

Book reviews

G. Van Steen. *Theatre of the Condemned: Classical Tragedy on Greek Prison Islands* (Classical Presences), Oxford: Oxford University Press 2011. xiv + 354 pp., 5 figs. ISBN 978-0-19-957288-5.

Theatrical context generally and the particular context of theatrical productions in Greek prison camps of the post-war period is the subject of this meticulously researched and excellently written new volume. Based on hundreds of interviews the author conducted with ex-inmates and guards at the prison camps as well as ordinary Greeks and supplemented by contemporary secondary research, *Theatre of the Condemned* employs a sophisticated mix of reception theory and theatre studies, a mastery of Classical tragedy and a keen sociological eye to reconstruct an overlooked aspect (theatrical production) of a well-studied period (post-war Greece). The first chapter addresses the political and historical background of the prison camps and the role of tragedy in them, while chapters 2, 3 and 4 focus on the productions of *Antigone*, *Philoctetes* and *The Persians* on the prison islands of Makronisos, Ai Stratis and Trikeri. The concluding two chapters offer perhaps the book's most exciting and lasting contribution: an introduction to and bilingual edition of the Leftist playwright and poet Aris Alexandrou's version of *Antigone*, stage ready for contemporary theatre companies. Each section—the historical and political orientation of the first chapter, the literary and theatrical analyses in the middle chapters and the concluding chapters on Alexandrou's *Antigone*—would by itself offer a significant contribution to modern Greek political history, Classical reception studies and modern Greek theatre in English: taken together, however, the total is even greater than its parts.

In the opening section, Van Steen demonstrates how, for political prisoners, dissidents and others who, often for no real reason at all, were sentenced to “internal exile” to the island prisons, Classical tragedy “... invite[d] analysis of the aspirations and anxieties that the detainees projected onto the broader myths in which they saw their own experiences mir-

rored” (p. 2). The aim of Van Steen's book, then, is to explore the symbolic power Classical tragedy held for prisoners who found in it a mythological analogy to their own experiences: “For all inmate players, the seminal model of the tragic hero, of Antigone, Philoctetes, and Prometheus, became a meaningful exemplum: they saw overwhelming force vanquish merely the body of the hero but not his mind” (p. 14). For many Leftist prisoners undergoing torture and deprivation in the name of ideological “re-education,” these heroic exempla allowed the prisoners “to believe in personal and moral victory” (p. 14). But her book is more than an analysis of this theme. It is through “the study of the *cultural* forms in the history of the Greek Civil War and its aftermath and, in particular, the analysis of ancient Greek drama in the modern contexts of Greek (hyper)nationalism, history making, and memory” that Van Steen provides new insight into the history and political culture of the Greek Civil War and also, from a more scholarly perspective, their performance context, what Van Steen calls “the metatheatrical or symbolic nature” of the plays and their engagement with “issues of censorship, supervision and the appropriation of classical tragedy as cultural capital” (p. 16).

As much as it is a study of Classical reception and theatre, it is also a study of power dynamics and the complex psychological maneuvering which characterize all relationships between prisoners and imprisoners, between powerless and powerful, complicated ideas which Van Steen objectively and expertly describes, while simultaneously remaining sensitive to the human cost of these interactions. When, decades later, Van Steen interviewed the prisoners, they viewed their work primarily through the lens of ideological dissidence. The guards, wardens and intellectual overseers of the camps, however, by choosing which plays to perform and selecting the actors, producers and directors from among the ranks of prisoners (some of whom had substantial theatrical training), believed they were performing these dramas in the service of “*ethniki agogi*, or ‘national education’” (p. 18). The malleability of these classical exempla is all the more fascinating

because of the often opposing meanings imposed on the performances by prisoners and guards: “theatre as tyranny” and “theatre as torture” on the one hand, “theatre of reawakening (*théatro ananíspeos*)” and “theatre of absolution (*théatro apolýmánseos*)” on the other” (p. 18). There was ideological disagreement among the prisoner population as well: the more committed Marxists wanted nothing to do with a Classical past at all, while even among prisoners more sympathetic to the project, many felt that the actors had become pawns of the camp administration.

In the middle section, Van Steen analyzes the performance history of the plays themselves. In a world in which prisoners of conscience and jailers upholding the law struggled to claim the cultural capital of antiquity, it is not surprising that Sophocles’ *Antigone* would loom so large. Hegel understood the play to be about the conflict between two equally valid moral claims: the right of an individual to follow her conscience and the right of the state to enact laws and enforce them. To the prisoners of conscience and their jailers, each side, then, could see the play as offering mythological exempla justifying their own particular ideological positions and relation to state power: a “theatre of ideological complicity” (p. 66). In 1948 on Makronisos, the most notorious of the prison islands (and today a protected Civil War monument), for example, the guards permitted the staging of *Antigone*, in which “The prisoners’ political reading of the tragedy brought out the ‘democratic’ elements of a common, popular interpretation hostile to the tyrant Creon. Conservative onlookers, however, found their own measure of ideological satisfaction in a firm, consistent Creon, devoted to the state and to law and order” (p. 66). Van Steen rightly notes, however, that unlike the two other great dissident heroes in tragedy, Prometheus and Philoctetes, who could take some solace in “the promise of a future victory that they live to enjoy, complete with the rewards of exoneration, recognition, and restored memory,” the severity of Antigone’s death offered a harsher possible future. As one of the interviewed detainees is quoted in the book, “Yes, and Antigone dies and Creon counts his losses. But he goes on living. That seemed to me to be the moral of the story” (p. 66).

The heart and soul of the book is not its analysis, however, but her bilingual edition of the Leftist dissident Aris Alexandrou’s adaptation of *Antigone*, written in response to the state-sponsored performance of *Antigone* on Makronisos. Van Steen demonstrates how this “eternal *persona non grata*” came to his own perspective on the *Antigone*. As a Leftist, he was hated by the Right; as a Leftist critic of the Left, however, he was equally hated by them. His *Antigone*, therefore, emphasizes the appalling levels of internecine strife, beginning with the double fratricide with which the play opens and ending with the double deaths of Antigone and Haemon at the hands of their father/father-in-law/uncle. Then, wisely,

Van Steen lets Alexandrou’s play and its characters speak for themselves, in Greek and in her own English translation. In the larger context Van Steen has provided in the rest of the book, Alexandrou’s play stands out for the way in which it engages with the larger theme of the political authority bestowed by the appropriation of Classical symbols. In the interchange between characters with Byzantine and Classical names speaking in the ancient and modern Greek language about contemporary events (the play is set during World War II), Alexandrou’s characters seem to exist in a Greece for all times.

For Alexandrou, a critic of Right and Left, of past and present, the Classical heritage is the common inheritance of all Greeks of all periods, regardless of political persuasion. *Theatre of the Condemned* shows us how the appropriation of Classical literature was a site of nationalist contestation in post-war Greece. It should also remind us, however, that it has become the common currency of world civilization, a notion which Alexandrou identifies in his prologue: “Any similarity with persons who have lived, are living, or will live is entirely coincidental. ... Therefore, any theatre company, professional or amateur, has the right to produce the entire play or scenes of it, without asking permission of the author” (p. 239). The same can be said of the Classical tradition writ large, and Van Steen has provided a valuable service to Classicists, historians and those in the theatre by illuminating this interesting aspect of the reception of tragedy.

ADAM J. GOLDWYN
Department of Linguistics and Philology
Box 635
SE-751 26 Uppsala
adam.goldwyn@lingfil.uu.se

N. Papazarkadas, *Sacred and public land in ancient Athens* (Oxford Classical Monographs), Oxford: Oxford University Press 2011. xii + 395 pp. ISBN 978-0-19-969400-6.

This volume is extremely ambitious, and is based on the author’s Oxford dissertation in 2004. Nikolaos Papazarkadas (henceforth, NP), examines the presence of non-private land in Athens, i.e. sacred and public land, as the title suggests. The structure of the work resembles that of a systematic catalogue (or dissertation), which makes reading the volume from cover to cover difficult, in spite of the seven appendices which include hard facts. On the other hand, this outline allows the reader to find specific areas of interest, which may be preferable. A larger issue is that, generally, the text is too loaded with concentrated facts discussed in detail according to conventional scholarly manner and at the same time too colloquial. For the interested, but non-specialist scholar of the field, it is sometimes hard to

make out the gist of the individual studies. The timescale is not explicitly stated, but the study focuses on the Classical period, especially the Late Classical and Early Hellenistic period.

Chapter 1 deals with modern scholarly opinions of ancient forms of proprietorship, and the economy related to proprietorship. NP considers many of these modern opinions anachronistic. NP deals with the terms “land”, “real property” and “realty” interchangeably, as the ancient Greeks themselves did not distinguish between the categories of tillable lands, pasturage and buildings. The investigation is based upon literary and foremost epigraphic evidence and, to a smaller extent, the archaeological evidence—all of which are scrutinized in every detail. Where possible, NP combines different kind of sources in order to strengthen the interpretation. The aim of the study is to “provide an exhaustive presentation of ancient testimonies of realty controlled by collectivities” (p. 14). NP has divided the presentation of his investigation according to the corporate groups that controlled sacred and public land: sacred realty administered by the *polis* of Athens (Ch. 2); lands managed by the tribes and demes of Athens (Ch. 3); real property managed by semi-public groups, i.e. *phratries*, *gene*, *orgeones* (Ch. 4); the absence of publicly owned sacred property in Athens (Ch. 5). A concluding summary is contained in Chapter 6. Appendices 1 and 2, dealing with the sacred Orgas and *morai* respectively, constitute a direct continuation of the first chapter, while appendices 3–7 stand alone, more-or-less.

NP traces the existence of the terms *temene* and *basileus* back to Linear B documents, in which they are associated with land units allocated to a sequence of palatial functions. They also occur in the Homeric epic. However, as NP himself admits, there is no evidence of continuity for these terms—neither in terms of usage or meaning.

One of the points which NP pursues is that, in contrast to what is usually taken for granted, he perceives sacred property as both economically and conceptually essential. As a consequence, sacred landholdings and thereby sacred administrations were more autonomous, vis-à-vis the *polis*, than conventional scholarship maintains. Moreover, NP identifies a link between sacred rentals and cultic activity; he posits that income from sacred property was meant to cover expenditure for cultic activity.

