism in Iron Age Thrace by Adela Sobotkova. She studies the possibility of nomadism as an economic strategy in Thrace, based on multidisciplinary research (archaeology, paleoenvironment, diet, written sources), combined with theory and ethnographic data, in two study areas of the Kazanlak and Yambol provinces. The study area was used for nomadic pastoralism under the Ottomans, meaning it was potentially suitable as well in the Iron Age. Archaeological survey indicates that in the Iron Age, the settlement pattern shifted rapidly. This could potentially indicate pastoralism, but not necessarily. The study of paleo-diet based on skeletal evidence proved to be inconclusive. Paleoenvironmental data, however, show quite radical environmental change in the period under study, which can be linked to more extensive agriculture. The author stresses rightly that nomadism as practice requires a complex system of markets and exchange where pastoralists could exchange their products for agricultural produce. This condition was not met in the Iron Age, Sobotkova concludes, and thus, we are probably rather facing mobile farming or mixed agro-pastoralism in the Iron Age.

Jan Bouzek provides a summary of existing knowledge of the exceptional site of Pistiros. Despite the fact that part of the town has been washed away, extensive remains testify to private and public spaces. One of these might have been an agora. What also remains is a regularly laid-out part of the town, including defences, a colonnade, a building in which weights and seals were found – probably functioning as an official building – and a monumental luxury house, perhaps the residence of the city's magistrate. Pistiros was the location of a lively trade with the Aegean, but liable to taxation by the Odrysian kings.

Miroslav Vasilev reports on a study of the toponym 'Boryza'. The name is only mentioned twice in ancient texts, in Hecataeus and Stephanus. The site's location was unknown, but after careful analysis of the narrative construction of Hecataeus, the author proposes that it was located on the Pontic coast, near Cape Igneada. What we know through literary sources is that it was considered to be a Persian town, which leads the author to conclude that it might have been founded by the Persians during Darius' Scythian campaign. However, rather than being founded, the author's convincing second hypothesis is that it was a small existing Thracian settlement that was taken over by the Persians and then expanded.

Margarit Damyanov presents a selection of pottery from votive deposits on the Skamni promontory – the ancient city of Apollonia Pontica. No architecture is preserved, nor have any inscriptions been found. The nature of the assemblages suggests, however, that cult practices took place. The numerous female figurines and vessels recovered, the latter possibly for offerings and/or the consumption of food, might suggest a cult for Demeter (and Kore). Damyanov thoughtfully discusses the problematic nature of the category of miniature vessels and provides a detailed overview of find categories. The latest discoveries in Apollonia Pontica, including the present discussion, underline the importance of the site in Antiquity. It can only be hoped that, in the near future, the scholarly community will be able to profit from a full publication of all the evidence, including details on quantities. It is increasingly becoming clear that quantification is an important tool for study, in addition to qualitative analysis and the documentation of typological variation.

Mila Chacheva discusses a small selection of objects from the rich necropolis of Apollonia Pontica, to enquire if strings, bracelets, earrings and finger rings were used as more than mere bodily adornment, i.e. as protective amulets. As the author states in her contribution, Apollonia is the most extensively excavated necropolis of the Black Sea region. Regrettably, as remarked *supra*, it is not the most extensively published site, even though numerous smaller thoughtful contributions, like the present one, provide information on the wealth of objects and practices that have been documented during several decades of excavation. Apollonia has the potential to become one of the best documented sites of the Ancient World, if only it were fully published.

The next chapter in the book, co-authored by Alexandre Baralis, Krastina Panayotova, Teodora

Bogdanova, Dimitar Nedev and Konstantin Gospodov summarises the impressive results that have come out of Apollonia during recent years. Great progress has been made into understanding the urban development and rural occupation through time. Important is the discovery of the exploitation of copper in the nearby mountains, which might have played a role in consolidating contacts with the Greek world. The results of this project cannot be underestimated and they prove how fruitful international and interdisciplinary collaboration can come to important results.

Georgia Aristodemou studies in her contribution to the volume attestations of the cult of Nemesis in the Black Sea region. The cult is strongly linked to spectacle and often associated with theatre buildings. The paper collects epigraphic and sculptural evidence and demonstrates the importance of the cult in the Black Sea region.

From the Southern Black Sea region comes a contribution of Sümer Atasoy, who reports on recent research in Tios. Recent excavations have been informative especially on the Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine periods.

In his very brief overview on Sinope, Owen Doonan reports important results. The team discovered architectural remains and handmade pottery with finger imprints – comparable to early remains from Berezan, Istros, Olbia and other sites. This indicates, according to the author, that there was a pre-Greek network spanning both sides of the Black Sea. Pre-Greek connectivity in the Black Sea region is a very important aspect that has, hitherto, not been studied enough, and the contribution is most welcome in this respect. The earliest Greek pottery at Sinope dates to the later 7th century BCE. In this time, the economy might have been heavily oriented towards fishing. There is presently very little evidence of a formalised chora. In Hellenistic times, trade appears to have been an important part of the economic activities.

Şahin Yıldırım and Nimet Bal report on the study of the Hacilarobası tumulus. The first part of the paper discusses the tumulus itself, which was plundered. Its architecture and content were heavily damaged and partially lost as a result of these illegal excavations. The tumulus has a circular krepis of 20m, a dromos, a front chamber and a main burial chamber. Some scarce finds of glass and ceramics date the tomb to the 1–2 centuries AD. In the immediate surrounding of the tomb, several other tumuli have been observed, but these have not been excavated. The tomb belongs to the so-called

Macedonian type. In the second part of the paper, the authors elaborate on funerary monuments in Paphlagonia, where tumuli are very common burial monuments.

Burcu Erciyas and Mustafa Tatbul provide a preliminary report on Roman Komana. The sanctuary and cult of Ma had a regional importance, for cult and trade. The flourishing sanctuary was taken over by the Romans under Pompey. New research is now starting to reveal the effects of Romanisation in the area, as testified by inscriptions, architectural fragments, coins, pottery, sculpture. The authors report that the elite seemed eager to integrate in the Roman Empire. It would be interesting to know, however, whether there was also local resistance or creative re-appropriation of Roman culture by the local people in this region.

