polis/*municipium*/*colonia* had distinct characteristics. Nor does Liebeschuetz accept them as a parasitic institution: town and country were intermeshed, making Liebeschuetz's task more complex. The book has two sections, 'The end of Classical urban politics' and 'A Society transformed'. The main factors and players of the first are post-curial civic government and the rise of the Bishop (most prominent of the 'notables' who succeeded the old authorities), civic finance in the East, and factions. Liebeschuetz exploits the geographical distinction to measure change, although it was partly dictated by the siting of the evidence. Literary testimony gives the East an advantage, and Liebeschuetz finds Anatolia wearing surprisingly badly compared with Syria. The second part brings famous names into court to attest the transformation of Greek literary culture under the influence of Christianity, conflict and disorder, and the beginnings of renewal. In the West the balancing theme is that of citizenship, and, correspondingly, the rise of ethnic solidarity. Here again Liebeschuetz carries readers beyond the worst. This work, the result of intense research, is a synthesis with attitude, pointillist, enthralling.

BARBARA LEVICK

Art and Archaeology

Herodotus 1.68 tells of a blacksmith in Tegea who set about digging a well in his backyard and came across a burial (*soros*) containing the remains of a body some seven cubits tall. Seven cubits (*heptapechys*) translates to some three metres, making this supposed prehistoric ancestor loftier than any of today's lords of the basketball courts. Respectfully, the Tegean blacksmith reinterred the giant bones. But word got out, and the site was revisited: Spartans, eventually, carried off what they deemed to be the relics of their hero Orestes. Before reading Adrienne Mayor's [B]★*The First Fossil Hunters*,[1] I had always taken this story as an example of the Herodotean tendency to exaggerate: in his day, 'six-footers' (*tetrapecheis*) were of sufficiently heroic stature (see Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1014). But the context of the anecdote is now demonstrated, within what Mayor calls 'the ancient bone rush'. Find skeletal parts of mammoths and mastodons, then claim them as objects of cult. We may know of Kimon's foraging for Theseus on Skyros, but that was only one of many such curious finds and missions. On the Troad shoreline, Pausanias relates (1.35.3), locals recovered an enormous frame which they took to be that of the hero Ajax. The patellae or knee-caps of the figure measured exactly the size of the discus for the boys' pentathlon. No need, says Mayor, to treat this too sceptically: that the *boys'* discus is specified gives a tone of fastidious accuracy. In any case, she points out, this part of the Turkish coast has yielded many large mammal remains from the Neogene-Pleistocene period; one of which (the rhinoceros) does typically show a patella about 5 inches in diameter – close, indeed, to the average boys' discus-size. The mix of expertise introduced for this analysis is unusual, and carried off in a sprightly style by Mayor: not only illuminating about the conduct of hero cults, but also making some intriguing connections between Greek mythology and natural history. Palaeontology evidently fascinated Greeks and Romans insofar as it

[1] *The First Fossil Hunters*. Palaeontology in Greek and Roman Times. By Adrienne Mayor. Princeton U.P., 2001. Pp. xx + 361, with black and white illustrations and 7 maps. Paperback £12.95.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.2.258 Published online by Cambridge University Press