Although NP focuses on the identification and investigation of public and sacred real property, he concludes that the majority of land in Athens was private; at the end of the Classical period, public land was even increasingly transferred into private ownership. This is especially important to bear in mind when analyzing the Athenian economy altogether. NP also points out that there are certain issues with the ancient terminology and the modern understanding of these terms. This is essential when identifying an ancient property as public or private. Leasing properties were common and a

not un-substantial source of incomes. The administration of leasing and purchasing, whether of public or private realty, is accounted for by NP. He includes prosopographical studies, which demonstrate that a limited amount of individuals were involved in leases as well as sale transactions, both for financial benefits and social prestige.

The *demes* and other sub-*polis* associations were allowed to keep landed property in their domain from the Archaic period onwards. According to NP this explains why the *polis* of Athens does not appear to receive any income from arable lands. During the 5th century BC, confiscated territories, especially those of the rebellious members of the Delian League, were founded as sacred realty of the *temene*. In the first half of the 4th century, the absence of relevant documents indicates that the leasing system disappeared or at least decreased considerably. However, the Social War constituted a turning point, and Athenian public finances experienced a recovery which, in the 340s, implied a renewed interest in land exploitation, including the sacred leasing system.

From the Hellenistic period, in general, there is a decline in the number of documents preserved, i.e. inscriptions recording land administration. It is significant that *deme* documents, describing themselves as self-governing units, become rare in the Early Hellenistic period and disappear towards the end of the 3rd century BC. By ca 200 BC there is a disappearance of documents which record sacred realty or rentals. This is a pattern which is also noticeable in relation to the *polis*, and probably a reflection of the political crisis in Attica (and mainland Greece as a whole) at the time: the Macedonian occupation, the administration of Demetrios Poliorketes, the Chremonidean War etc., which all brought about a shift in political power. This, together with the depopulation of the Attic countryside entailed a transformation of cultic activity, according to NP. Regarding the decline and disappearance of epigraphic testimony, the existing amount of inscriptions and their contents are not necessarily representative of their frequency in antiquity. That is, there may have been inscriptions that are now lost and, moreover, a certain phenomenon may have existed even if the habit of documenting it through inscriptions did no longer exist.

In conclusion, well into the Roman Imperial period, the existence of sacred realty controlled by the *polis* of Athens has a recovery. NP stresses that the ownership of sacred land was divine and lay beyond the public sphere, but divine ownership and the gods' rights to receive services was crucial for the prosperity of Athens and, thus, of public concern.

SUSANNE CARLSSON
Department of Archaeology and Ancient History
Uppsala University
Box 626
SE-751 26 Uppsala, Sweden
susanne.carlsson@antiken.uu.se

Aspects of ancient Greek cult. Context, ritual and iconography (Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Antiquity, ASMA, 8), eds. Jesper Tae Jensen, George Hinge, Peter Schultz and Bronwen Wickkiser, Aarhus 2009. 245 pp. ISBN 978-87 7934-253-8.

This book brings together the papers from a conference which took place at the Centre for the Study of Antiquity and the Department of Classical Archaeology at the University of Aarhus in 2004. The aim of the event was twofold: on the one hand, to establish a network of young scholars working on ancient Greek cult, and on the other, to let them discuss their ideas under the guidance of Richard Hamilton, a seasoned scholar, and subsequently develop them into articles.

The scope of the volume is presented by one of the organizers, Jesper Tae Jensen, in a short preface. Then follows eight articles, seven of which were presented at the conference. The book is concluded with an index and a list of the contributors. The articles span a wide field including archaeology, philology, architecture, history, musicology and religion with the specific aim of combining the study of material culture with ancient texts and inscriptions.

The first paper, by Lisbeth Bredholt Christensen, explores the definition of the term “cult” within various branches of scholarship, in particular in relation to concepts like “religion” and “ritual”, stressing the great distinctions in the uses of the modern terminology. Within the study of religion “cult” has been either of very little interest or considered as “ritual lived” and discussed primarily within particular religions from an emic perspective with no attempt at applying an analytic apparatus. This is contrary to “ritual”, which is treated as a category where different kinds can be discerned such as transitory rituals, prayer, sacrifice, etc., clearly an etic approach. Sociology (at least in the anglophone sphere) instead uses cult for the experience of private religions, often contrasted with how institutionalized and mainstream religion is practised. In prehistoric archaeology and Classical archaeology and history, on the other hand, cult is a central concept. In the study of prehistory, the preference for the terms cult, rituals and religious practice instead of religion can be explained by the nature of the archaeological evidence, which does not allow for the reconstructions of belief, the core of religion. Among classicists the situation is partly the inverse, as cult is used as a synonym for religion rather than for ritual, an effect of the prominence of the written evidence, which facilitates the interpretation of the archaeological material. This paper cautions an unreflected use of terms, but there are certainly further distinctions between the terminologies in different languages that should be addressed as well.

Richard Hamilton analyses the relationship between altars, animals and baskets (*kistai*) on Attic votive reliefs from

the Classical period by applying a statistical method, a chi-square test. The evidence consists of 224 reliefs dedicated to Zeus, Apollo, Artemis, Athena, the Nymphs, Asklepios and the banqueting hero, presented in a catalogue in an appendix. Several interesting observations are made. Of particular importance is the relation between altar and *kiste*, two elements that have to be taken as having different connotations in the reliefs. Altars more frequently occur with animals than with baskets, refuting van Straten’s proposal that the *kiste* holds sacrificial cakes. There is also a variation between the deities, and in reliefs for the Nymphs, altars may have had a different meaning than to suggest animal sacrifice. A closer investigation of the *kistai* shows them to be more strongly associated with children and family groups, in particular women, than with the sacrifice of animals or vegetal offerings, a conclusion backed up by a brief detour into Attic vase painting.

Statistics are rarely used in this way on ancient evidence, which makes the paper interesting, in particular, as pointed out by Hamilton, as such an approach demands both a precise description of one’s thesis and a consideration of the converse of the same thesis. On the other hand, the relationships revealed cannot be explained by this method.

Bronwen Wickkiser’s contribution examines the relation between the establishment of Asklepios in Athens and the plague, as the introduction of the god is usually taken to be a response to the local healing gods’ incapacity to help. The only source telling us about the introduction of the cult is the Telemachos monument, which, however, does not state why the god was established in Athens, nor does it refer to the plague. The problem is that the plague broke out already in 430 BC, and the cult was imported in 420, an important point stressed by the author. Wickkiser argues that there is no compelling evidence showing that the Peloponnesian war hindered the importation of the cult from Epidauros, as there were other important cult places of Asklepios from where he could have been taken. Moreover, there is no tradition of Asklepios being a plague-curing deity, nor that he ended the plague in Athens. Instead, a number of factors may have lain behind the importation of Asklepios as late as 420, most of all his general concern for health and the curing of chronic illnesses rather than fatal ones, a trait suitable in a climate of general worries about health raised by the plague. Political and military concerns, in particular engendered by the Peloponnesian war, would also have played a prominent role.

The next two papers deal explicitly with the Athenian Asklepieion, in particular the structure usually interpreted as the altar of this sanctuary. Vanda Papaefthymiou presents the results from the investigations of the altar in 2001. The exploration of the earth-filled interior of this structure showed that it was constructed almost directly on the bare rock. Under and around the altar were discovered nine rock-cut, earth-

filled pits, rectangular or oval, between 50–30 cm deep, interpreted as having been used for planting trees in the period before the installation of the Asklepieion, perhaps as part of a sacred grove. The pottery recovered dates mainly to the second half of the 5th century BC, suggesting that the pits must have been filled in when the altar was first constructed after the end of the 5th century. Important for the history of the altar structure is also a fragment of the cassette ceiling from the Erechtheion found in one of the pits. This fragment must presumably have arrived here after Sulla's invasion of Athens, when the Erechtheion was burnt, dating the present structure to the Roman period, perhaps Augustan, a date supported by the shape of the cuttings for the dowels and pour channels for lead. As the altar was rebuilt in the Roman period, it might originally have stood in the western part of the sanctuary, later to be moved east, and can therefore not settle the issue of whether the earliest Asklepieion was founded on the west or the east terrace, though Papaefthymiou finds it more likely that the Roman altar was constructed on the same spot site as the original one.

Unfortunately the new excavations did not seem to offer any evidence, for example, animal bones, ash or charcoal, that would support the structure's actual use as an altar, a circumstance which is important for the following paper, by Michaelis Lefantzis and Jesper Tae Jensen, which deals with the layout and placement of the original Asklepieion on the south slope of the Acropolis. The authors argue that the cult place established by Telemachos in 420 BC was located on the east terrace, thereby substantiating a suggestion previously forwarded by a number of scholars. The structure usually considered as being the main altar of the sanctuary, re-investigated by Papaefthymiou, had four phases: it was constructed in 418/7 to 416/5 BC and reconstructed twice in the 4th century. A careful and detailed discussion of the 15 extant blocks of this structure leads the authors to argue that, at least in its second phase (ending ca 360–350 BC), this was not an altar but a small building, entered from the west by a pair of doors. The corners were formed by wooden posts and the walls, presumably of wood as well, rested on blocks of Acropolis limestone. A stele was placed in the northwestern corner of the foundation. Fig. 8 (p. 101), essential for understanding the complex history of the structure, should definitely have been larger, allowing the reader to better follow the details of the argument. The extant peribolos must originally have delimited a smaller precinct, entered from the north-east corner, and did not include the so-called "sacred pit". This construction is still to be considered as part of the sanctuary from the beginning, however, due to its inner diameter being identical with one of the basic modules used in the design of the Asklepieion.

The authors' careful re-examination of the primary evidence certainly offers new data as to the architectural devel-

opment of the Asklepieion, but one would have liked to have some of the arguments further developed here, for example, the use of the structure previously considered to be the altar. Furthermore, to claim that the "sacred pit" must have belonged to the early Asklepieion due to the deity's chthonic character (p. 111) is a statement which needs to be substantiated, as it is far from generally accepted.