The very short last section comprises two papers on the relations of the Pontus with the outside world. The first contribution, co-authored by Anna Argyri, Ioannis Birtsas and Manolis Manoledakis presents coins that were found in Thessaloniki during emergency excavations for the construction of the Metro. In total, 668 coins were found during the excavations. In this paper 57 coins from Propontis and the Black Sea region are presented. The coins date mostly from Roman times, ca. from the mid-3rd to 5th centuries AD. Most frequently attested are coins struck under Constantine. The coins come from excavations that were executed under difficult circumstances. Funding was interrupted several times, there was little time to study or document the finds, and the storage facilities were below standard. As a result the quality of the visual documentation has been negatively impacted. Indeed, it is appalling that many urban emergency excavations in Greece, and elsewhere, receive so few facilities, despite the great benefit they can have for tourism, as one can see in the metro in Athens today.

The last contribution to the volume, written by Polyxeni Adam-Veleni, discusses the relations Philip II and Alexander maintained with the Black Sea region. Good relations obviously existed as testified e.g. by the magnificent Scythian arrow case that was retrieved from the royal tomb in Aegai. Alexander did not appear to have been very interested in the Black Sea region, although he might have installed a democratic regime in Heracleia Pontica and possibly elsewhere. However, the influence of Hellenistic culture was extensive, and had an impact economically, politically and culturally. Throughout the Black Sea, it has been possible to document the extensive adoption of Macedonian-style rural residences with a fortified tower for

agricultural exploitation. A previous contribution to the present volume discussed the presence of Macedonian-style tombs in Paphlagonia. In general, the Hellenistic period in the Black Sea seems to have been a flourishing one, testified to by the multiple new settlements and evidence of trade.

Overall, this book provides the reader with fascinating new results of archaeological, historical and epigraphic research. Despite our relative scarcity of written sources and its depiction as an alien region in some Classical texts, the Black Sea was a thriving region that provides archaeologists with a wealth of data to compare or contrast Mediterranean contexts with. Whereas some contributions to the book might appeal more to a specialist readership of Black Sea archaeologists and historians, a number of papers will certainly interest scholars studying broader economic, political and cultural developments of the Ancient World. The book is, moreover, richly illustrated throughout with high quality images in colour.

LIEVE DONNELLAN
SCHOOL OF CULTURE AND SOCIETY
AARHUS UNIVERSITY
l.donnellan@cas.au.dk

Wolf-Dietrich Niemeier. *Das Orakelheiligtum des Apollon von Abai/Kalapodi. Eines der bedeutendsten griechischen Heiligtümer nach den Ergebnissen der neuen Ausgrabungen. (Trierer Winckelmannsprogramme 25). pp. VII+60, 1 map. 2013. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag. ISBN 978-3-447-10708-2. paperback 29€.*

Whereas one would usually not proceed with acquiring the booklet of a named public lecture, the present volume could be an exception, for it brings to the reader an excellent overview of the history and current state of the grossly overlooked Apollo sanctuary of Abae in Phocis. Wolf-Dietrich Niemeier, director of the excavations at Abae since 2004, was invited to deliver the yearly Winckelmann lecture in Trier in 2013. His lecture includes a comprehensive overview of recent work done at the sanctuary, and presents some of the groundbreaking conclusions that can be drawn from it. None of the recent excavations have been fully published and even less is available in English, this despite the fact that Abae

was one of the most important oracle sanctuaries of the ancient world.

Niemeier introduces the sanctuary with the conventional overview of references in written sources. Subsequently, he discusses the old excavations that led to the identification of the sanctuary, and the new excavations that expanded the chronological horizon of the sanctuary from LH IIIC (if not earlier) to Roman times. Niemeier concludes with a section on the controversial suggestion that the evidence in the sanctuary suggests a continuity in use throughout the Early Iron Age, thus challenging long-standing assumptions of a 'Dark Age' rupture in Greek cult.

The sanctuary of Apollo at Abae was well known to the Ancients. Herodotus refers several times to the oracle in relation to Delphi and Olympia. Sophocles refers to it as 'one of the most important ones'. According to Pausanias, the Thebans consulted it before the battle against the Spartans at Leuktra in 371 BCE. Even Stephanos of Byzantium mentions it, thinking it was even older than Delphi.

The sanctuary is placed on a hilltop on one of the most important routes connecting the Euboean Gulf and Atalanti, ancient Opous and Orchomenos. Today, the village of Kalapodi is located there. Despite its apparent importance in Antiquity, the existence and location of the sanctuary faded from memory until modern times. Even though the sanctuary was visited first in 1676 by G. Wheler and later by many travellers e.g. W.M. Leake, W. Gell, E. Dodwell and S. Pomardi in the 19th century, no excavations were conducted, apart from some test trenches in 1905. During a field trip of the DAI in 1970, R. Felsch noticed the potential of the area and started excavating.

At first, the sanctuary was identified as that of Artemis Elaphebolos of Hyampolis, a city located nearly in the valley. It was not until Niemeier took over the excavations in 2004, that he started to doubt the identification. It looked rather improbable to him that both poles of Abae and Hyampolis would have been located at a distance of only 1,5 km. Since 2007, more and more indications led to the idea that Abae was located in the valley of Kalapodi.

Niemeier summarises the following evidence:

Inscriptions mentioning Apollo have only been found in the Valley of Kalapodi. Inscriptions mentioning Artemis have been found in the Valley of Exarchos, the presumable location of Hyampolis.

Pausanias does not mention that the supposed sanctuary of Artemis Elaphebolos was located far from Hyampolis, which he, supposedly would have done, should it have been the case.

The Hellenic Oxyrhynchia says that Hyampolis was strongly fortified. Lesbian fortifications were observed on the Kastro hill but not on the Bogdanou hill. From this follows that the Kastro hill can be identified with Hyampolis and the Bogdanou hill with Abae. This would also confirm the order of Pausanias' itinerary.

The temple in the north was always larger than the temple in the south. It should therefore be identified as the temple of Apollo.

Detailed descriptions by Pausanias of Hadrian's building activities could be observed on the ground.

The dedication of weapons is more suitable for an Apollo sanctuary than for an Artemis sanctuary.

Initially, the Apollo sanctuary was more important. It was only after the battle at Hyampolis, which gave rise to the Phocian koinon, that the Artemis sanctuary became more important.

Another nearby sanctuary that was excavated in 1894 and initially identified as the Apollo sanctuary is too small to have fulfilled the important functions attributed to the Apollo oracle.

When Niemeier took over the excavations for the German Archaeological Institute in Athens, he formulated a number of questions, apart from obtaining general knowledge about the last of the important sanctuaries of this type that can be studied with modern techniques. First and foremost, the aim of the project was to determine when in Ancient Greece spatially determined sanctuaries were developed, and, related to that, 2) what happened next and 3) whether there was any continuity in cult between the Mycenaean and Archaic times.

