the usual topics, but I should have welcomed a more dynamic account of the *Quinquennium*. (Nero, as the author points out, threatens to retire to Rhodes, but why Rhodes, if not in emulation of the high-principled constitutionalist Tiberius? There were issues at stake.) In spite of stemma, 'timeline', map of the Empire, adequate illustrations, brief bibliography, and index, the hardback at least is over-priced. S. Burstein's equally attractive-looking ⋆*The Reign of Cleopatra*[18] tackles a subject both inflammatory and haphazardly documented. Following the series pattern, he takes the only possible course: treating it in short segments. Hence mixed impressions. We have a Chronology, a basic narrative of Ptolemaic Egypt (Burstein goes beyond the boundaries of his title), and of Cleopatra herself; then thirty pages on how the country worked, multiculturalism, and Alexandria, its culture and conflicts. There is much for the student here. The concluding chapter, 'Queen and symbol', attempts a contrast between conventional views and Burstein's own view, but it is not very clear, and the page on 'black' Cleopatras seems timorous and unfocused. Burstein then offers sketches of sixteen prominent persons, including deities (repetition was inevitable). Sixty-one pages of translated documents follow (largely Caesar, Plutarch, papyri), some from ancient Loebs ('But if thou dost not like the thing . . .'); next a helpful glossary and bibliography, with critical comments; finally a sprinkle of notes. The book serves a purpose, including helping 'student research', but it is not as tightly built, nor as well written, as it should be. Perhaps there may be a second edition. Meanwhile: 'Before this day it had been wrong to bring our Caecuban froth from ancient bins'. Discuss.

doi: 10.1017/S0017383506000349 BARBARA LEVICK

[18] *The Reign of Cleopatra*. By Stanley M. Burstein. Greenwood Guides to Historic Events of the Ancient World. Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut, and London, 2004. Pp. xxiv + 179, with 2 maps, 10 plates. Hardback.

Art and Archaeology

Between the end of 2003 and early 2005, museum-goers were subjected to a shocking experience. It was a travelling exhibition hosted in Munich, Copenhagen, and the Vatican. The purpose of the show was to make clear to the general public a feature of ancient art often overlooked: namely, the fact that Greek and Roman sculpture was originally painted – moreover, it is evident, painted in extremely bright or 'loud' colours. Anyone who did not suffer the direct trauma of seeing a cast of the Prima Porta Augustus arrayed in red and blue, complete with cinnabar hair and scarlet lips, is now obliged to seek out the volume of essays now published on behalf of the Vatican Museums, entitled *I colori del bianco.*[1] The paradox embedded in that title is eloquent enough: we generally see Classical statues as shiny white objects, and easily forget (if we were ever aware) the polychrome gaudiness these statues once possessed. J. J. Winckelmann is often reckoned as the authority who in the late eighteenth century 'canonized' the notion that the surface of ancient marble was finished to a cold, translucent white, compounding his aesthetic regard for the 'noble simplicity' achieved by Praxiteles *et al.* But the habit of appreciating carved marble for the sake of

[1] *I colori del bianco. Policromia nella scultura antica*. Edited by Paolo Liverani. Rome, De Luca Editore, 2004. Pp. 356, with 458 illustrations.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383506000350 Published online by Cambridge University Press

its own texture, whether polished or rough, had already been fostered by Michelangelo and others during the Italian Renaissance. The production of Neo-Classical statuary by the likes of Canova and Thorvaldsen only confirmed the habit. This meant that when the French antiquarian Quatremère de Quincy surmised, on the basis of ancient texts, that colour had once been used on Classical sculpture, his theory (published in *Le Jupiter Olympien*, 1814) seemed radically 'nouveau'. But archaeologists were at least alerted to the precaution of examining newly-excavated finds for traces of pigment prior to having them cleaned; and throughout the nineteenth century, the evidence of ancient paintwork accumulated. The Prima Porta Augustus, discovered in 1863, might be explained as some Roman elaboration of the Classical ideal. But watercolour studies of the *korai* recovered from the Athenian Akropolis in the mid-1880s made it undeniably clear that the precedents for bright colouring were established in the Archaic period. Even the pedimental ensembles of the Parthenon were allowed to carry traces of 'Pheidian brushstrokes' – and were originally placed, it was conceded, in an architectural structure that was itself throbbing with rich hues. Over a century later, however, the knowledge of coloured originals remains something of a distasteful secret. So it is that the various scholars contributing to this collection of essays and case-studies regarding ancient polychromy are united by a somewhat polemical zeal for setting the record straight. In a sense, it ought to be easy enough to persuade us that sculpture is improved by colour: after all, our most popular painters today – Van Gogh and the Impressionists—are those who were unrestrained about using colour to express form. But there is no doubt that we nevertheless find it difficult to sympathize with the aesthetic effects created by reapplying polychromy to casts of Classical sculpture. And beyond that, there remain some doubts regarding the norms of ancient practice. If a marble surface were regularly overlaid with pigment – so that even a nude Venus would be covered in a 'glaze' of white lead – why do Greek and Roman poets like to apostrophize the purity of Parian marble as a likeness to the complexion of a desirable female? And if, as it is argued, bronze statues were also painted, then why might certain facial components – such as lips – be crafted out of different metals, such as copper? For that matter, why go to the trouble of finding glass paste for inlaid eyes? The literature of ancient appreciation for the materials of sculpture is sufficient to indicate that the substance of a statue was important in the eyes of viewers: not only gold and ivory in the case of chryselephantine statues, but marble preferred to other stones, and certain quarry-sources of marble held in particular esteem. Such esteem could only flourish if at least some sculpture were once displayed as Winckelmann would have wished – unadorned by paint.