The longest contribution to the volume (almost 70 pages), by Peter Schultz, discusses the portraits of Philip II and his family executed by Leochares and displayed in the Philippeion at Olympia after the Macedonian victory at Chaironeia. The larger issue is the origin of divine or heroic royal iconography in the Hellenistic period, here investigated from the point of view how Leochares' Argead portraits, may have inspired such a manner of representation. Schultz focuses on the questions of patronage, composition and appearance of the group and the symbolic and practical function of the tholos.

A detailed examination of the statue base in the Philippeion by autopsy reveals that it must have been erected at the same time as the tholos itself, due to similar tooling and identical marble and clamps in both the base and the building. There is no evidence for adjustments or later additions supporting the notion of two phases, one being Philip's and the other, Alexander's. It is most likely that Philip ordered the monument and that it was finished before the 111th Olympic Games in 336 BC and the king's death the same year. From the study of the base and the cuttings for the plinths, it is demonstrated that Philip was placed in the centre with Alexander and his mother/Philip's wife, Olympias, on his right side, and his parents Amyntas and Eurydike on the left side. The appearance of the statues is harder to determine, but Schultz argues that they clearly must have been divinizing or at least heroic, perhaps even modelled on the east pediment of the Temple of Zeus. Judging by the cuttings, the material cannot have been gold and ivory, as stated by Pausanias, but stone, possibly gilded. The placement of the statues within the tholos further enhanced their particular status, especially as the shape of the building is that of a *theatron*, a place for spectacle and display, in analogy with other round buildings housing statues of gods or heroes or being used for performances in sanctuaries.

The relation between music and cult is the focus of Tore Tværnø Lind's paper, dealing with the limits of our abilities to understand music in the ancient Greek world and how these obstacles may be overcome. Starting from his work on Byzantine and Post-Byzantine music, the author discusses the advantages of applying an ethnomusicological approach. The physical evidence for ancient music is marginal and even the music theories found in philosophical and literary writings may give only a partial idea of the practical and aural reality or

how the audience experienced it. The study of ancient Greek music requires interdisciplinary and creative approaches, including reconstructions, and the field of ethnomusicology can be most helpful here regarding how to conceive the setting, forms and conceptualizations of music in antiquity. In the case of religion, music is an important element in creating the cultic context and serves as a mediator between mortals and immortals, as well as expressing inner and spiritual sensations. Lind stresses that reconstructions are always interpretations influenced by contemporary music, in particular what is called “World Music” today, and that they also echo the trends of the period when the recordings were made, a reconstruction from the 1970s would sound different from one made in 2004. He advocates an increased awareness of the impact of the present on such attempts. Though this paper offers many interesting thoughts, it deals more with methods of accessing ancient Greek music than with its relation to cult.

The final contribution, by George Hinge, explores the *partheneions* of Alkman and Pindar, arguing that the personal names included are to be taken as generic role names or “cultic personae” and that the poets did not have specific living girls in mind. He suggests that the choral lyrics were not composed to be performed at a single occasion only, but were re-performed in connection with certain festivals linked to particular kinship groups, who rehearsed and performed these traditional compositions generation after generation down to the Hellenistic period. The transmission of Alkman’s poetry within a cultic context in Sparta led to these works being almost unknown outside this region before the 3rd or 2nd century BC, when collected by Alexandrian philologists. It would have been interesting if the relevance of the cultic context for the preservation of the choral lyrics had been further explored.

A general trait of the papers in the volume is that they are quite short (apart from Schultz), which does not have to be a problem, but in several cases this brevity results in the arguments not being fully developed or the main support of the discussion not being presented here, but referred to as published elsewhere or forthcoming. This is unfortunate, as it is stated in the preface that the contributors could choose the length of their papers themselves.

As in all conference volumes, there is the risk of the contributions being too disparate and not adhering to a unified theme, and this is the case also with this book. The topics given in the title—context, ritual and iconography—actually cover almost any aspect of Greek cult: however, the cultic angle of some of the papers could certainly have been made stronger. Although the individual papers are often interesting and offer new insights, in particular the new empirical evidence presented from the Asklepieion at Athens and the Philippeion at Olympia, a more co-ordinated approach would have been

welcome, both when choosing and editing the contributions. A case in point is the small structure in the eastern part of the Asklepieion which in one paper is presented unequivocally as an altar, while in the following text re-interpreted as a small building (or shrine?), without either of the contributions acknowledging the completely opposite interpretation presented by the other. Here some editing would have been welcome. The illustrations are also problematic, in particular the maps and some of the plans, which unfortunately are too small and unclear.

GUNNEL EKROTH
Department of Archaeology and Ancient History
Uppsala University
Box 626
SE-751 26 Uppsala
gunnel.ekroth@antiken.uu.se

A. Powell & S. Hodkinson (eds.), *Sparta. The body politic (Study of Sparta)*, The Classical Press of Wales: Oxford 2010. viii + 348 pp., 5 figs. ISBN 978-1-905125-26-5.

For anyone who is interested in Sparta and current research on the Lakedaimonian state, this book is a must-have. The present publication forms the seventh volume of collected papers from the International Sparta Seminar, presented at the Celtic Conference of 2006 held at the University of Wales Lampeter (now University of Wales, Trinity Saint David). Eight distinguished scholars dealt with various expressions as well as impressions of Spartan politics. Topics varied from Spartan nudity to British perceptions of Sparta and Nazi Germany. Certainly, each of the eight individual studies in this volume can stand on its own, but the “Introduction” does not shed enough light on the common theme or the aims of the publication as a whole. As for the editorial details, each chapter concludes with notes and a bibliography; the volume as a whole ends with a general index.

To facilitate for readers who wish to locate their respective fields of interest, a short account of each chapter will follow.

Chapter 1. Nicholas Rider, “Elements of the Spartan bestiary in the Archaic and Classical periods” (pp. 1–84). Rider explores the link between human communities and particular animals by investigating the presence of Spartan personal names composed of names of animals. He also examines the presence of animals in Spartan vase painting as well as in literary sources. Although the investigated area was not a large producer of inscriptions, the use of whatever is left could have contributed to this survey of personal names. Rider’s chapter is divided into three main parts. The first part deals with personal names referring to animals. In this section, Rider divides the animals into groups of domestic and carnivorous animals, birds, flying insects and snakes. Each individual spe-

cies (horse, dogs, cattle etc.) is treated separately within each group. In part two, the context of the animal images is examined. Rider classifies the animals according to context, i.e. animals on their own, in groups, in combat, associated with men etc. In part three he discusses animals as mediators between men and gods. As well as this classification system, the role of animals in sacrifice and their various symbolic meanings are discussed. Rider concludes that the creation of Spartan personal names is contemporary with the appearance of animals in Laconian vase painting. In addition the animals which were viewed as important were restricted to a few species. However, even though names of animals were common in Greek personal names, Rider makes no comparison with the rest of the Greek world.

Chapter 2. Anton Powell, “Divination, royalty and insecurity in Classical Sparta” (pp. 85–135). Powell examines the use of religious rituals in times of insecurity, whether caused by military or internal threats, or natural disasters. Powell’s hypothesis is that, although the Spartan society “worked successfully to impose a false view of its own ‘unchanging’ character”, and appeared as stable, the Spartan kings were extensively executed or exiled. Powell presents a couple of case studies of specific periods of unrest and the Spartan response to them. He concludes that the performance of rituals such as divination, the usage of omens, seers and oracles in times of crisis was a political instrument which was consciously wielded by the diarchy to maintain power.

Chapter 3. Ephraim David, “Sparta and the politics of nudity” (pp. 137–163). David looks at nudity in Spartan society during the Archaic and Classical periods. According to him, nudity was institutionalized and supportive of the ideology of the *homoioi*. Using many different sources, David examines different aspects of nudity such as its origins, its relationship to age, its pedagogic aims, female nudity, and finally the negative connotations of nudity. To conclude, David claims that Sparta was not a nudist society, but nudity was practised and accepted in certain contexts, and moreover, it was an indigenous Spartan innovation. However, exactly where were nudity practised in the institutionalized way except in the gymnasias?

Chapter 4. Andrew Scott, “Laconian black-figure pottery and the Spartan elite consumption” (pp. 165–181). Scott estimates the extent of the industry of Laconian black-figure pottery, and tries to understand and explain its rise in ca 580–575 BC, and its fall at the end of the 6th century BC. It is well-known that Laconian pottery from the 6th century BC is of high quality. Scott maintains that every Spartan had his own personal drinking cup and that black-figure pottery was used by the elite to display status. According to Scott, the establishment of a black-figure industry is contemporaneous

with the Spartan elite’s wish to stand out from the rest of the Spartans, who used plain ware in the *syssitia*.

Chapter 5. Jean Ducat, “The ghost of the Lakedaimonian state” (pp. 183–210). Spartan—Lakedaimonian—*perioikoi*: the relationships between these denominations, discussed in the present chapter, are presumed to be clear-cut, but for the non-Spartan historian they are sometimes confusing and seem to be exchangeable. The roles of the *perioikoi* were crucial since they together with the Spartans were part of the army, and the two groups were included in the Lakedaimonians. Ducat examines the use and meaning of the words “Spartan” and “Lakedaimonian” found in texts by Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon and other ancient authors. It becomes evident that the word *Lakedaimon* can mean both Lakedaimon and Sparta. In addition, Ducat clarifies how 20th-century scholars have contributed to our understanding of Lakedaimon as a *polis*, a city-state. He suggests that Lakedaimon should be considered as a federal state—having examined the evidence, he claims that there were no city, no citizens, no institutions of Lakedaimonia itself, and thus it was a ghost city. Regarding the perioikic cities, Ducat stresses that we know nothing about their traditions, political systems etc., but he proposes that slavery of the helotic type may have been practised in some of them.