During the earlier excavations, conducted by Felsch, remains dating to the mid-9th century BCE had already been uncovered, but it had proved impossible to say something about them, given that they were covered by the later, Classical, temple. It proved eventually that the area of the Archaic temple was more promising for studying the

chronology of the sanctuary: layers and mudbrick deposits, indicative of architecture, found in a test trench in this location could be dated to Mycenaean times. Since the start of the new excavations in 2004, a succession of 10 temples, dated between Mycenaean and Roman imperial times has been found.

It seems thus, that the sanctuary might have been one of the most important in Greece and key to our understanding cult practices between the end of the Bronze Age and Early Iron Age. The results are important because they contradict earlier ideas that the sacred would not have been separate from the profane during the Dark Ages, or that the appearance of the temple was linked to the appearance of the polis. At Kalapodi, the earliest temple dates to the 10th century BCE, and it had at least three Mycenaean predecessors. Niemeier makes a convincing case for continuity in cult practices at Kalapodi, as has been argued for other sanctuaries such as Epidauros, Tegea, Agia Irini on Kea, Aegina, Delos and Delphi, where others have rejected such a continuity. Niemeier reiterates that the vast majority of the Olympian gods was already known in the Mycenaean Linear B tablets, as are the words *heron* and *naos*. While evidence in many of the other sanctuaries is not of the same quality, because they were excavated in different circumstances a long time ago, the rigorous methods adopted in Kalapodi can fill this hiatus in knowledge.

In the main part of the lecture, Niemeier gave an overview of the different phases of the sanctuary, based on the evidence of the excavations conducted since he took over the project from his predecessor in 2004.

The earliest evidence dates to as early as the Middle Helladic to Late Mycenaean (20th-13th centuries BCE). No architecture of the Middle Helladic period is preserved, but the presence of several objects and fragments of pottery is suggestive for a frequentation of the area in this period. Also a steatite seal with circle decoration from Crete, dated to the 19th or 18th century BCE was found. Cretans were possibly active in the region in their search for metals.

The first temple is the first rural temple known from Mycenaean times. It was built in LH IIIA1 (1420-1370 BCE). It had a substantial foundation built in limestone, which is partially preserved. The entrance could be located in the east. The building measured 9m x 4,5m. Associated with the temple were an altar and a platform on which animals might have been sacrificed. The last couple of years,

rich remains of the Mycenaean period have come to light in the region, including rich chamber tombs at Kalapodi. These testify to the existence of a small kingdom. The power of nearby Orchomenos was possibly responsible for the construction of the new temple at Abae. With the construction of the second temple, rich objects were left as dedications at the time of foundation. Among these are many seals. Another important find associated with the second temple are the remains of a wheel made female figurine. The temple was destroyed towards the end of LH IIIB (ca. 1200 BCE), at the same time as Orchomenos, Gla or the port at Kynos.

Soon after the destruction, the sanctuary was rebuilt, probably by a local ruler – a Basileus – as known at other sites such as Mitrou and Lefkandi. Of this third, LHIIIC, temple little is known, because of disturbances by the Protogeometric temple. The presence of terracotta bull figurines testifies to cult activities, as well as remains of animal sacrifices and votive objects such as female terracotta figurines, and at that time, a 5000 year old amulet, bronze fibulae and pins, jewellery and two seals. Ceramic fragments indicate that feasting, including the consumption of food and wine, took place. The depiction of marine animals and ships connects the sanctuary now with the port of Kynos: many of the pottery fragments were probably produced there and brought to the sanctuary by its visitors.

During the Protogeometric period, the pottery shows that the sanctuary was engaging heavily with the Euboean world, which the author chooses to frame within the slightly old-fashioned perspective of ‘Euboean koine’. The PG temple was apsidal, and surrounded by wooden posts, making it, together with the Lefkandi Heroon, one of the earliest colonnade buildings of Ancient Greece. Also in this period, feasting took place in and around the building.

In the first half of the 9th century BCE, a fifth temple was erected on the foundations of its predecessor. Around the middle of the 9th century BCE, a second temple was erected to the north. The latter is only partially known because of later overbuilding. Connected to the new temple is the use of tripods. Around 800 BCE, a fire destroyed the south temple. In the first half of the 8th century BCE, a new temple was erected. It was slightly smaller than its predecessors. The remains of a wooden cult statue were found inside. In the second half of the 9th century, the Euboean influence was stronger in the pottery, but from the 8th century onwards, Niemeier reports a strong Corinthian influence, testified to by Thapsos pottery. At the same time, Niemeier reports

a stark increase in metal dedications, among them many weapons but also a bronze bowl from Syria, which puts Abae on the same level as Samos, Delphi, Olympia.

In the Archaic period, both the north and south temple were rebuilt. The north temple was by now an impressive building measuring 10m x 29m. Associated with it was an eschara – located on the same place as its predecessor. Also the apsidal south temple was rebuilt, now with four columns in front, making it the oldest prostyle temple in Ancient Greece. Its size was equally impressive, with its 24,70m x 7,6m covering not just its predecessor but also the altar. In the temple, there was no trace of a cult statue. However, a pi-shaped structure was found inside. Its function is not clear, but perhaps it should be connected to the oracle.

An earthquake in the second half of the 7th century BCE disturbed the buildings. The destruction led to the partial collapse of the walls. Remains of its plaster and stucco decoration could be recovered. It depicts helmets and arms and immediately brings the phalanx on the Chigi ole in mind. Other exceptional finds at Kalapodi dating to this time are parts belonging to wagons, helmets, as well as a handle of a monumental bronze Laconian volute krater, only 30cm shy of the famous Vix krater.

The sanctuary was rebuilt, only to be destroyed again in the Classical period. After the destruction by the Persians, only the northern temple was restored. Before the full restoration, a provisional structure was erected, together with a provisional bronze statue of Apollo. Both the structure and the statue were ritually closed together with a number of votive gifts. Around 430 BCE the new Classical temple was soon destroyed yet again by an earthquake. Towards the end of the 5th century BCE, a new temple was erected. It differed in plan from the previous one (a three-part cella) as it was rebuilt with a pi-shaped internal colonnade, comparable to the Parthenon’s predecessor. In the ruins of the south temple, a bronze workshop was discovered, which probably served the production of the new cult statue. In addition, the ruins of the south temple were transformed into an open courtyard with a building constructed of spolia, located just next to the former temple.

The events during the Third Sacred War cannot be reconstructed because the layers are not well-preserved. Megarian bows and fragments of late Hellenistic wall painting demonstrate that the sanctuary was frequented and that important buildings must have existed. A last new temple was

built in Roman times, probably under Hadrian, when the latter consulted the oracle regarding flooding in the Copais basin. In Hadrian's time, it was known that the oracle at Abae was highly regarded and of considerable antiquity.

