

would have benefited from M. M. Willcock's 'The funeral games for Patroclus', *BICS* xx (1973) 1–11. In general P. is not at his best in handling literary evidence; he ignores the possibility that Homer's stylised accounts of boxing and wrestling in *Il.* 23 may in some ways not be true to life, e.g. when Epeios after defeating Euryalos decorously puts him back on his feet (*Il.* 23.694–5) and in the decorous wearing of loincloths.

P. has written an easily digested introduction to Greek boxing, wrestling and pankration, but the lack of either any central thesis (he might have gone into the role of ancient sport as an outlet for aggression) or full discussion of interesting problems has strangled a book that could have packed a weightier punch.

STEPHEN INSTONE

Institute of Classical Studies, London

EISEMAN (C. Jones) and RIDGWAY (B. Sisondo) **The Porticello shipwreck: a Mediterranean merchant vessel of 415–385 B.C.** (Nautical archaeology series, 2.) College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1987. Pp. xii+126, numerous illus. (incl. plates, text figs, maps, plans). \$89.50.

This is a model publication in many ways. It is beautifully produced and printed, with excellent plans and illustrations, and, above all, while not shirking conjecture and conclusion, it sets out clearly and in detail the evidence upon which any conjecture and conclusion must be based. Unless further material turns up, looted from the site before proper investigation could take place, the present volume would seem to provide what any serious student requires to make up his or her own mind about the finds.

There was too little left of the ship itself to add materially to our knowledge of classical merchant vessels. She seems to have been between 16 and 17 metres long, and perhaps of about 30 tons burden (pp. 13 & 108), carvel-built in the normal classical manner. The only unusual remains of the actual vessel were a unique cleat (p. 12, fig. 2–4, and p. 16), and a possible anti-luffing toggle (cf. p. 16, figs. 2–10 & 2–11, and pp. 16–17). There is no clear indication where she came from, or what her destination was, though the cargo carried suggests she was headed for a port or ports in the western Mediterranean (pp. 109–13).

There are likely to be two principal areas of controversy. First, the date of the wreck: E. (p. 33) dates it to 'around the year 400 B.C., with a margin of perhaps ten or fifteen years on either side', on the basis of the lamps, bolsals and cup-skyphos associated with it. Here the bolsals are crucial, and it is possible that E.'s date for them is too low: closer parallels, perhaps, than the one she cites (p. 28), are those found in the Rheneia purification pit, giving a *terminus ante quem* of winter 426/5 (cf. Thucydides 3.104.1–2; C. Dugas, *Les vases attiques à figures rouges, Délos 21* [Paris 1952], pl. lii, nos. 167 & 168; D. W. J. Gill, *The international journal of nautical archaeology and underwater exploration* xvi/2 [1987], 31–3). Moreover, a date in the early 420s might be better for the lamps, with their comparatively thin walls and base, and, indeed, for the cup-skyphos (cf. p. 29). An earlier date, finally, would mean that there would be no problem about how the cargo of the Porticello ship came to contain lead from Laurion at a

time when the mines there were possibly closed down (cf. pp. 59–60).

The second area of controversy, of course, concerns the bronzes. R., largely on the basis of the extremely abundant facial hair and other features of the head, tentatively suggests that they come from a group depicting 'Chiron and the young Achilles, perhaps also in the presence of Peleus and other youthful charges' (p. 106). Here it might have been easier for the reader to follow the argument if a sketch of the proposed reconstruction had been included, but the suggestion is an attractive one, though if it is correct, one might have expected some fragments, at least, of the centaur's equine parts to have survived. It is also worth noting that R. dates the bronzes earlier than E.'s date for the wreck, and then finds it a problem that 'their watery burial might have occurred as much as twenty-five years after their manufacture' (p. 103). However, if the wreck in fact dates to the 420s, this would be less of a problem.

It is still, however, something of a puzzle how a group of bronze statuary came to be included in a cargo alongside jars of wine and salt-fish, lead ingots and ink (cf. pp. 37–62). R. could find no evidence of intentional dismantling of the figures, except for signs that one of the feet (S7/8) might have been removed from a stone base (cf. pp. 98–9), and this would suggest that the bronzes were not being transported as scrap metal, though they might have been in the process of being moved to a new location; if so, they might have been acquired as loot. If they were new, and did all form part of one group, they would have been very valuable, and must, presumably, not only have been commissioned, but have been destined for a wealthy buyer (cf. pp. 11–(2), whether private or public. If so, it would seem possible that they formed the principal item of the ship's cargo, while the rest was merely carried to fill up space.

The authors thus display a commendable caution throughout, and yet contrive to squeeze an immense amount of information from such scant remains: it is this kind of painstaking analysis which is slowly enabling us to come to a better understanding of trade in the classical world.

J. F. LAZENBY

University of Newcastle upon Tyne

LEMBA LAKKOUS. **Excavations at Lemba Lakkous, 1976–1983.** By E. J. Peltenburg and others. (Lemba archaeological project, 1: studies in Mediterranean archaeology, 70:1.) Göteborg: Åström, 1985. Pp. xxv+332, [51] plates, 86 text figs. (some folding). Price not stated.

Since 1976, the excavations of the Lemba Archaeological Project at a group of sites situated around the villages of Lemba and Kissonerga have considerably increased the material evidence for the prehistory of southwestern Cyprus, and at the same time have greatly enhanced our historical understanding of the late Neolithic and Chalcolithic periods in the island. This volume is meant to be the final report on the first site excavated, Lemba Lakkous. It is edited by the Director of the Lemba Archaeological Project; besides the sections written by Peltenburg himself, there is a considerable number of specialised contributions by

scholars working at Lemba (D. Baird, A. Betts, S. Colledge, P. Croft, C. Elliott, T. Lawrence, D. Lunt, K. Nicklasson, J. Renault-Miskovsky, J. Ridout Sharpe, E. Slater, J. Steward, P. Xenophontos).