Chapter 6. Paul Christesen, “Spartans and Scythians, a meeting of mirages: the portrayal of the Lycurgian *Politeia* in Ephorus’ *Histories*” (pp. 211–263). Christesen analyzes the representation of the Lycurgian *politiea* in the fragments of Ephorus of Cyme (ca 405–330 BC). According to Christesen’s reading, the success of the Spartan hegemony was due to the Lycurgan reforms; its loss of power in the 4th century must be related to the general political circumstances of the time. Comparatively, Ephorus, who drew on Herodotus, examined the traditions and life-style of the Scythians. He emphasized that both groups—Sparta and the Scythians—took pleasure in a public harmonious relationship and were not concerned with possessions. Christesen maintains that, in the text of Ephorus it emerges that as early as in the 4th century the picture of Sparta was contrasted to the picture of the “Spartan mirage”, i.e. Sparta as successful leader of the Peloponnesian League in the 5th century. Christesen also discusses the methodological problems with extracting the narrative structure of a specific text from fragments. Christesen defends Ephorus from other scholars, who consider him as a mere compiler, and asserts that the *Histories* is one of the most important pieces of historical narrative in Classical antiquity.

Chapter 7. Thomas J. Figueira, “Gynecocracy: how women policed masculine behaviour in Archaic and Classical Sparta” (pp. 265–296). Figueira examines the role of Spartan women from an unusual point of view. Most of the studies concerning Spartan women have focused upon their

emancipation, political and economic influence and independence—areas which, according to Figueira, are anachronistic. In his investigation, Figueira takes a closer look at Spartan women's direct influence on male upbringing and behaviour—spheres which he thinks are the most important and significant aspects in the study of Spartan women. Spartan women's influence on and supervising of the male part of society is presented in the ancient texts by Herodotus, Aristotle, Xenophon, the Attic Old Comedy and 4th century historiography. Also Plutarch, although a late writer, is a usable source since he relies on earlier, now lost, sources. How mothers treated sons going into battle, as well as their reactions when sons did not show bravery in combat are discussed—a part which especially strengthens one's impression that the author sometimes uses the sources too literally. Figueira underscores that the gynocracy must be understood in the context of the unique Spartan society. Women's behaviour reflects Spartan customs and women had different roles from those of women in other Greek cities. The roles of Spartan women should not be compared to the roles which women in Athens played in the *oikoi* and the cult. A crucial feature in Spartan society was the elongated maturation of citizen women and men. As a consequence, young women married when they were adults, and were married to men of the same age, which in turn were absent from home most of the time; something which must have contributed to women's possibility to be in power of the *oikos*.

Chapter 8. Stephen Hodkinson, "Sparta and Nazi Germany in mid-20th century British liberal and left-wing thought" (pp. 297–342). Hodkinson examines the analogy between Sparta and Nazi Germany used by intellectuals in Britain and naturalized Americans (e.g. Moses Finley). Firstly, he examines how this analogy emerged with Arnold Toynbee and Richard Crossman in the 1930s. Secondly, he examines the analogy which developed during World War II, when Britain was at war with Germany; and eventually the post-war heritage in British thought, which was spread by radio broadcasts. The left-wing, intellectual, central figures that are discussed by Hodkinson share a common feature: they were all educated in Classics. This, however, was a rule more than an exception for the time period. The fact that Nazi Germany associated itself with ancient Sparta is well-known, but this article sheds light on how the British "other side" shaped and maintained the analogy over time.

As stated at the beginning, the articles of this volume constitute individual contributions without any mutual coherence—other than dealing with Sparta. This is of course a common feature in conference volumes, nonetheless, a clear summary of each article is missing in the Introduction. A couple of the contributors (Richer, Powell, David), do not clarify what is so special about Sparta, and make no comparison with

other Greek societies. The majority of the articles address scholars of respective fields, but the last two articles (Figueira and Hodkinson), are suitable for students and could be used to inspire discussions in seminars.

SUSANNE CARLSSON
Department of Archaeology and Ancient History
Uppsala University
Box 626
SE-751 26 Uppsala, Sweden
susanne.carlsson@antiken.uu.se

L. Bouke van der Meer (ed). *Material Aspects of Etruscan Religion. Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Leiden, May 29 and 30, 2008. BABESCH, Annual Papers on Mediterranean Archaeology, supp 16, 2010*, Leuven: Peeters, 2010. 1-164 pp. ISBN 978-90-429-2366-9.

Recently, scholars have been increasingly interested in materiality: how artefacts, patterns of tomb distributions or the landscape's interplay with a sanctuary may be studied, in order to obtain cognitive aspects of ancient societies. The present book, however, proceedings from a colloquium on material aspects of Etruscan religion, examines a variety of religious paraphernalia and constructions as matter *sensu Platonicis*. The publication contains ten papers by fourteen scholars on various topics related to Etruscan cult practices and/or cult artefacts.

The initial article is by Maria Bonghi Jovini, and examines the *area sacra/monumental complex* in Tarquinia (pp. 5–16). When this sanctuary was excavated, it received much attention, due to the evidence of human sacrifice and the possible deposit of a young boy with a deformed cranium buried close to a centrally placed, natural gorge. Here, the main focus of the author is to tie the archaeological finds from the area to the possible divinity receiving devotion at this place, from the end of the 10th century BC until ca 400 BC. She scrutinizes the various finds in the area and records changes in the artefacts which were deposited as offerings in the *longue durée* of its existence. Her conclusion is that a female divinity with chthonic aspects, perhaps a combination of characteristics from the cultic spheres of Artumes, Turan, Thesan and Uni, was worshipped here. Uni is evidenced by an inscription on a base of a bucchero vase which was found in the area. The possible connection between the gods is still obscure and the author provides an interesting discussion on the importance of Greek influences on Etruscan, originally aniconic, divine characters.

Giuseppe Sassetelli and Elisabetta Govi present new ideas on the foundation rites which were performed during the planning of Marzabotto (pp. 17–27). They outline how summer and winter solstices were the main points of reference

when outlining the city. They demonstrate how a centrally placed *cippus* with an incised cross, lined out the streets in a model of the heavenly *templum* above. From an *auguraculum* on the acropolis, in the northwestern part of the town, a line was drawn from one centrally placed altar to a point on the horizon in the southeast. The spot where the summer solstice sunset took place was marked by the augur/haruspex, on the acropolis hill. The ground plan of Marzabotto (probably called “the new” judging from a find of an inscription from the sanctuary with the name *kainua* in locative, “at *Kainua*”) is an Etruscan custom and an example of a foundation rite described by Plutarch (*Rom.*, 11). When discussing the role, gesture and instruments of the *haruspex*, Francesco Roncalli calls attention to the famous “*Tarchon*” mirror from Tuscania which depicts two *haruspices* (pp. 117–127). Roncalli convincingly argues that they are depicted as if they were involved in a foundation rite, perhaps the original founding of Tarquinia. He bases this assumption on the staff in the right hand of the diviner which is clearly stuck down below the base-line of the engraved mirror. The author means that soothsayers—in order to communicate with the chthonian world—employed such means. According to Livy and Plutarch, such a habit was used when Romulus traced out the boundaries of the future Rome. Roncalli also discusses a memorial rite which was completed during the annual commemoration of the triumph over the defeated Veii, and performed at the Ides of October in Rome. Here an old, indecently behaved old man dressed in a purple toga but wearing a child’s bulla, may call to mind Tages, the famous *puer sapiens* who revealed the *disciplina etrusca* emerging from a furrow made by the plough in Tarquinia. This old man was the target for Roman mockery even during Plutarch’s time. At Area Sacra in Tarquinia the bones and deformed cranium of a nine-year old boy was found exhumated near the sacred gorge. Perhaps this boy was once conceived of as Tages, the boy with the wisdom of an old man, as has been hinted at by the excavators, cited in Bonghi Jovini’s present article (p. 15). Connections can, certainly, not be ruled out.

Other influences or connections discussed in the book are Near Eastern parallels to Etruscan cult practices. One well-known example of a Near Eastern parallel is provided by a reference to divination, by means of *hepatomancy*. This practice was used by Babylonians, and is evidenced by a “model-liver” stored in the British Museum. It is also described in Hittite texts. Scholars are, seemingly, less biased today against origins and influences *ex Oriente*. Claus Ambos and Ingrid Krauskopf document the Oriental sources of the *lituus*, the curved staff used by augurs both in Etruria and Rome (cf. Roncalli p. 123), from Akkadian, Assyrian and Hittite texts and images (pp. 127–153). Its origin is a herdsman’s staff, crooked so that animals could be hooked by the legs or necks. It is at-

tributed to agrarian, archaic societies. It was used upraised or lowered in different situations by the diviner and is not found as a ritual implement in Greek contexts. In the Tomb of the Augurs in Tarquinia, it was most likely used by the organizer of the funerary games, as suggested by the authors. They cite Jeannot’s thorough examination of *lituus* staffs in Chiusine milieus (Bibliography, p. 151) and his conclusion that the explanation to their use in Etruria is dependent on the scenes in which they occurred, and should be interpreted accordingly.

Later Etruscan artistic developments, especially from the artistic *floruit* of the Late Classical and Early Hellenistic periods are discussed in two articles. Maurizio Harari deals with Etrusco-Faliscan architectural sculpture and vase-paintings (pp. 83–103), and Fernando Gilotta describes an intriguing motif on an Etruscan red-figure column krater from “the storerooms of Chiusi, Museo Archeologico Nazionale” (pp. 105–115). It is painted in the style of Polygnotos and his group working in Athens around the last three decades of the 5th century BC. Its decoration, however, is purely Etruscan and depicts the journey to Aitas/Hades. A cloaked soul appears on both the A and the B sides; in A he is watching the funeral games which were held in his honour, and on side B he is being addressed by three successive Turms who appear beside and on an altar, possibly to help the deceased on his way to the underworld. The cartoon-like appearance of the three Turms/Aitas figures suggests that Etruscan art could be “read” as depicting distinct phases/stages which were perceived simultaneously by the spectator. Gilotta sees this exceptional vase as providing an insight into a period of prosperity and a noble clientele who were open to religious influences and experiences from Greece and Magna Graecia at the time.