This last observation brings Niemeier to his following point, that of continuity of the cult through time – a topic of great controversy. The cult continuity at Kalapodi is usually seen as an exception, but Niemeier points out that in two other places where he conducted research, in the Athena sanctuary in Miletus and in the Hera sanctuary on Samos, continuity existed throughout the Dark Ages. Also at the Zeus Lykaios altar in Arcadia, continuity has been attested. Equally, Megaron B in Eleusis appears to have had a Mycenaean predecessor. Niemeier is therefore convinced that also in other sanctuaries such as the Apollo and Athena sanctuaries in Delphi, the Aphaia sanctuary in Aegina, and the Dionysos sanctuary on Kea continuity must have existed.

Niemeier underlines that, when he speaks of a cult continuity, he does not mean that the cult remained unchanged. Important social and political changes between the Mycenaean and Archaic period must also have altered religion drastically. Therefore, Niemeier shares the views of de Polignac, when he says we do not need to decide for once and for all whether continuity existed, but what part breaks and continuity played in the respective society. In Kalapodi, there was no spatial change between the 14th and 9th century, The Mycenaean female figurines disappear after the mid-11th century BCE. According to Burkert, Apollo was a post-Mycenaean god, so he might not have been the focus of cult in the earlier centuries of the sanctuary. Because of the ample presence of game, Niemeier proposes that the sanctuary might have been dedicated to Artemis, goddess of hunt and known from Linear B tablets. Apollo might then have been introduced in the mid-9th century BCE, similar to what happened in other sanctuaries like in Delphi and Delos.

Overall, the volume offers an excellent overview of the current state of research, complete with an ample bibliography and a selected number of high quality images, mostly in black-and-white. Some of the maps are in colour, and therefore it is a bit puzzling that the publisher chose black-and-white for the other images. In the digital age, colour plates are far less expensive than what they used to be and the use of colour for visual documentation makes such a difference. Several of the plates would have been more attractive, while given the target public of the Winckelmann lecture, a broader readership, it would, actually, have been a better

choice. Nevertheless, experienced scholars and students alike will enjoy this complete overview and challenging thoughts on cult continuity in one of the most important oracle sanctuaries of Ancient Greece.

LIEVE DONNELLAN
DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGY
AARHUS UNIVERSITY
l.donnellan@cas.au.dk

Jeremy McInerney. *Greece in the ancient world*. pp. 368, 273 colour illustrations. 2018. London and New York: Thames and Hudson. ISBN 978-0-500-25226-0. £35

Richard T. Neer. *Art and archaeology of the Greek world. A new history, c.2500-c.150 BCE*. Second edition. pp. 408, 559 colour illustrations. 2019. London and New York: Thames and Hudson. ISBN 978-0-500-052082. £45

This double review compares the first – and possibly only! – edition of a new book by Jeremy McInerney (of the University of Pennsylvania) with the second edition of a book first published in 2012 by Richard Neer (University of Chicago). Both books or rather tomes are published by the brainchild of the late Walter Neurath, Thames and Hudson, the house founded in 1949 and named after famous rivers of London and New York City. On their respective dust jackets under 'Other Titles of Interest' McInerney's lists first Neer's and Neer's *vice versa* McInerney's. Symbiosis rules, OK?

Together, they comprise getting on for 800 pages – heavy-duty, art-paper pages, since, in accordance with the standard TandH house-style, they are massively and beautifully illustrated, and almost exclusively in full colour throughout: altogether over 800 illustrations, of all possible types and kinds (McInerney 273; Neer 559). (Printed and bound in China, of course.) They are also very similar in style of layout, and both are very self-consciously pedagogically minded, Neer's even more so than McInerney's. Hence the inclusion of timelines, chapter summaries, full captioning, 'spotlights', glossaries, bibliographies, and lists of sources of quotations. But Neer has the advantage of having been able to correct and/or otherwise emend and add to what he published first time round. (There

are rather too many corrigenda of various sorts in McInerney's book. The very first caption, on the Contents page, has 'c. 505–520 BC'.) In terms of the periods covered, McInerney tracks back to around 38,000 BCE, whereas Neer advertises a start date of c. 2500 and begins in earnest with Late Bronze Age Crete and the Cyclades, but really they very closely echo and overlap each other, both of them getting going seriously with (Late) Minoan Crete and concluding with a terminal chapter on the post-Alexander Hellenistic world or age (although McInerney's timeline concludes with the Battle of Actium in 31 BCE, Neer's in c. 150 BCE, as his subtitle makes explicit).

Naturally, though, a first question might be how far do these two weighty volumes complement, how far do they (merely) reduplicate, each other? Readers of this journal might also be particularly keen to ask the authors – and themselves – how far, or in what sense(s), do they address Archaeology: is this a useful way to invoke, imply or talk about the nature and condition of the modern 'archaeology' of ancient Greece? A first answer to that latter question might be that, although McInerney is designated Professor of Classical Studies and Neer Professor in the Humanities, Art History, Cinema and Media Studies, the former is more of an archaeologist or archaeo-historian, the latter (much) more of an art historian. Yet, despite the presence and indeed foregrounding of 'Archaeology' in Neer's title, actually there is no entry for archaeology – or excavation or fieldwork studies, vel sim. – in his otherwise very full and helpful 9-page double-column index. Likewise one notes the same absence from McInerney's 4-column, 4-plus page index, which does, however, have quite extensive art-historical entries – including one for 'art' itself – under various regional and substantive subheadings. (The presence of 'Osama Bin Laden' here comes as a bit of a shock, all the same.) For a more strictly archaeological account, one should therefore still turn back rather to John Bintliff's 2012 *The Complete Archaeology of Greece*, subtitled less riskily and more accurately *From Hunter-Gatherers to the 20th Century AD*. Still valuable too, depending on the level of treatment required, is C. Mee and A. Spawforth's *Greece: An Oxford Archaeological Guide* (though that of course is quite seriously out-of-date now, whereas both Neer and McInerney are quite impressively up-to-the-minute. (One illustration: on pp. 75 and 358 McInerney, and on p. 59 Neer, are both able to mention the existence of a Mycenaean palace a few kilometres south of modern Sparta confirmed only in 2015.) I return to the 'archaeological question' at the end of this review.