served to attest a reality behind the heroic or the fantastic. But only a few Classical minds (some of the Hippocratic authors, and later Lucretius) seem to have wondered about the nature of 'everyday' existence in prehistory (history beginning, conventionally, with the first Olympiad of 776 BC). This is very much an area of modern curiosity, though ironically generated in the first place by Heinrich Schliemann's irrepressible hunting for Bronze Age demigods, not ordinary mortals. Since Schliemann, two prehistoric civilizations, the Minoans and the Mycenaeans, have been substantially identified by archaeological investigation. So what is the present state of our knowledge? B★*Greece Before History*[2] by Curtis Runnels and Priscilla Murray answers that question in a trustworthy and straightforward way. Though both authors have long experience 'in the field', their text is mercifully written with an awareness that it might be perused by students equally unschooled in techniques of excavation and archaeological theory. Simple line drawings are inserted to show, for example, how a flint tool was shaped. On occasion the simplicity extends to the absurd, with a pen-and-ink sketch of a boat bobbing by a promontory accorded the title, 'The Greek countryside'; but at least readers are encouraged to take leave of the library and go to see the sites and artefacts themselves. Key excavations and research topics of recent memory – such as the Stone Age cave at Franchthi in the southern Argolid – are summarized and assessed; but there is no shying away from the traditional questions (why did 'the Mycenaean world' collapse? did Atlantis exist?). Counsel about mosquitoes, noise, snakes and so on is also included; along with a valuable essay about further reading. The name of Vitruvius would not, I suppose, loom up as a Classical mind interested in the primitive past. But in his account of the genesis of the Doric order in architecture Vitruvius was prepared to allow a sort of evolutionary development going back to primal or at least pre-urban habitations. That was his hypothesis, untried by excavation. Has modern archaeology proved him right? Not really, argues Barbara Barletta in her B★★*The Origins of the Greek Architectural Orders*.[3] Vitruvius gave as his first examples of recognizable Doric and Ionic the temples of Hera at Argos and of Artemis at Ephesus respectively. The dates assigned to those temples – later seventh century BC for Argos and around 560–50 BC for Ephesus – can be taken, acording to Barletta, as more or less the beginnings of both orders. The Vitruvian theory that forms of wood preceded and influenced forms in stone is here dismantled, along with most other explanations of foreign influence and prototypical design. (George Hersey's search for a 'lost meaning' of triglyphs and torus mouldings amid ritual practices is given only passing notice). Even the peripteral structure exhibited by the ninth-century 'Heroon' at Lefkandi is reckoned marginal to the story. Principles of monumental construction in stone were devised virtually *ex novo*, according to Barletta, who is also concerned to emphasize the localized, sporadic nature of pre-canonical building. It is true that certain features of the Doric entablature are no less peculiar in wood than their supposed 'petrification' in stone, though how far seventh-century architects were aware of separating 'ornamental' from 'tectonic' elements in their design, we can only speculate. Barletta must be right, however, to stress the appearance of the orders as part of a wider requirement to

[2] *Greece Before History*. An Archaeological Companion and Guide. By Curtis Runnels and Priscilla M. Murray. Stanford U.P., 2001. Pp. xii + 202, with line drawings and black and white illustrations. Paperback £11.95.

[3] *The Origins of the Greek Architectural Orders*. By Barbara A. Barletta. Cambridge U.P., 2001. Pp. xi + 220, with line drawings and black and white illustrations. Hardback £47.50.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.2.258 Published online by Cambridge University Press

make 'statements of Greekness' at sanctuary-sites across the Mediterranean. If we accept the *kouroi as* schematic symbols of 'peer-polity interaction' among the Greek city-states, why not the distinctions of temples too? It is clear enough, at any rate, that a temple made of limestone was perceived more effective as a sacred space than a temple made of wood; and a temple made of limestone would be enhanced or improved if all or parts of it were replaced by marble. A similar logic applied to statues, though with a more elaborate hierarchy of raw materials. In the course of his B★★*Chryselephantine Statuary in the Ancient Mediterranean World*,[4] Kenneth Lapatin does not actually quote the justification once given by the Neo-Platonist Maximus of Tyre, for the Greek practice of shaping divine images from rare substances – that one way of expressing honour to the gods is to fashion their images in 'the earth's loveliest things' (*en ge tois kallistois*) – but this long-awaited monograph surely proves the supremacy of the chryselephantine as a medium. 'I would far rather enter a temple, no matter how small, and behold in it a statue of ivory and gold, than behold one of terracotta and bad workmanship in however grand a setting' says Philostratus in his *Life of Apollonius* (5.22). Lucian (*De Sacrificiis* 11.85) suggests that precious materials were germane to divine epiphany – 'Those who enter the temple see not ivory from India nor gold from Thrace but the real son of Kronos and Rhea translated to earth by Pheidias' – and one would have to continue marshalling such testimonies: because, of the statues considered greatest in antiquity, such pathetic fragments remain. Odd dismembered joints dominate the illustrated section of this book, along with the detritus recovered from the workshop at Olympia where Pheidias made his definitive Zeus. It is probably as well that they are gone, these monuments to so many dead elephants; if we do crave the sight of a colossus overlaid in real gold we shall have to take ourselves to the replica Athena Parthenos projected in Nashville, Tennessee. It was a feature of the Parthenos statue that its 1,137 kilogram cladding of gold was removable; and one reason why it is not inaccurate to describe the Parthenon as 'a huge treasury'. That is the kind of crisp detail to be found throughout John Camp's B★*The Archaeology of Athens*,[5] a survey of the city's ancient history and topography written from the latest archaeological evidence. 'Latest' is a rash word to use there, since preparations for the 2004 Olympic Games are, predictably, bringing fresh discoveries by the week. But the director of American excavations in the Agora is well placed to deliver this unfussy and open-minded Athenian tour, and is thankfully not aloof from using imaginative reconstructions (by Peter Connolly) of how ruins once looked. Certain monuments – for example, the Erechtheion – still leave many questions unanswered; certain periods – such as that of the Peisistratids – have been much illuminated by archaeology. In any case, we are presented with a city whose grandiose projection of itself may have been deceptive (as Thucydides noted): but it was done convincingly, and with conviction too. We can vouchsafe the extent to which one lesser medium of Athenian image-making, painted pottery, continues to wield heavy influence, despite attempts to discount its ancient (and modern) importance. Thomas Mannack's monograph,