Greek influences are particularly noticeable in Graviscae, the harbour town of Tarquinia, in both religious and social contexts. Lucio Fiorini and Mario Torelli present the results of 40 years of excavations at the site (pp. 29–49). They document various sanctuaries; amongst them is one which was devoted to Aphrodite. It is situated in close proximity to an area which was connected with metallurgic activities, with large finds of slag from iron, copper, and lead production as well as melting furnaces. The connection between Aphrodite and metalwork is well-known in the Eastern Mediterranean, especially in Cyprus where she is at times connected with Astarte. An Adoneion with a large cortile is another spectacular find from the city.

Turms Aitas was sitting on an altar on the vase discussed above, and discussions and typologies of altars play a dominant role throughout this book. Stephan Steingraber and Silvia Menichelli, in “Etruscan altars in sanctuaries and necropoleis of the Orientalizing, Archaic and Classical periods” (pp. 51–74), provide a complete overview of types of altars

and their various uses. They also provide clear, graphic illustrations of their findings. Two maps are provided which illustrate the various types of cults and altars respectively. It is interesting to note the predominance of altars which were dedicated to funerary cults in the areas of San Giovenale and Blera.

Friedhelm Prayon follows suit, with an article on the tomb as an altar (pp. 75–82). He demonstrates that, for the Etruscans, the grave monument was not only a place to deposit the dead, but it also served as an altar from the beginning to the end of Etruscan tomb building. He points to the presence of ramps leading onto the summit of *tumuli* in earlier periods, possibly with a *cippus* on top and points out that the Etruscan *cippi* have not yet been studied in great detail. Later periods had other types of altar constructions, but the habit of using the tomb as an altar was maintained and did probably later inspire the Romans in their construction of the “altartomb/*Altargrab*” as a symbol of the cult of the ancestor. In Roncalli’s paper (pp. 117–125) an Archaic golden ring with an incised bezel depicts the altar, as well as a crouching creature sitting on top of it. The creature has a human body and a wolf’s head, mane and outstretched paws and “... can only be the Etruscan demon of death, related to *Aplu/Šuri* ...” (p. 124).

The last contribution by Giovannangelo Camporeale, “Il teatro etrusco secondo le fonti scritte, spettacolo, ritualità, religione” (pp. 156–164), provides a useful collection of all the sources in Greek and Roman literature for various types of Etruscan performances.

To conclude, this is a valuable book of interest for any student of Etruscan religious activities. As is evident from the above descriptions, most of the contributions in the colloquium proceedings illuminate the ideas and propositions of each other. The quality of each individual text is reflected in the overall volume, as it is a high-quality scholarly endeavour.

INGELA M.B. WIMAN
Dept. of Historical Studies
University of Gothenburg
Box 200
405 30 Göteborg
ingela.wiman@class.gu.se

Nancy A. Winter, *Symbols of wealth and power, Architectural terracotta decoration in Etruria and Central Italy, 640–510 B.C.* (Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, Supplementary volume, IX), Ann Arbor, Michigan 2009, lii + 650 pp., 525 figs. ISBN-13: 978-0-472-11665-2; ISBN-10 0-472-11665-7.¹

Jette Christansen & Nancy A. Winter, with contributions by Patricia S. Lulof, *Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Catalogue Etruria Vol. I, Architectural terracottas and painted wall plaques, Pinakes, c. 625–200 BC*, København 2010. 198 pp., 254 figs. ISBN 978-87-7452-312-3.

Patricia S. Lulof, *Architectural terracottas in the Allard Pierson Museum Amsterdam* (Collections of the Allard Pierson Museum, 2), Amsterdam 2007. viii + 117 pp., VI + 32 pls., 35 figs. ISBN/EAN 978-90-71211-40-9.

The progress of research concerning Central Italic architectural terracottas has centred around five particular years. In 1918, Alessandro Della Seta divided the terracottas in the Museo di Villa Giulia into three chronological (and stylistic) phases, a classification still valid to a great extent even today. In 1940, Arvid André published his fundamental *corpus* of the entire bulk of material known at the time. In 1966, American archaeologists started excavating an Etruscan site at Poggio Civitate (Murlo) and Swedish ones, another at Acquarossa—two projects that were soon to alter entirely our comprehension of early terracotta production in Etruria, even adding an earlier unknown phase before the first one of Della Seta’s.

In 1990, the first international conference on Central Italic terracottas was held at the Swedish Institute in Rome, followed up to now by three more—all of them entitled *Deliciae Fictiles*. These four conferences have considerably promoted the publication of both new and old finds. In 2009, finally, Nancy Winter’s new handbook, *Symbols of wealth and power*, superseded André’s work that, through the wealth of new discoveries from the 1960s onwards, had become increasingly obsolete. It is, however, telling that Winter’s weighty volume has room only for Della Seta’s first phase and for the earlier one that we now know preceded it.

It may be more than mere chance that the distance between these five fundamental dates happens to be more or less the same (19–26 years)—each, thus, representing a new generation of scholars with new aims and new methods. While André’s *corpus* clearly reflects early twentieth-century scholarly traditions, Winter’s *magnum opus* is firmly based on the

¹ Parts of my review of Nancy Winter’s book have been published before (in Swedish) in *Medusa* 32:1, 2011, 43–47.

methodology and the framing of questions grown out of the Acquarossa and Poggio Civitate publications as well as of the four *Deliciae Fictiles* conferences.

New technical examination methods have paved the way for detailed information on production processes: the concentration on studies of entire terracotta roofs rather than individual, detached objects of art has laid the foundations of a more reliable chronology and, thus, of a better understanding of technical as well as decorative development in the early terracotta industry.

Nancy Winter got her archaeological training at Poggio Civitate around 1970 and wrote her dissertation about early, human-head antefixes from the whole Graeco-Italic world. In 1993, she published a scholarly handbook on Archaic Greek architectural terracottas, but later returned to the Central Italic material. During a long succession of years, she personally examined every piece and fragment of importance for her study and could finally present an almost complete catalogue,² with analyses of the material from every possible aspect.

In all, Winter publishes 101 terracotta roofs from 32 sites, distributed among seven groups (chapters), partly chronological and partly representing different but contemporaneous, decorative traditions. By a consistent grouping and treatment of the roofs, she manages to present a convincing picture of the development. In spite of minor, regional variations (particularly at Caere), there was a basic uniformity over the entire Central Italic area, and Winter, thus, can once and for all refute those earlier theories that maintained that some terracottas with early stylistic traits were examples of late, retarded characteristics in isolated, hinterland regions.

Through the study of entire roofs and both their technical and their decorative details, Winter evades these pitfalls. She presents a convincing survey of the various chronological stages: the experimental phase, when each workshop tried to find its own solutions (*c.* 640–600/580 BC: Chs. 1–2), the increasing influence from the Hellenized world (*c.* 600/580–550/540 BC: Chs. 1–4), and finally the emergence of various competing systems (*c.* 550/540–510 BC: Chs. 5–7). I find only one weakness in this arrangement of the book—that is, the very first chapter: “Undecorated or modestly decorated roofs, 650–530 BC.” Not only is the time-span of the period too great to be treated as one, but the chapter also inevitably combines roofs that never had any decorative terracottas with others that may have had but lost them before excavation. Moreover, this arrangement divides obviously identical

roof-tiles from decorated and undecorated roofs between different chapters and, thus, obstructs a comprehensive view of their evolution.

Winter’s arrangement of the material presented within each chapter is, at first view, quite difficult to grasp, but soon appears perfectly logical and crystal-clear. After a general introduction and a chronological survey of the roofs (for instance, “Roof 2–6” is the sixth roof discussed in Ch. 2), the terracotta categories are presented under eight headings: A. Raking simas, B. Lateral simas, C. Antefixes, D. Revetment plaques, E. Akroteria, F. Pan-tiles, eaves-tiles, G. Cover-tiles, and H. Ridge-tiles.³ For instance, “no. 2.B.1.a” denotes lateral simas (B) from the Late Orientalizing period ([Ch.] 2), belonging to the morphologically first group presented (1) and the subgroup decorated with a feline-head water-spout (a).

After the seven chapters that present the material follow two thematic ones: “8. Manufacturing techniques and evidence for workshops”, and “9. Topographical synthesis”. In Ch. 8, Winter summarizes and comments on our constantly increasing knowledge of the manufacturing process, roof constructions, etc. Ch. 9 presents, in chronological order, the buildings (and some *disiecta membra*) from the 32 sites included in the book. More than half of the space is taken up by seven sites: Acquarossa, Caere, Rome, Poggio Civitate, Tarquinia, Veii, and Rusellae. It is worthy of note that only two of these are located in North Etruria, four in South Etruria, and none (except possibly Rome) in Latium.

In her “Conclusions”, Winter gathers information on the various kinds of buildings involved, the locations on the roof of decorative terracottas, the evolution of decorative motifs, etc. Many of these issues may become the point of departure for more detailed studies by other scholars. Less than five pages are devoted to the author’s “Historical considerations”—a matter which the reader could have expected (and hoped for) more of, considering Winter’s long-standing interest in these questions. She wisely abstains from involving herself in the highly imaginative attempts of some scholars to provide far-fetched “historical” explanations for the motifs of relief scenes on raking simas and revetment plaques. But we do get a useful summary of the “Bacchiad theory”, developed and expounded by Winter in a series of articles from 1999 onwards. It is a daring theory but—well argued and to a great extent convincing—it helps to explain various issues in the earliest history of roof terracotta production.

The text of the book is complemented by a comprehensive selection of illustrations, including mostly well substantiated reconstruction drawings, of separate terracottas as well as entire roofs. A number of indices and museum concordances

² For practical reasons, we are not dealing with a true catalogue of pieces, but rather, one of types and groups of terracottas. But, in most cases, Winter lists all inventory numbers belonging to each of these.

³ The order of these headings appears odd to me, but Winter presents no explanation for it.

make the book easier to consult. But it goes without saying that it is not a book suited for perusal: it is a book of reference for the specialized expert, while the non-professional would soon become swamped with the wealth of information.