No less worthy of mention for purposes of comparison (this is a very crowded field) are Judith M. Barringer, *The Art and Archaeology of Ancient Greece*,¹ reviewed very well (in both senses) by Mark D. Fullerton² (one notes his salient comment that 'in any Greek art text' the section dealing with the Hellenistic period is 'surely the most inherently difficult'); and D. Plantzos, *Greek Art and Archaeology, c. 1200–30 BC*.³ A rather different exercise, but still worth mentioning, is the equally massive and fabulously well illustrated *The Greeks: Agamemnon to Alexander the Great*, the catalogue of a 2015/2016 travelling exhibition, brilliantly edited by M. Andreadaki-Vlazaki and A. Balaska, and brilliantly produced by Kapon Editions for the Hellenic Republic's Ministry of Culture and Sports ('More than 500 exhibits from Greek state museums document more than 6,000 years of Greek history in a museologically resourceful manner: by focusing on individuals' – yet, despite the book's title and subtitle, the earliest, anonymous exhibit is dated 5800–5300 BC). There is also an associated book, by Diane Harris Cline: see her revealing interview (of the ancient Greeks' achievements she privileges above all others education) conducted with her publisher, National Geographic.⁴

Professor Neer opens his Introduction with three questions: What do we see? How do we know? Why should we care? Professor McInerney is no less reflexively self-conscious: his Introduction is subtitled 'Why Study the Greeks?'. One of his answers is given in his double-spread 'Spotlight' on Jacques-Louis David's magnificent and far from immediately transparent 'Leonidas at Thermopylae' oil painting now hanging, to Napoleon's regret, in the Louvre: 'past and present are in constant dialogue: the past is always a part of the present, a past that we reinvent, rediscover, and reuse'. As Herodotus might have said, that remark should be taken to apply to the whole of his – and Neer's – work. Or, as I would put it, the past – what actually happened – is one thing, the (or any) history of a (or any) past quite another. It's not alas profitable, let alone possible, adequately to represent and critically analyse and discuss either of these massive books in any fine detail. Four points or moments of comparison are selected here, as these would be well worth anyone's time and effort to ponder: the

¹ Barringer 2018.

² Fullerton 2016.

³ Reviewed – together with yet another History of Greek Art, this by M.D. Stansbury-O'Donnell 2015, Wiley-Blackwell 2015 – by L.M. Gigante, BMCR 2017.04.35.

⁴ Cline 2016. <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/expeditions/get-inspired/stories-from-the-road/diane-harris-line-interview-studying-ancient-greece-culture-social-structure/>

transition from Bronze Age/Late Mycenaean Greece to early historical/Early Iron Age Greece; Sparta; the Parthenon; and Alexander the Great. But many, many others could have been chosen – from the new discoveries around Mycenaean Pylos through the emergence and development of democracy and its iconography (apart from the Parthenon) to the debate over ‘The Tomb of Philip’ at Vergina, Macedonia.

The transition from Bronze Age/Late Mycenaean Greece to early historical/Early Iron Age Greece is sometimes described as from the world of the palace to the world of the *polis*. In Neer’s Glossary the latter term of art is curtly glossed ‘city-state’ (his text, p. 79, is more comprehensive). McNerney’s Glossary entry is rightly far more expansive, but even so stops short of offering what I consider to be the best English rendering of this protean concept and object, ‘citizen-state’. Aristotle’s *Politics*, his masterly summation of this cardinal feature of ancient Hellenic civilisation post- as well as pre-Alexander, should really be translated ‘Matters Concerning the *Polis*’. Neither author uses – dares use? – the old sobriquet Dark Age(s) for some or all of the twelfth to ninth centuries. McNerney goes with ‘Early Iron Age’, which is strictly applicable only to a relatively few, advanced regions of Greece south of Macedonia – and hardly at all applicable to distinctly dark Laconia. Neer prefers the strictly art-historical ‘Geometric Greece’ for c. 1100 to c. 700 BC, a somewhat surprising throwback to an older, originally Germanic way of seeing things.

Sparta in McNerney is accorded an entire chapter, ‘The Archaic Age: Sparta’, together with substantial later references, as is appropriate for what was from the mid-seventh century down to the 350s always a leading, sometimes the leading *polis* in the entire – and by the latter date greatly expanded – Hellenic world. His index entry for ‘Sparta’ is the reverse of laconic. Neer’s by contrast seems a bit jejune – until one turns to his entry for ‘Lakonia’ (rich by comparison with that of McNerney). Happily, a direct object of comparison between the two treatments of Sparta is available in the towering shape of the ‘Vix Krater’, a statuesque 1.64 m. bronze mixing bowl buried ceremonially in a Hallstatt-era prince(ss)ly grave at Vix in Burgundy. For McNerney, there is no doubt even hinted at concerning either the place or the agents of its manufacture, indeed ‘it is a testament [read ‘testimony’] to the skill of the Spartan craftsmen who made it’ (p. 145). I happen to agree that it is a Spartan or rather Laconian product, but since others, such as the late great expert Claude Rolley, are equally convinced that it was not made in Sparta, let alone by ‘Spartan’

craftsmen, Neer is probably rightly cautious – ‘probably a Lakonian product of the later sixth century’. One reason for systematic doubt is that, even it was made in a (geographically) Spartan workshop, the hands that fashioned it – and also inscribed letters of a mainly Laconian alphabet on the krater’s neck and on the corresponding items to be attached there after transport to final destination – were almost certainly not those of full Spartan citizens (*Spartiatiai*) but of either *Perioikoi* (free but disfranchised Laconians) or/and Helots. There is no entry for ‘helots’ in Neer’s Glossary, but McNerney’s entry is full – and (though broadly acceptable to me) controversial. He labels them as a ‘serf class’ whose ‘agricultural labor enabled the Spartans to develop their uniquely militaristic society’. Stephen Hodkinson, former pupil of Moses Finley, would not be alone in bristling at the latter and perhaps also the former classification. That debate and indeed the many others that affect or afflict Spartan historiography are now best consulted in Anton Powell’s magisterially edited two-volume *Companion to Sparta*.⁵

The Parthenon casts its massive shadow still – politically, culturally, art-historically, even ideologically. Here, Neer comes into his own. His ten-page discussion is placed within the chapter ‘Athens and the Akropolis, c.480–c.404 BCE’ that forms one of his three ‘case studies’ – the other two are respectively ‘Olympia and Delphi, c.900–c.480 BCE’ and ‘Cyrene and Paestum’. Within that space he manages with aplomb to do sufficient justice to the political, military, fiscal, religious and aesthetic dimensions of what he calls ‘in effect, a giant treasure house’ – rather, that is, than a temple pure and simple. What he does not quite do appropriate justice to are the blood, sweat, toil and no doubt tears expended and exuded by the mainly non-Greek, chattel slave labourers who it was – rather than Neer’s bland ‘the Athenians’ – that ‘carted up huge amounts of earth, stone and debris left over from the Persian destruction’. McNerney, by contrast, somewhat underplays the Parthenon’s monumentality and influence, though he does evocatively label the overall Akropolis context ‘a landscape of memory’ and does notice the specifically (battle of, topographical) Salamis connection. 2021 will be the 2,500th anniversary of that epochal encounter, which like Marathon before and Plataea after was, arguably, among the most important in the history not just of ancient Greece but of the Western world.