Two short introductory chapters discuss the setting of the site and its chronology (c. 3500–2400 B.C.). The bulk of the volume consists of a very detailed and highly technical description and analysis of the structures and burials recovered as well as of the related finds, including the remains of fauna and plants. The ceramic evidence and the artefacts are amply documented by both drawings and photographs (the last ones, unfortunately, not always of the highest quality).

The publication provides the reader with a wealth of new and pertinent information, although it is not always very easy to use. This is due not only to the (unavoidable) separate treatment of the two excavated areas, but sometimes also to the difficulty—admittedly met with very often in similar reports—of connecting the illustrations and descriptions of the same object.

In general, this final report is comprehensive, but not complete. On the one hand, as the editor himself points out in the preface, a report of this type (encompassing e.g. ca. 3 million pottery sherds) must necessarily be selective. On the other hand, a definitive appreciation of the data recovered at Lemba and thus a full understanding of the site will only be possible in the context of other contemporary sites and surveys—an analysis promised for volume 3 of the series. Yet despite such minor criticism, the importance of the report on Lemba Lakkous should be stressed again: it not only provides new material, but also opens up new vistas in the exploration of economy and society in Chalcolithic Cyprus.

F. G. MAIER

University of Zürich

BARBER (R. L. N.) **The Cyclades in the Bronze Age.**

London: Duckworth, 1987. Pp. xviii + 283, 168 illus. (incl. plates, text figs, maps, plans). £28.00.

GETZ-PREZIOSI (P.) **Sculptors of the Cyclades: individual and tradition in the third millennium**

B.C. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press (in association with J. Paul Getty Trust), 1987. Pp. xxii + 254, [61] plates (11 col.), 52 text figs. \$65.00.

The archaeology of the Cyclades is, like their tourism, in a boom period (though each has profited from the other less than one might have hoped). The extent and variety of the field-work carried out during the past quarter-century has begun to be matched by the flow of publications, ranging from definitive excavation reports and specialised monographs to collections of papers and (at last!) a synthesis of the whole. Most are aimed specifically at fellow-archaeologists, leaving the non-specialist ill served. The two books under review are thus especially welcome. Though Barber requires of his readers prior knowledge of the Aegean Bronze Age, informed undergraduates can benefit from it quite as much as scholars with some expertise. Getz-Preziosi successfully aims at a much wider readership than the purely academic.

Given the circumstance that the major settlements which have furnished the bulk of the stratigraphic and architectural evidence for the Cycladic Bronze Age are

still only partially published, it required courage to attempt a synthesis. B. is better equipped than most to undertake the task, though his perverse (his own word) refusal to consult others has led to some misconceptions which might have been avoided: assigning to Late Cycladic III the incorporation of the water-supply into the fortifications at Ayia Irini, for example; or asserting that the canonical marble female figurines stand (as, indeed, they are usually exhibited), while G.-P. argues strongly for a reclining position. Such lapses are rare, however, in a well-researched and up-to-date (to 1984) book which covers two millennia in an admirably clear and well-organised fashion.

The decision not to seek help from others no doubt derived from the sense of isolation which Barber patently feels. Affirming his own view that 'the objectives of the archaeologist should be primarily historical', he throws down the gauntlet to proponents of modern archaeological theory and their attempts 'to fabricate for themselves an independent discipline from a hotch-potch of materials and methods which are more constructively employed within the individual fields of study to which they more properly belong' (24).

From the sidelines, one may sympathise with the spectacle of a traditionalist rounding on those at whose hands he has probably experienced the sort of contemptuous arrogance which is, unfortunately, the stock in trade of some. Certainly one must applaud his honesty in making his bias so plain. From the start, the reader knows exactly where he is (and some may stop reading right there). It is a great pity that similar sentiments creep into the text at intervals, colouring what is otherwise a conscientiously balanced account. Dislike of Renfrew's terminology has led B. to underestimate his contributions to Early Cycladic studies. The accusation that another scholar 'projects the expectations of a modern mind onto an ancient situation' (118) comes dangerously close to the pot calling the kettle black. Some useful new terms are sacrificed in the studied avoidance of all jargon. More seriously, B.'s exhortation not to neglect the study of contemporary landscape and way of life pays scant tribute to such investigations on Melos, and entirely overlooks the recent (admittedly unpublished) work on Kea.

Much of this is clearly deliberate, perhaps intended to enrage. It is sad that the author has felt sufficiently provoked to include such lapses from scholarly impartiality in what is designed to be—and surely will become—a standard text and an indispensable work of reference. Fortunately, they are relatively infrequent, and are more than counterbalanced by one of the book's great strengths: difficult problems, particularly chronological ones, are never shirked. Not that one is usually left in any doubt of B.'s own position. Theories he abhors (Rutter's 'gap', for instance) are consigned to the footnotes, while his own controversial bipartite division of Early Cycladic III occupies the main text. But there are no grounds for complaint, when the alternatives are fully and fairly presented. At his best, as in his discussion of the question of Minoan colonisation of the islands, or that of the relationship of the eruption of Thera to other events in the Aegean, he presents as thorough, fair and sensible an account as any this reviewer has seen.

Although much has been written about the Early Cycladic period, and the splendours of Thera have helped to focus attention on Late Cycladic I/II, nobody