Another exhibition has left its mark on our understanding of the practicalities of Classical art. At its centre was a tattered piece of papyrus – not much, on the face of it, to excite public attention. But the impresarios of this show at Turin's Palazzo Bricherasio in the spring of 2006 ingeniously gathered around the papyrus a collection of related artifacts which made for an illuminating visit, whose didactic value is perpetuated by the accompanying catalogue, *Le tre vite del Papiro di Artemidoro.*[2] If the papyrus looks battered and torn, it has a right to do so, for it was first used (in late Ptolemaic Alexandria) to transcribe some of the geographical treatises of Artemidorus of Ephesus – a major source for

[2] *Le tre vite del Papiro di Artemidoro. Voci e sguardi dall'Egitto greco-romano.* Edited by Claudio Gallazzi and Salvatore Settis. Milan, Electa 2006. Pp. 327, illustrated throughout.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383506000350 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Strabo—along with an illustrative map. This map was never finished; and so the parchment ended up not in a library, but in some artist's workshop, as potentially useful scrap material. Here the *verso* became a sort of sketchbook: first exploited to assemble a graphic menagerie of animals, ranging from the exotic (giraffes, flamingos) to the fabulous (a gryphon), which may have been used as a repertory for mosaic-makers and their patrons. Subsequently, remaining spaces on *recto* side of the papyrus were evidently used for apprentice draughtsmanship – studies of heads, hands and feet, probably made from plaster cast models. 'It was a tremendous moment in the history of art when, perhaps a little before 500 B.C., artists dared for the first time in all history to paint a foot as seen from in front.' This judgement, from E. H. Gombrich's *The Story of Art*, serves to invest the Artemidorus papyrus with its art-historical importance. Absolute first evidence of a foreshortened foot does indeed come from early Athenian red-figured vase-painting, in the output of the so-called 'Pioneers' – Euthymides, Euphronios *et al.* But here in Graeco-Roman Egypt we find confirmation of the entire Classical ideal of what artists should be trained to do. Anyone who has tried representing the human form in two dimensions knows very well that hands and feet are difficult parts of the body to 'get right', especially when foreshortened. It takes practice. 'Draw, draw, and don't waste time', as Michelangelo chided one of his pupils. One can almost hear the same advice echoing from this precious relic in Turin. If we had the 'notebooks' of Pheidias, no doubt those too would be filled with similar exercises. But about Pheidias and the methods of his art we are destitute of any direct evidence—beyond the marvellous end result. Intuitively, we recognize that the coalition of Pheidias and Perikles in mid-fifth century Athens was a coming-together of time, place, and personality that proved extraordinarily productive. Plutarch probably relied on more than intuition to inform his evocation of a 'dream-team' at work on the Athenian Akropolis – but as to the programmatic meaning of what these masterminds devised, we can only speculate. And inevitably, when we speculate, there is the temptation to construct some 'spirit of the age', or *Zeitgeist*, which might in turn provide telepathic access to the thoughts and intentions of Pheidias. Such historical method is usually associated with Hegel and the nineteenth century. But it was in 1972 that Jerome Pollitt of Yale University presented his version of it, in a book which has been steadily used by undergraduates ever since. Pollitt's *Art and Experience in Classical Greece* set out to explore 'some of the basic cultural experiences which the arts were used to express' in the Classical period. So Pheidias, for Pollitt, joins Sophocles in giving 'witnessable form' to the ideology of Perikles (primarily as voiced in his Funeral Oration). Now a *festschrift* for Pollitt, *Periklean Athens and its Legacy*,[3] pays tribute to Pollitt's influence in refocusing scholarly attention upon the cultural history of Greek (and Hellenistic) art, and departing from the sort of analysis of formal style favoured by, for example, Rhys Carpenter (to name its most eloquent exponent). There are several stimulating contributions to this honorific volume, making appropriate links between Athenian imagery and Athenian politics, rhetoric, literature, and cult practice. But a concluding essay, composed as an appraisal of the impact and influence (for better or worse) of Pollitt's *Art and Experience*, inadvertently highlights the generic risks of all attempts to define the 'temper' of an 'epoch', or Hegelian 'Spirit of the Age'. For I discover