⁵ Powell 2017/8.

Alexander the Great is – for once – a historical phenomenon to which, and to whom, the grossly over-used term ‘iconic’ may be literally and accurately applied. He spent a great deal of time and effort trying to ensure the propagation and preservation of what he considered to be the ‘right’ self-image. He is predictably the sometimes evil genius presiding either in person or in image over the last 60 pages of Neer’s book, and the last 30 of McNerney’s; curiously, both books end with a Chapter 13, tempting fate or defying superstition in equal measure. McNerney, I think rightly, chooses as his Spotlight for this final chapter precisely the imagery repertoire of Alexander, developed above all to ‘disseminate images of himself that projected not just an aura of power but of physical near-perfection’. Neer diffuses his Alexander discussions more loosely but does not beat about the bush: ‘There is no other way to put it: Alexander changed the world’. The ‘Hellenistic’ world that his meteoric career helped critically to usher in ‘was vast, cosmopolitan, and diverse: different in scale and in kind from anything in earlier Greek experience’.

And what, finally, of the new – or newer/newish – archaeology of Greece? Over thirty years ago now, in 1986, I published a ‘thinkpiece’ on that topic,⁶ noting the rise of an alternative kind of ground-up as opposed to top-down archaeology of ancient Greece, an alternative and rival to the traditional, more or less elitist, more or less connoisseurship-style approaches – a novel approach that was more quantitative than qualitative, more interested in the results of intensive regional fieldworking and fieldwalking survey than in the latest monograph on the Berlin Painter, and more preoccupied with society, culture and economy than in trying to find archaeological correlates for the ‘events’-focused narratives cherished by the more old-fashioned practitioners of political, military and diplomatic historiography. In short, the sort of archaeology fostered in Cambridge from the 1970s by Anthony Snodgrass, himself heavily influenced by the sort of archaeology then being thought and practised in Cambridge’s Department of Archaeology (by such as David L. Clarke, or Colin Renfrew). The fruits of this ‘new classical archaeology’ are neatly summed up in two recent collective volumes, one by his former colleagues and another by former students, dedicated to Professor Snodgrass to mark the passage (in 2014) of his 80th birthday. The first is co-edited by John Bintliff and Keith Rutter: *The Archaeology of Greece and Rome. Studies in Honour of Anthony Snodgrass*,⁷ the second co-edited by James

Whitley and Lisa Nevett: *An Age of Experiment: Classical Archaeology Transformed, 1976–2014*.⁸ Suffice it to say here that there is precious little evidence of this – genuine – transformation in the two books under review. The ‘paradigm shift’ desiderated by Snodgrass himself⁹ is a shifting, episodic affair rather than a solid all-engulfing, wave-like movement. It is to be hoped that *The Oxford History of the Archaic Greek World*, a multi-author project that I co-direct with Professor Paul Christesen (Dartmouth College), may serve to further a shift of the field in a paradigmatically archaeohistorical direction.

PAUL CARTLEDGE

A.G. LEVENTIS SENIOR RESEARCH FELLOW, CLARE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE
pac1001@cam.ac.uk

- Andreadaki-Vlazaki, M and A. Balaska. 2014. *The Greeks: Agamemnon to Alexander the Great*. Athens: Kapon Editions.
- Barringer, J.M. 2014. *The Art and Archaeology of Ancient Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bintliff, J.L. 2012. *The Complete Archaeology of Greece. From Hunter-Gatherers to the 20th Century AD*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bintliff, J. L. and N. K. Rutter, Eds. 2016. *The Archaeology of Greece and Rome. Studies in Honour of Anthony Snodgrass*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Cartledge, P. 1986. A new Classical Archaeology? *The Times Literary Supplement* September 12.
- Cartledge, P. and P. Christesen. In progress, *The Oxford History of the Archaic Greek World*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cline, D.H. 2016. *The Greeks: An Illustrated History*. London: National Geographic books.
- Fullerton, M.D. 2016. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2016.06.05
- Gigante, L.M. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2017.04.35
- Mee, C. and A. Spawforth. 2001. *Greece: An Oxford Archaeological Guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Plantzos, D. 2016. *Greek Art and Archaeology, c. 1200–30 BC*, trans. N. Wardle. Atlanta, GA: Lockwood Press.
- Powell, A. 2017/8. *Companion to Sparta*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Snodgrass, A.M. 2006. *Archaeology and the Emergence of Greece*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Stansbury-O’Donnell. M.D. 2015. *A History of Greek Art*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

⁶ Cartledge 1986.

⁷ Bintliff and Rutter 2016.

⁸ Whitley and Nevett 2018.

⁹ E.g. Snodgrass 2006.

Whitley, J. and L. Nevett (eds) 2018. *An Age of Experiment: Classical Archaeology Transformed, 1976–2014*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute.

Brice L. Erickson, *Lerna, Volume VIII, The Historical Greek Village, Results of Excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*. pp. 520, 356 b/w figures, 10 colour figures. 2018. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens. ISBN 978–0–87661–308–5 hardback, \$150.

Brice Erickson's the *Historical Greek Village* is an excellent new addition to the Lerna series and significantly furthers our understanding of the nature and character of the site from circa 970 to 175 BC. Volume VIII in the series follows contributions that detail the fauna, people and prehistoric pottery and architecture of Lerna. Ericson's *Historical Village* not only presents an important and rich corpus of material, it also attempts to interpret the available archaeological data to reconstruct the nature and character of the site and its place within the wider Argolid. In this the book succeeds marvellously and Ericson's work significantly furthers our understanding of village life and culture in Geometric – Hellenistic times.

Lerna VIII is composed of seven chapters and four appendixes. Chapter 1 focusses on the historical and political narratives of Lerna. Chapter 2 discusses the Geometric cemetery. Chapter 3 presents the material recovered from the Late Archaic and Early Classical wells. In chapter 4 and 5 the Later Classical wells and Early and Middle Hellenistic wells are discussed. Chapter 6 presents miscellaneous pottery, figurines, loomweights and coins, and material with no securely dated archaeological context. Finally, chapter 7 draws on the preceding chapters to discuss village society and economy at Lerna. Appendixes on petrographic analysis of table, coarse and cooking wares; Archaic to Hellenistic transport amphoras; faunal remains and architecture, follow the main chapters.