[4] *Chryselephantine Statuary in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology. By Kenneth D. S. Lapatin. Oxford U.P., 2001. Pp. xvi + 242, with 3 colour plates and 249 black and white illustrations.

[5] *The Archaeology of Athens*. By John M. Camp. Yale U.P., New Haven, 2001. Pp. xii + 340, with 277 illustrations (some colour). £29.95.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.2.258 Published online by Cambridge University Press

B★★*The Late Mannerists in Athenian Vase-Painting*,[6] argues that one group of fifth-century Athenian craftsmen were self-conscious enough to quote from earlier styles of Attic vase-decoration, and to target specific markets for their wares in the western Mediterranean. Before proceeding to a formal analysis and attributive catalogue of his painters, Mannack gives a useful discussion of what 'Mannerism' generally entails in art historical parlance. It is a predilection for certain tricks of effect, often archaizing; and as such, implies an awareness of 'tradition' in both style and subject-matter. Earlier Athenian vase-painters can seem highly 'mannered' in their output (hence such sobriquets as 'The Elbows-Out Painter' and 'The Affecter'); 'Mannerism' is more strictly a dependence upon the out-moded, not just the predictable. Of the 'early' Mannerists, the Pan Painter is probably best-known. The founder of this later group is Myson, from whom a genealogy is elaborated that includes the Pig Painter, the Academy Painter, *et alii*. Should we balk at such cosy arrangements? Mannack shows no concern about method, not only acknowledging J. D. Beazley's techniques of attribution as 'the most plausible and most vivid', but also conceding his own inability to match Beazley's familiar knowledge of the painters and their production. A more circumspect view of Beazley is taken in Philippe Rouet's B★★*Approaches to the Study of Attic Vases*.[7] This is a comparative historiographical study of two pioneers, Beazley and Edmond Pottier – the latter being the Louvre curator who devised the album series known as the *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum* (CVA). It is true to say that neither Beazley's dense unillustrated lists of vases by painters, nor the CVA's folios of plates organized according to collection, then by shape and type of production, are in today's terms 'user-friendly'. But Rouet's treatment of the rival (and sometimes feuding) scholars is sympathetic and surprisingly engaging. It would seem to be a dusty dry topic, but Rouet pursues biographical and psychological aspects of both men with just sufficient indiscretion to keep us involved without irritation. The respective methods of Beazley and Pottier had one thing in common: neither was disposed to dig for his beloved pots. So neither features in the down-to-earth handbook that is B★*Classical Archaeology in the Field: Approaches*.[8] The authors waste little time in wondering what 'Classical archaeology' is – a debate now gone sterile, though perhaps it ought to have been mentioned – nor do they alert young readers to the main prerequisite for becoming a Classical archaeologist these days, which is what it was a century ago: the possession of independent means, or else indifference to poverty. That (jaded) caveat apart, one can only salute the practicality of this affordable paperback, which offers a briefing about the entire entire excavation process, from fund-raising (the most laborious task of all), through survey, trench-types, recording and publication. It is aimed at the apprentice, but may also serve inept technicians who learn how to use a theodolite one year – only to have quite forgotten it by the following summer. *Credite mihi*.

NIGEL SPIVEY

[6] *The Late Mannerists in Athenian Vase-Painting*. Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology. By Thomas Mannack. Oxford U.P., 2001. Pp. xviii + 153, with 64 black and white plates. £60.00.

[7] *Approaches to the Study of Attic Vases: Beazley and Pottier*. Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology. By Philippe Rouet. Oxford U.P., 2001. Pp. xii + 167, with 21 black and white plates. £50.00.

[8] *Classical Archaeology in the Field*. Approaches. Classical World Series. By L. Bowkett, S. Hill, Diana and K. A. Wardle. Bristol Classical Press, 2001. Pp. ix + 138, with line drawings and black and white illustrations.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.2.258 Published online by Cambridge University Press