It is difficult to bestow upon Winter's book the praise it rightly deserves; its merits are too many and varied. There are, of course, issues on which I do not share her views, and there are (of course) some errors and flaws; but I see no reason to list them here.⁴ The really important thing is that Nancy Winter's impressive study has provided us with the tools necessary for further scholarship: a summary of (almost) all early terracottas known up to now, a basic classification of them, and an at least mainly trustworthy chronology. In spite of the rapid pace of contemporary terracotta studies, her book will undoubtedly remain the basis of all work on the subject during the foreseeable future.

Along with her work on the terracotta *corpus*, Nancy Winter has also been active with the publication of special groups of terracottas as, for instance, the clandestine finds from Caprifico (near Cisterna di Latina) and the collections in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek in Copenhagen.

To a great extent, the Copenhagen collection of Etruscan architectural terracottas—presumably the largest one outside Italy—has never been published before. Winter and her co-authors, Jette Christiansen and Patricia Lulof, have strived to attain a form of publication aimed for both the experts and the general public—and have been quite successful in doing so.

The "Foreword" by Christiansen (pp. 7–10) gives a short background of the history and growth of the collection. In the "Introduction" (pp. 11–24), Winter provides a basic account of the various terracotta elements and their decoration, Christiansen, of the painted wall plaques (*pinakes*).

The "Catalogue" (pp. 25–191) presents "roughly 250 more or less joining fragments of architectural terracottas" (p. 7), gathered under 77 catalogue numbers, and about 65 fragments of *pinakes* under eight entries. One catalogue number may refer to a single object or fragment, but it often includes several, more or less closely related ones.

The roof terracottas are arranged, not chronologically, but according to category—mostly (but not entirely) in the order used by Winter in her *corpus*. The most common terracottas are antefixes (nos. 16–52), followed by revetment plaques (nos. 53–67), raking simas (nos. 7–14) and akroteria (nos. 68–74). Chronologically, the terracottas represent

most periods from the late VII to the II century BC, while the fragments of *pinakes* are all dated between 525 and 460. But among the terracottas, too, the one hundred years from 550–450 dominate completely: only eight catalogue numbers are earlier and fourteen younger.

The skewed chronological distribution is, at least partly, due to the extensive acquisitions made by the Museum in 1977–1978—material apparently deriving from clandestine excavations and later "... part of the evidence in a pending lawsuit in Rome against, among others, the art dealer who sold these architectural fragments to the Glyptotek". Christiansen gives a plain and unreserved account of these embarrassing developments and the attempts at finding a solution to the problem satisfactory for both Danish and Italian authorities (pp. 9f.).

The fact is that more than half of the catalogue numbers of roof terracottas (and all those of *pinakes*) belong to these questionable acquisitions. But it is noteworthy that even the rest of the Museum's architectural terracottas (mostly acquired before the First World War) includes pieces of great quality and interest. For instance, parts of the Poggio Buco terracottas have been kept in Copenhagen since 1905 (nos. 15, 53, 54, 58), including the single lateral sima preserved from that site.

Among the sixteen "old" numbers from Caere are, among other things, a rare 4th-century raking sima with open-work cresting (no. 13), a female-head antefix with diadem and particularly well-preserved polychromy dated *c.* 520 BC (no. 24), and a number of terracotta warrior statuettes from an akroterion (no. 74) and two *mutulus* plaques (no. 75). Also worthy of special attention is the "head of a female akroterion statue wearing *tutulus* and diadem" (no. 68)—allegedly coming from Caere, but recently shown to join an akroterion statue (of Ariadne?) from the second temple of Mater Matuta at the Forum Boarium in Rome.

In spite of its total (and deplorable) lack of profile drawings, this catalogue is in many respects a real treat—for its clear presentations of the objects (a more general one to the left, measurements, detailed descriptions of clay and paint, etc., in a separate column to the right), but particularly for the lavish colour photographs illustrating each object. Whatever may happen in the future to the acquisitions of the 1970s, they have been treated here in a most splendid way.

Patricia Lulof's catalogue of architectural terracottas in the Allard Pierson Museum in Amsterdam differs in many respects from the one from Copenhagen. First, it is a strictly scholarly publication and, second, it includes *all* terracottas in the Museum, irrespective of chronological and geographical extraction.

⁴ I am discussing some such mistakes in my forthcoming publication of the Poggio Civitate roof-tiles, and a list of errata is presented by the author herself in the Acta of the "Giornata di studio" arranged around Winter's book at the Università di Roma, La Sapienza in March, 2010: *Tetti di terracotta. La decorazione architettonica fittile tra Etruria e Lazio in età arcaica* (Officina Etruscologia, 5), ed. A. Conti, Roma 2011.

After a general introduction containing the history of the collection and a “guide to the reader” (pp. 6–8), the 88 pieces are presented (each with its own catalogue number). The arrangement is, in the first place, chronological (37 Archaic objects, 36 Classical and Hellenistic, 15 Roman⁵), then subdivided within each period geographically (Asia Minor 12 objects, Greece 2, Magna Graecia 39, Sicily 4, Campania 6, Etruria 10, Italy and Rome 15), and within each geographic region according to roof elements.

When the author maintains that the collections “provide ... an almost complete overview of Archaic and Classical-Hellenistic roof decoration” (p. vii), this is, thus, an exaggeration—a fact that becomes even more obvious when the material is divided according to categories. Of the 88 catalogue entries, all but eight are either antefixes (54) or revetment plaques (26). Nonetheless, by detailed and informative introductions concerning various regions and terracotta elements (including useful *Forschungsberichte*), Lulof manages to tie the book together and produce some kind of total effect.

In any case, the core of the collection (almost half of it) is composed of 41 Tarentine antefixes, 39 of which derive from the private collection of P. Arndt and reached the museum in 1934 via C.W. Lunsingh Scheurleer. Lulof devotes ample space discussing and analysing these antefixes, which constitute a group of considerable scholarly interest (pp. 11–14, 41–44). The earliest fourteen numbers are decorated with various kinds of Gorgoneia (or Medusa heads, as Lulof prefers to call the more “humanized” versions *en vogue* in the Classical period). During the 4th century, they were replaced by a more varied repertory: female heads and male ones with Phrygian or lion-head caps, horned heads of Pan, etc.

The terracottas from Asia Minor consist of one almost complete geison revetment plaque from Düver (no. 1) and eleven small fragments “from the same mould”. The Sicilian and Campanian terracottas are mostly antefixes, the Etruscan fragments are small and insignificant. The most interesting pieces from Central Italy are two large fragments of moulds: one of a shell antefix with female head from South Etruria (no. 36) and the other of a Campanian Gorgoneion antefix framed by tongues (no. 37). Considering the rareness of such roof terracotta moulds, these pieces are of great importance, in particular for their good state of preservation.

Of the fifteen Roman terracottas, eight are “Campana” reliefs: one well-preserved, almost complete plaque from the *Horti Sallustiani* in Rome (no. 74) and seven small fragments. For reasons of personal preferences, I very much appreciate that Lulof has chosen to include (even though in an appendix) the sixteen Roman roof-tiles in the Museum’s possession.

⁵ To which should be added 16 roof-tiles, numbered separately, in an appendix (pp. 93–98).

The problems that have befallen many museums (including the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek) because of the recent, stricter attitude to acquisition of unprovenanced objects of art has affected the Allard Pierson Museum, too: “Some forty items in the Museum’s collection of architectural terracottas [that is, almost half the number of entries in the catalogue] have been acquired on the art market over the last thirty years with unknown provenances” (p. vi). In spite of explicit hesitation, Lulof finally chose to include them in the catalogue. Strong arguments could be raised against her decision, but I still think she acted wisely. Mistakes already made are not remedied by concealing the existence of such objects.

The illustrations are numerous and of very high quality. Fourteen objects are reproduced in colour, all entries in black and white—a large number of them seen from more than one angle: “a front view and a view of the best preserved side (in some cases also a rear view, if advisable)” (p. viii). There are also drawings of all objects (made by the author herself): a vertical section, a rear view, and in some cases a front view, too.⁶

Lulof’s book is in many respects commendable. Its clear arrangement, detailed catalogue entries and lavish illustrations (including profile drawings) could very well serve as a model for a long-felt desideratum: a *Corpus ornamentorum fictilium antiquorum*.

ÖRJAN WIKANDER
Department of Archaeology and Ancient History
Lund University
Box 117
SE-221 00 Lund
orjan.wikander@klass.lu.se

H. Dodge, *Spectacle in the Roman World* (Classical World Series), London/New York: Bristol Classical Press 2011. 99 pp. ISBN 978-1-85399-696-2.

Hazel Dodge’s new book on *Spectacle in the Roman World* forms part of the Classical World Series published by Bristol Classical Press. Over the years, this series has produced a large number of useful introductions to central topics within the Classical field, including, among others, Andrew Wallace-Hadrill’s *Augustan Rome* (1993) and Zahra Newby’s *Athletics in the Ancient World* (2006).

The series aims at presenting accessible guides to key themes in ancient civilisations for late school and early university students. This might seem an easy task, but is in fact no small challenge. To achieve their purpose, these introductions need to be concise but still substantial, basic but also

⁶ The profile drawings of two pan-tiles (fig. 35k–l) are printed upside down.

comprehensive, easily read but not shallow. *Spectacle in the Roman world* manages this balancing act rather successfully, although, as I shall argue, some discussions seem almost too brief and would have benefitted from a somewhat deeper penetration into their arguments and contextualisations.

The book consists of seven short chapters, followed by an appendix, suggestions for further reading, and an index. The introductory chapter, “Approaching Roman spectacle”, briefly presents the diverse sources that give evidence of *spectacula*: archaeological, literary, epigraphic, iconographic, and osteological. Dodge also adds reconstructions and re-enactments as a novel means of testing aspects of spectacles in practice.

The discussion in this first chapter is relevant, as it underlines the types of information that can be extracted from what sources, but I find it too brief. Precisely because of the comprehensive nature of this series, a more substantial introduction would have been helpful. As it stands, the students are not really provided with useful tools to approach Roman spectacles. Also, this would have been the place to define what a Roman spectacle is, what role it played in ancient society and why it is of interest to us today. I also missed a clear statement of the contents of the book: what kinds of spectacles are treated and what kinds are not. Certainly, the format does not allow the author to embrace the variety of performances considered Roman spectacles today. But it would have been relevant to know from the start that theatre plays, mimes, processions, religious festivals and even public orations and dining were spectacles too, but that this overview focuses only on the Roman classics: chariot racing, gladiator fights, animal shows and aquatic displays.