The book's primary audience, as admitted by Ericson himself, are site archaeologists and material specialists working in Greece. The core data chapters of the book, chapters 2 to 6 and the appendixes are indeed most useful for practitioners in the field. The presented pottery in particular represents an important overview of ceramic development/interaction at an Argolid site from

Geometric through Hellenistic times and is as such a valuable addition to our current understanding of the region. For the non-specialist reader chapters 1 and 7, however, are most easily accessible. Chapter 1 discusses Greek village and landscape archaeology and associated Lernian evidence whilst chapter 7, as already mentioned, places the presented archaeological evidence in context. It's important to highlight that this is a study of so-called legacy material. As such it suffers from similar drawbacks as other sites excavated during the middle of the last century. Particularly noteworthy in this context are the very selective ceramic sampling practices by the original excavators, leaving us with an assemblage which in all likelihood bears little resemblance to that originally deposited.

Chapter 1, Historical and Political narratives, provides an overview of the historical and archaeological evidence pertaining to the Greek village. We learn, for example, that villages were generally neglected by the ancient writers and that equally archaeology provides only limited information for the Archaic and Classical periods, with few village sites excavated. Archaeological field survey, however, has made a major contribution in various areas to our understanding of the ancient landscape and the role of smaller scale rural settlements. Ericson also pays attention in this chapter to discussions around how to define a site as a village. Another section of this chapter discusses the historical evidence for Argive domination in Argolid. The final part of the chapter considers the role of Lerna in the Argive territorial system, which is made challenging by the lack of available historical information. All in all chapter 1 is a highly interesting read and covers much ground. In so doing it raises a number of interesting and important questions to which Ericson will come back in subsequent chapters and particularly in his final contextualisation of the presented material.

Chapter 2, is the first of the data-heavy chapters and discusses Lerna's Geometric cemetery. It provides a full description of the burial ground and integrates in the discussion all archaeological evidence attested. The chapter is structured around the various excavated trenches and for each the attested archaeological material is presented in turn. Floor plans, photographs of cist and pithos tombs and other artefacts, plus images and line drawings of attested pottery make the chapter visually very attractive and taken together this approach succeeds marvellously in providing a joined-up overview of the attested remains. In a very sizable final section Ericson discusses and interprets the attested material. Very interestingly the evidence suggests site specific funerary rites

and ritual indicative for a distinct local identity and sense of community. At the same time Lerna appears to partake in a wider Argive ceramic koine, as most tableware cannot be distinguished from Argos or other sites in the region.

Chapters 3 to 6 form the real meat of this volume. Chapter 3, the late Archaic and Early Classical Wells, discusses a series of ten wells and one pit. It follows a similar structure as chapter 2 in that it presents the evidence for each well in turn. As chapter 2 it is lavishly illustrated. In chapter 4, the evidence from a series of wells dated to the Later Classical period is discussed. Well A:1 is particularly important as it covers the early 5th–early 3rd centuries BC a period not well attested in the Argive ceramic record. The chapter traces ceramic developments through discussion of each well in turn and is again visually very pleasing and informative. In chapter 5 Early and Middle Hellenistic material is discussed. Again ceramic developments are traced through discussion of a series of excavated wells. As with the two preceding chapters the author has refrained from making any significant attempt at interpretation and has restricted himself to highlighting noteworthy observations, particularly those associated with selection of studied material by past excavators. Finally, chapter 6 discusses pottery, figurines, loomweights and coins from poorly documented contexts. This material has been included to supplement the evidence from the more closely dated deposits. Hellenistic pottery in particular has received attention in this chapter as this period is in most need of an enhanced understanding. The chapter is structured chronologically from Geometric to Hellenistic.

The final chapter, chapter 7 is Ericson's main *tour de force* with regards interpreting and making sense of the material so lavishly presented in the preceding chapters. It discusses in turn Lerna's place in the Argolid during the Geometric period and the wells attested at Lerna datable to the Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic periods. Ericson indicates that the material recovered seems domestic in nature and potentially represents household debris. However, the absence of associated architectural structures and a quantifiable ceramic assemblage make it impossible to confirm this. A subsequent section focusses on potential rationales for why the wells discussed were filled in at certain moments in time. A number of historical events significant to the area are highlighted but the difficulties in connecting specific historical events with the archaeological record are stressed. The subsequent section is one of the most interesting of the volume. It focusses on local drinking habits and traditions, discussing the role

of the symposium at Lerna. Interestingly few table amphoras were attested. Ericson argues, however, that this does not mean the absence of formalized drinking practices. Various more domestic looking jugs and pouring vessels could have fulfilled a similar role. 5th century transport amphoras from Northern Greece, Chios, the South-Eastern Aegean and Mende appear to demonstrate according to E. access to foreign luxury goods and evidence for conspicuous consumption. Interesting also is that during the 5th century Lerna was importing Aeginetan cooking pots. The character and provenance of the ceramic material attested contradicts, according to the author, traditional views of ancient villages as conservative and economically self-sufficient backwater places. Indeed, throughout this volume Ericson has focussed on discussing both the specific nature and character of Lerna and its connections and interactions with the wider region, highlighting that 'village' sites like Lerna are fully-fledged members of local, regional and even extra regional political, economic and religious networks.

In sum, Ericson's work is a highly engaging and thought provoking contribution which furthers our understanding of a 'village' type site in the 'historical' Argolid. Ericson has shown, through a lavish presentation and discussion of various deposits, that traditional interpretations of the Greek village are in need of revision. Lerna certainly does not appear to confirm to this image. As always, however, the evidence presented in this volume presents only a limited snapshot and as Ericson admits seemingly unconnected to identifiable domestic structures. Going forward, therefore, surface survey archaeology has an important role to play in furthering our understanding of 'village' like sites in antiquity. Targeted excavation and intensive field walking of the surrounding 'territory' of community seems like a winning combination.

To finish, a minor criticism to Ericson's landmark study. The scope of interpretative sections is very wide-ranging and ambitious. It makes for a highly engaging and interesting read but sometimes some of the themes discussed do not get the space required to fully blossom or in the opinion of the reviewer can appear a tad disconnected. It equally can be difficult for the reader to establish some of the rationale of what is covered and how it connects with the material discussed in the data-heavy chapters. Luckily in an excellent preface to the work Ericson sets out the rationale of his approach and the main questions he attempts to cover. These are, however, minor issues and should not detract from an excellent piece of work on which many others will undoubtedly build to further our understanding of

Argolid archaeology and village life in the Ancient Greek world.