[3] *Periklean Athens and its Legacy. Problems and Perspectives.* Edited by Judith M. Barringer and Jeffrey M. Hurwit. University of Texas Press, Austin 2005. Pp. xix + 306, with black and white illustrations.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383506000350 Published online by Cambridge University Press

something entirely new to me: that there is, in transatlantic perception, a 'Cambridge Culture' of Classical archaeology, a 'school' of theorists committed to 'a fundamentally ahistorical' method of explaining the styles and artifacts. Whitley, Shanks, Osborne, Spivey *et al.*, here presented as a coterie of conspirators, may have it in common that they once studied in the Classics Faculty Library at Cambridge, and more or less at the same time. But I am not sure which of us would be the more horrified at any suggestion of intellectual concord and joint enterprise—let alone mutual respect.

doi: 10.1017/S0017383506000350 NIGEL SPIVEY

Religion

Almost all of this year's books deal with Greek religion and myth, reminding one both of the field's apparently unlimited openness to re-interpretation, and of its ability to capture imaginations, not least among the young. Only one of them, however, is by an English scholar; and she is not only of an older generation but has spent many years of her working life in the United States. This absence is of course in a sense fortuitous; but may also prompt one to reflect on David Martin's question in his recent *On Secularization: Towards a revised general theory* (2005): with the advance of a consumer ethos mainly interested in measurable utility, are the universities in Britain ceasing to be bases for a diffuse humanism? Corinne Pache (now at Yale), who is already known for her translation of Nicole Loraux' *Les mères en deuil* (1998), was alerted to the potential interest as a dissertation topic of a neglected area, hero-cults of (small) children. Despite the considerable attention devoted lately to the cults of (adult) heroes, most people would indeed be hard put to name even one such cult apart from Mermeros and Pheres, the sons of Medea, at Corinth, of Melikertes-Palaimon at the Isthmus nearby, and Pelops at Olympia.[1] In order to give the book some argumentative coherence, she has however been rather selective. One will find no reference here to the 'boy kings' of Amphissa identified with the Dioscuri, and later with the Cabiri (Paus. 10.38.7), nor to the sons of Trophonius at his oracle-site at Lebadeia (Paus. 9.39.5), nor to Patreus and his two sons at Patrae, all three represented as young boys (Paus. 8.20.7), nor even to Sosipolis at Olympia, the mysterious baby who metamorphosed into a snake and saved the Eleans from the Arcadians (Paus. 6.20.4f.). Instead, Pache concentrates on seven relatively well-known mythic cases of pre-pubertal children, usually killed by some form of transgressive violence, who received posthumous cult as heroes: the children of Medea and Heracles (victims of their own parents' violence), Linus and Demophon (failed immortalization), and the three cults associated with pan-hellenic games, Pelops, Melikertes-Palaemon, and Opheltes-Arcemorus at Nemea. These are, I think, tacitly understood by her as the three major modes of child-heroization. She rightly sees Brelich's *Gli eroi greci* (1958) as a decisive break with the older discourses of *biothanatoi* (Pfister), chthonic powers aligned with the Cabiri (Nilsson, *Griechische Feste*, p. 213: not cited by Pache), or cults of a mother-goddess with two children (W. R. Halliday: again not cited by her), and inclines to favour his model of initiation-rite. One of her main concerns, in the manner established by Franz Brommer and Timothy Gantz, is to combine literary

[1] *Baby and Child Heroes in Ancient Greece*. By Corinne Ondine Pache. University of Illinois Press, 2004. Pp. x + 234. £24.95.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383506000350 Published online by Cambridge University Press