That said, the following chapters provide adequate basic information about the Roman key spectacles. Chapter 2 deals with the circus and chariot racing. Here, Dodge devotes most of the space to the Circus Maximus and to chariot racing in Rome. She also presents some very notable inscriptions that give fascinating information about famous charioteers, and she notes the interesting fact that names of horses appear in the epigraphic evidence, indicating the individual importance of some of the swift steeds. Chapter 3 focuses on gladiators. Here, Dodge presents a range of themes and perspectives such as the possible Etruscan and Samnite origins, the funeral context, different types of gladiators, their equipment and training, gladiatorial graffiti, physical remains of gladiators, women gladiators, and the amphitheatres in Rome and in the eastern Empire. This chapter is the most extensive and informative in the book. In particular, Dodge should be applauded for discussing such a vast variety of sources: buildings, text, relief, and not least the remains of gladiators found in 1993 at Ephesus. This graveyard has preserved thousands of bones of gladiators, mostly male, who died between the ages of twenty

and thirty from their wounds, evidence that provides helpful information about injuries, training and diet.

Chapter 4 treats the animal shows in Republican and Imperial times. Here, as in all chapters, Dodge does not limit her survey to Rome, but includes discussions of spectacles from all around the Empire, a very laudable approach. One important point made here is the role of the army in collecting animals for the shows (p. 56). The short Chapter 5 (only five pages) takes up the *naumachiae*, large-scale enactments of naval battles set in artificial lakes and performed first by Julius Caesar, later by emperors such as Augustus and Titus. Dodge briefly mentions the inflamed debate on whether or not the Colosseum was actually used for water shows, but does not really explain why she thinks that Titus’ show in the amphitheatre, noted by Dio Cassius, is doubtful (p. 65), whereas Domitian’s, mentioned by Suetonius, is not (p. 66). In Chapter 6, Dodge deals with “Spectacle in Late Antiquity”, where she presents a balanced discussion of the role of Christianity in the changes in displays at this time. Finally, Chapter 7, “Roman spectacle: ancient contexts and modern perceptions”, sets the spectacles in their political context. Here, Dodge also addresses public executions as entertainment, along with the social aspects of seating arrangements according to rank. In the final passage, she brings up Hollywood’s modern adaptations of the Roman spectacle. This is a topic very much in vogue that could have been given further attention. The finishing sentence, “All such productions heavily emphasised the bloodlust, cruelty and ‘uncivilised’ nature of Roman culture, with strong moralising and eroticising elements”, leaves the reader with more questions than answers.

The main chapters are followed by an appendix entitled “Roman buildings for spectacle” listing major examples of circuses, theatres, amphitheatres, stadia and *naumachiae*, and also includes drawings. Hereafter follow suggestions for further reading. The recommendations are valuable, although a bit sparse on the most recent works. An index concludes the book.

The book includes some disturbing factual errors. For example, Caecilius Metellus’ triumph showing elephants was held in 250 BC and not in 252 BC as stated (p. 49). Aemilius Paullus’ execution of deserters is not described in Plutarch’s *Life of Aemilius Paullus* 16–23, but by Valerius Maximus (2.7.14) and in Livy’s *Periochae* 51 (p. 49). Dio Cassius does not call Augustus’ *naumachia* a *stagnum* at 55.10.7 (p. 63) and his description of Titus’ aquatic display is in book 66, and not at 46.25.2–4 (p. 65).

The style is fluid and the text is generally accessible, but the arrangement of contents causes occasional difficulties. Dodge has a tendency to jump back and forth between centuries, also in single passages, which at times makes it difficult for the reader to follow her line of argument. I give two ex-

amples: The section entitled “Equestrian sports in Greece and Etruria” (pp. 16–17) devotes half of its space to discussions about Rome, including Caligula and Nero. The beginning of p. 22 takes us in three sentences from Caesar back to Fulvius Nobilior in 186 BC, and then immediately forth to the 6th century AD.

Despite these critical remarks, *Spectacle in the Roman World* provides what the Classical World Series sets out to do, namely, giving beginner students an introduction to a central Roman topic. Its strengths are the inclusion of areas beyond the city of Rome and the discussion of all types of sources. Hopefully, *Spectacle in the Roman World* will encourage students to understand that buildings, texts, archaeological material and inscriptions together can provide a fuller picture of ancient cultural contexts.

IDA ÖSTENBERG
Department of Historical Studies
University of Gothenburg
Box 200
SE-405 30 Göteborg
ida.ostenberg@class.gu.se

Classics and Comics, eds. G. Kovacs & C.W. Marshall, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. 288 pp., 38 figs. ISBN 978-0-19-973419-1.

Reception studies have become an undisputed part of the Classical curriculum during the last decades, and considering the cultural appraisal comics have enjoyed in the very same period, it was only to be expected that the links between comics and Classics would become the focus of scholarly attention sooner or later. And this volume is indeed welcome: as the editors put it in the introduction, “comics represent an important and underexplored corpus of material that reflects popular conceptions of antiquity” (p. vii–ix). This anthology, therefore, sets out to explore how Classical themes are treated in the world of comics. But also, more ambitiously, it aims to explore how comics can actually contribute to our understanding of antiquity.

The anthology consists of four parts, preceded by an introduction where George Kovacs considers the contexts in which comics have developed as a medium and the various ways in which Classical themes are adapted to this medium. Of the following four parts, the first is the most wide-ranging, exploring a number of approaches to the topic of Classics and comics. The two first contributions in this part are the most innovative, as they explore what the world of comics can actually tell us of the ancient world: Gideon Nisbet examines a papyrus from Oxyrhynchus and proposes to read it as a graphic novel, while Kyle P. Johnson approaches the shield of Achilles which is described in Homer’s *Iliad* as a comic strip. Nicho-

las A. Theisen analyses how Classical themes are treated in Japanese manga culture, thereby demonstrating that western readers invest such themes with meaning that may not have been intended. Finally, Brett M. Rogers examines the superhero myth and its links with American comics.

Part two continues on this track and explores the adaptations of mythologies in comics. C.W. Marshall examines how the furies are portrayed and developed mainly in two well-known comics presented by DC Comics, Neil Gaiman’s *The Sandman* and *Wonder Woman*. Craig Dethloff then analyses the development of the American superhero-comics and the changing expectations that these superheroes were supposed to meet; Dethloff makes the interesting observation that the ancient gods, not really “superheroic” in the modern sense of the expression, were difficult to adapt to such expectations and that they were used rather because of “the spirit of aesthetic elegance they conveyed” (p. 114). R. Clinton Simms then examines how one of the most problematic of these gods, Ares, has been portrayed in comics. Simms demonstrates how Ares has become an increasingly complex figure; however, one could have wished that Simms would have delved deeper into the changing concepts of war that have led to the emergence of this more troubled, complex Ares in recent comic adaptations. Finally Benjamin Stevens analyses the interplay between superhero characters and biblical themes in *Kingdom Come*, without specifically analysing Classical mythology, however.

Part three turns from gods to issues of ancient history. Vincent Tomasso discusses references to the Battle of Thermopylae in Frank Miller’s *Sin City* and interprets this reference as an argument that there is no room for “ancient Greek values” in today’s cynical world. Emily Fairey compares the Persians as depicted by Frank Miller in *300* and the Persians as they are rendered in Greek vase painting. Fairey concludes that Miller’s Persians stem from the “supervillain” tradition. However, she could have penetrated more deeply the idea that the portrayal of these “supervillains” may have stemmed from the idea of the battle representing a “clash of civilisations”, an idea recurring through later western cultural history. Anise K. Strong examines the “dream of Augustus” which is a fascinating episode from Neil Gaiman’s *The Sandman* and Martin T. Dinter provides an overview of the idea of Antiquity in the French/Belgian *Les Bandes Dessinées*-tradition.

Part four treats adaption of the myth of Troy to comics. Cartoonist Eric Shanower describes his work with his acclaimed *Age of Bronze* in a “cartoon essay”. This is a pleasant surprise, but of course makes perfect sense in this context. Chiara Sulprizio analyses Shanowers’ decision to leave the gods out of the story and instead put the emphasis on human motivations, more specifically love, eroticism and desire. However one might argue that Sulprizio could have ad-

dressed other topics that seem controversial. For example, is it reasonable to do as Shanower wants to do, and reconcile *all* the versions of the story into one? Are not the different versions parts of the story? Further, does it make sense to place the story, which was so clearly part of a “distant Greek mythological past,” in an archaeologically well-defined Bronze Age? Thomas E. Jenkins, finally, analyses adaptations of the *Odyssey* in the well-known “adult fantasy” magazine *Heavy Metal*.

The volume ends with an extremely helpful section of references. First, there is a list of “Classical comics” most frequently referred to in the anthology and considered most important by the editors. Second, there is a list of other comics that are also of some importance. These are augmented with lists of resources, both in print and digital, on comics and comic-based theory. The book is handsomely printed and edited, and this reviewer could find no apparent typos or errors.

This, truly, is a pioneer work. The contributions explore a wide range of different issues and a variety of methodological approaches, from the sophisticated comics theory employed by Johnson to intertextuality as utilized by Stevens. The volume also outlines a range of topics that await further exploration. This is all to be expected from an anthology that represents a “first” in the field.

However, the reader is also left with an impression of a certain lack of coherence, and that certain discussions could have been taken further. For instance, the different appropriations of the traditions from Classics that seem to be apparent in European *bandes dessinées* on the one hand and American comics on the other, simply beg for analysis. Still, it could be argued that these matters could be taken up in another volume or in a number of volumes where they could be examined in greater detail. But above all one lacks a coherent discussion of “Classics” and comics. A number of contributions end up discussing the links between comics and “culture” or “heritage” in general, never really arriving at the question of what—if anything—is special to the relations between comics and Classics.