MARK VAN DER ENDEN
LOUGHBOROUGH STUDENTS' UNION
markvanderenden@lsu.co.uk

Francesco Collura with contributions by Sergio Cascella, Emiliano Arena and Benedetto Caroccio, *Studia Calactina I. Ricerche su una città greco romana di Sicilia: Kalè Akté – Calacte*. pp. Vii+452, 16 color plates. 2016. Oxford: BAR International Series 2813. ISBN 978-1407314808 paperback \$144.00

The Tyrrhenian north coast of Sicily is in its eastern part, and apart from Tyndaris and Alaesa, archeologically far less explored than the south and east coast with its numerous Greek settlements. The new publication about Kale Akte is therefore very welcome. The city is located about 100 km west of Milazzo and about 60 km east of Cefalù, the ancient Kephaleodium. In the immediate vicinity are Halesa, about 20 km west, Apollonia (San Fratello) 20 km, Aluntium (San Marco d'Alunzio) 30 km and the villa of Patti Marina 60 km east.

Literary sources confirm its foundation for 446 B.C. by Duketios and a looting by Verres (pp. 11–18). After the 496 B.C. foundation of Tyndaris by Dionysios of Syracuse and the nearer Aluntuim, which apparently developed in the course of the northern expansion of Syracuse in the 4th century BC, the Kale Akte was probably one of the places settled on the north coast of Sicily in this later phase.

In recent years Carmela Bonanno carried out excavations in the Roman and late antique districts following a Swedish project in Caronia Marina.¹ The present volume gives a broad overview of the archeology of the present-day town of Caronia on the heights and the coastal settlement of Caronia Marina as well as the surrounding area. The material was compiled by Francesco Collura, an economist and administrative expert, interested a lot in antiquity. The foreword by Professor Dario Palermo of Catania University (p. V) gives the book its scientific blessing as well as the publication in the prestigious BAR International Series in Oxford.

The history of the settlement site is traced back to far earlier times than the written sources allow

(pp. 49–68). The author gives a critical review of the published material and at the same time compiles his own inspections and observations. Because of this, he can make out two ancient settlements, one on the site of Caronia on the height above the coast, a second with a port on the coast at Caronia Marina. Between the foundation of Himera (648 BC) and of Kale Akte (446 BC), a smaller settlement between Himera and Messina must have been located here.

Collura is likely to exceed the borders of knowledge when he reconstructs an orthogonal road system on the steep hill of the Upper Town from limited remains, which he even compares with the urban planning of Solunt (pp. 120–123). Here, the plans and autopsy on site do not seem to reveal even right angles between the few excavated walls, apart from significant differences in level on the extremely steep slope, which are hardly suitable for such a grid shaped urbanistic system.

In the coastal town of Caronia Marina, the author bases his reconstruction on surface finds, sometimes of private land owners, and well-preserved cisterns on private land. The results are in agreement with those published by C. Bonanno in 2009 (see above). Some Greek ceramics prove a small settlement between the 6th and the 3rd century BC. There had been a more extensive settlement between the 2nd and 4th century AD, for which even a harbor was reconstructed and a wall stretch in the water off the coast was believed to be a mole. However, no geological studies have been done on the assumed erosion of the coastline, which therefore cannot be considered confirmed (pp. 187–232).

The author mentions three necropolises, one from late Antiquity to Byzantine times adjoining the coastal settlement and two near the Upper Town, which are mainly dated to the 4th and 3rd centuries BC. (pp. 233–250). These observations are primarily based on chance finds and finds on private land. The whereabouts of the finds, which are published in the book, are often not specified.

While the two settlements on the coast and on the mountain are already experiencing a decline after the 4th century AD, a possible repopulation of the height in the Arab period is not confirmed. There are, however, medieval majolica ceramics from the Norman–Hohenstaufen period and a Norman fort. The author also reconstructs the course of a fortification wall of the 12th–13th. century AD (P. 251–274), whose existence however remains questionable.

A chapter about the surrounding territory under the headline 'La Chora Calactina' mentions Bronze Age to Late Roman finds, including some Bronze Age settlement traces (p.280 Figs. 4–6) and the mosaic of

¹ Bonanno 2009.

a Roman villa (p.300 Fig. 65). However, it is not clear by which methodology the sites were discovered, probably it is all about random finds. In addition, it remains difficult to localize the places named on the attached map (p. 305 f.). Also, the reconstructed, supposedly ancient, centuriation (p. 303 Fig. 66) is based on the current land distribution.

At the end of the volume some single finds from the area of Caronia are discussed. E. Arena analyzes a public inscription from the turn of the 3rd to the 2nd century BC. (pp. 351–372, SEG LIX, 1102). In addition, we are presented with the fragment of a sundial (pp. 373–378), Greek coins from the period between the 4th century BC and the 1st century AD (379–392) and some Italian Terra Sigillata (pp. 393–412). Finally come comments on the Archaic–Classical settlement on the Pizzo Cilona, south of Caronia (413–434). Some color plates are attached, but an index is missing.

In summary, one must pay the author respect, who is not a professional archeologist, for his passion for collecting material and the intensity of his researches. The analysis of the objects however, the urbanistic interpretations of the hilltop settlement of Caronia and the centuriation go well beyond well-grounded conclusions. Concerns must be registered also against the collection strategy. Neither in the urban centers nor in the territory was any coherent collecting strategy pursued, but it is always a matter of chance, while moreover it is not always clear where the finds are now stored. Collura nonetheless speak in the introduction of handing over new materials to the province of Messina.

Undoubtedly, this extensive, 450–page volume broadens our archaeological knowledge of the north coast between Alaesa and Capo d’Orlando, if of course, in a slightly systematic and difficult to verify way. Still, the book can be considered helpful, as much of the material has not been available in the literature so far. Not infrequently, however, the interpretations of the findings exceed the possibilities of interpretation in archeology. It therefore has to be questioned to what extent the results of the volume can really enrich archaeological knowledge and research in this stretch of coastline.

JOHANNES BERGEMANN
 GEORG–AUGUST–UNIVERSITÄT GÖTTINGEN
 jbergem@gwdg.de

Bonanno, C. 2009. *Kalè Akté. Scavi in contrada Pantano di Caronia Marina 2003 – 2005*. Rome: L’Erma di Bretschneider.