There are two further somewhat problematic issues that should be mentioned. The first one is that of illustrations. There is simply too few of them. Frequently this reviewer found himself logging on to Google in order to search for artwork from the comics discussed just in order to get an impression of what the discussions were about. One could argue that if this volume made me curious enough to seek out the comics under discussion for myself, that alone is a success. And it is fully understandable if copyright issues restrict the amount of artwork from various comics that can be reproduced in a volume of this kind. Still, this presents problems, not least as some contributions refer in detail not only to the visual style of the comics under scrutiny but also frequently to individual captions.

The second issue is that of readership. The editors consider their target audience “the capeless classical scholar” (p. 5). One could note that some of the contributions probably work better if the reader has some knowledge of the issues discussed in the individual papers. Above all quite a few of the contributions benefit from at least some acquaintance with the comics discussed. The reader could be expected to have some knowledge of *Asterix*, but it is not so obvious that the he or she is familiar with some of the others, such as Gaiman’s *The Sandman*, a work of great complexity and intricacy, nor is it indeed self-evident that a European reader is familiar with the myriad of US superhero comic characters that pass through the pages of this volume.

Classics and Comics is evidently a labour of love: in the concluding presentation of the contributors, which is written in a congenially light tone, C.W. Marshall writes that he “has been conducting research for this volume since he was eleven”, p. 248). On the whole, enthusiasm shines through. This is a good thing. It is to be hoped that this volume provides a starting point for further research in the field, and that the capeless teachers and researchers in Classics are inspired by it to get acquainted with the field of comics. If this happens, then this volume will indeed be a success.

RAGNAR HEDLUND
Department of Archaeology and Ancient History
Uppsala University
Box 626
SE-751 26 Uppsala
ragnar.hedlund@antiken.uu.se

M. Prusac, *From Face to Face: Recarving of Roman Portraits and the Late-Antique Portrait Art* (Monumenta Graeca et Romana), Brill, Leiden & Oxford 2011. xxii + 202 pp. + 155 plates ISBN: 978-90-04-18271-4.

This book is a significant contribution to the study of Late Antiquity. During the last two decades, immense interest in this period has swept across the various fields of Classical studies and Art history: what is new in Marina Prusac’s (hereafter MP) study is the specific focus on recarving techniques in Late Antique portraiture. MP examines how, and under which historical circumstances, this phenomenon may be explained, and how it influenced the specific style or styles of Late Antique portraiture. In other words, she studies how developments in techniques and style were closely intertwined with social practices. It is argued throughout the book that, whilst earlier 1st and 2nd century AD portraits were usually recarved as a consequence of public memory sanctions *damnatio memoriae*, the recarving of portraits in Late Antiquity must be understood in the wider context of reuse during Late Antiquity, a practice which increased dramatically from

around AD 250. These recarved portraits can only be understood in this particular context of reuse whereby it becomes “possible to identify a connection between recarving methods and Late Antique portrait styles” (p. 10).

The “Introduction” briefly discusses the various kinds of reuse, and stresses that reuse was certainly not a novelty during Late Antiquity, nor the recarving of portraits, attested from ca 100 BC and continuing into the mid-6th century AD. Thus, the catalogue contains what is described as “a representative selection of recarved portraits from the Late Republican period to the 6th century AD” (p. 5). The catalogue is not meant to be complete but, since it includes 508 entries, it would have been useful to know how large a percentage of the known recarved portraits this is.

Chapter 1 is concerned with setting up criteria for identifying recarving on portraits, as well as understanding the phenomenon within the wider context of *spolia* (the reuse of sculpture and architectural members) during Late Antiquity. It is stressed that repairs and larger restoration work are common to all types of sculpture during Late Antiquity, when the sculptural output declined. However, recarving with the purpose of giving a sculpture new identity and new meaning is particularly characteristic to portraits. Contemporary portrait statues were still in demand and the recarving of earlier portraits became the rule rather than the exception with recarving becoming an art in itself and an ideology of power. The recarved portraits often sport abnormal proportions, such as too large eyes, too high forehead, too big ears often placed too high, and a too small or too big mouth. MP gives a highly informed and useful overview of how the decline in sculptural output, from the middle of the 3rd century AD, has been explained in various ways in previous scholarship. She seems inclined to see this decline as a consequence of economic crisis (p. 13). This may well have been the most important factor, but a shift in mentality towards ephemeral performances such as games, instead of monuments in stone, may also have played a role.

Chapter 2 deals with the relationship between recarved portraits and those portraits which were carved from new marble between the 1st and 6th centuries AD. The sampled material, 1592 portraits in total, of which 118 meet the criteria to be classed as “recarved”, consists of portraits published in four collections: the Capitoline Museums in Rome, the Louvre in Paris, the Archaeological Museum in Istanbul and the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek in Copenhagen. The reader is made aware of the problems involved in using such material, including how modern collecting habits may distort the picture. Therefore, these assemblages are tested against the chronological distribution of the recarved portraits in MP’s catalogue and illustrated by four highly informative diagrams. In spite of the insecurity concerning the datings, the tendency

is clear: during period 1, ca 100 BC to AD 235, there are 38 recarved portraits = 0.14% per year; from period 2, 235–284 AD, there are 8 = 0.15% per year; period 3, 284–565 AD, there are 73 = 0.22% per year. Period 3 accounts for 62% of all the recarved portraits, which must be characterized as a significant increase. The reader is informed that recarving is mainly concentrated to Imperial portraits during period 1 and 3, due to *damnatio memoriae* during period 1 and the historical tendencies during period 3 (p. 30) but it would have been useful to have another diagram illustrating this shift in figures.

Chapter 3 provides an overview of the *damnatio memoriae* practice during the 1st and 2nd centuries AD. MP shows that retrospective connections to a former ruler were something which the Romans drew on from the Republic, in particular concerning the reuse of portraits of Alexander the Great. In contrast to for example Carey,⁷ MP is of the opinion that the heads of condemned Emperors were recut in order to completely eliminate the memory of the condemned—unless there was a wish to identify with the sitter of the previous portrait—in which case traces of the former portrait could be left visible. This would prevent the *archetype* (the power associated with the perfect copy i.e. both the Emperor represented and the Imperial institution) from exerting its power (p. 38–39). That, however, leaves open the question as to why the head was not simply removed and replaced with a head of the new Emperor. It remains highly questionable as to whether it was more economical to recarve than to supply a new head. The actual process of recarving the portrait, putting up scaffolding, the noise of the tools striking the marble whilst eliminating the facial features of the condemned, the rededication of the statue etc. must have been more important if the ancient viewer did not even notice afterwards that the portrait had been transformed into a portrait of someone else.⁸

Chapter 4 deals with the 3rd century AD, when recarving increased dramatically. While one might disagree with some of the points made, e.g. the explanation of the so-called crisis in the 3rd century, increase in the number of private portraits being produced (p. 50) or the cause of a change in attitude towards the *archetype* of the portrait (p. 51), the main argument is both very convincing and very important. MP proves that Gallienus was the first Emperor to substantially reuse portraits, including those of “good” Emperors like Hadrian. This was a significant break with earlier traditions.

⁷ S. Carey, ‘In Memoriam (perpetuum) Neronis. “Damnatio Memoriae” and Nero’s Colossus’, *Apollo* July 2000, 20–31.

⁸ C. Vout, ‘The Art of “Damnatio Memoriae”’, in *Un discours en images de la condamnation de mémoire*, eds. S. Benoist & A. Daguët-Gagey, Centre Régional Universitaire Lorrain d’Histoire, Metz 2008, pp. 153–72; on how the condemned could almost feel the blow.

Chapter 5 discusses former interpretations of Late Antique portraiture as psychological, spiritual, metaphysical or plebeian, in the new light of recarving. Recarving is again placed in the context of the general use of spolia and attitudes towards *renovatio memoriae*, conservation and transformative memory and ideology, which are crucial to the understanding of the reuse. The chapter constitutes a convincing attempt to explain the ambiguity in the portraiture of Constantine, as well as how details of Constantinian portraiture—in particular the big eyes—were caused by recarving an earlier portrait (Sketch 1, p. 70). Even if one might disagree with MP as to whether isolated portraits were recarved from earlier portraits or not (cf. CAT 342, 345), the argument that most portraits of Constantine and the successive Emperors were recarved, is absolutely convincing.

Chapter 6 provides insights into the technical aspects of recarving, and Chapter 7 attempts to classify a number of Late Antique recarved portraits into six subgroups, according to specific forms and methods of recarving.

Chapter 8 demonstrates how a distinction between Imperial and private portraiture was kept, even in the reworked portrait. This could be linked with the different *archetypes* of the portraits of the two groups, as suggested by MP. However, if the phenomenon is mainly restricted to Late Antiquity, it may also be explained in the light of the extraordinarily re-

mote and superhuman role which the Emperor held in Late Antiquity, and which may have made reuse across social borders problematic. The chapter also includes interesting observations on the recarving of female portraits. It is suggested that the portraits of female members of a family (Imperial or private) may not have been considered as owners of personal character because of the idealized facial expression, but to what extent “portraits of earlier female members – mothers, sisters and wives” — “could be substituted with portraits of daughters, daughters-in-law and new wives” needs further scrutiny (p. 114). It also remains to be seen whether the stronger expression of verism observed in female portraiture during Late Antiquity should be seen in the light of recarving.⁹

The book shows how changed economic conditions and modifications in technique and style were heavily intertwined, and how these conditions, particularly reuse, were important instigators for the shaping of a new Imperial image and ideology. My only issues are that the text is so packed with information that it is sometimes difficult to follow the main argument, and although the book is lavishly illustrated almost all photos are too dark and some are even unsharp, which is a deficit in a work concerned with technical and stylistic issues. However, this does not distract from its significance as an important and innovative contribution to the understanding of Late Antique portrait styles, and Late Antique art and society.

JANE FEJFER
The SAXO-Institute, Classical Archaeology
University of Copenhagen
80 Njalsgade
DK-2300 Copenhagen S

⁹ K. Schade, *Frauen in der Spätantike – Status und Repräsentation. Eine Untersuchung zur römischen und frühbyzantinischen Bildniskunst*, Mainz am Rhein 2003.