

There are some useful themes that are fundamental to the success of this book. Most importantly is the fact that many of the authors embrace different types of data and techniques rather than single methods. As a result, the papers often illustrate the integration of ideas and data that is increasingly commonplace in all archaeology. While there are examples of processing or corrections that can only be done on particular data types, I like the fact that blending and combining data is not regarded as complicated but a routine that we could all master.

Returning to the title of the volume, I suggest that the title may under-sell the content. The papers represent a snap-shot of good practice expressed around excellent case studies; the fact that the case studies are largely Mediterranean based means that the techniques are better focussed for this audience than, for example, Cowley (2011). I would, however, turn to Cowley's volume if I wanted inspiration from other parts of Europe. As some of the papers are reviews of applications I would think that I would look elsewhere for detailed information on good practice. The EAC guidelines (Schmidt et al 2015) would be useful to read alongside this volume.

Although there are a few minor typographic errors the papers are generally easy to read. This will help enormously in the editor's stated aim for archaeologists and cultural heritage professionals to integrate the techniques into the own research. There will be few archaeologists who will not benefit from dipping into this volume.

- Cassidy, N.J. 2009. Ground Penetrating Radar Data Processing, Modelling and Analysis, in H.M. Jol (ed.) *Ground Penetrating Radar: Theory and Applications*: 141–176. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Cowley, D. (ed.) 2011. *Remote sensing for archaeological heritage management in the 21st century*. Europae Archaeologiae Consilium.
- Gaffney, C., C. Harris, F. Pope-Carter, J. Bonsall, R. Fry and A. Parkyn 2015. Still searching for graves: an analytical strategy for interpreting geophysical data used in the search for 'unmarked' graves. *Near Surface Geophysics*, 13(6): 557–569.
- Ruffell, A. and S. McAllister 2015. A RAG system for the management of forensic and archaeological searches of burial grounds. *International Journal of Archaeology. Special Issue: Archaeological Sciences* 3: 1–8.
- Ruffell, A. and J. McKinley 2008. *Geoforensics*. Hoboken (NJ): Wiley and Sons.
- Schmidt, S., P. Linford, N. Linford, A. David, C. Gaffney, A. Sarris and F. Fassbinder 2015. *EAC Guidelines for the Use of Geophysics in*

Archaeology: Questions to Ask and Points to Consider. Europae Archaeologia Consilium.

CHRIS GAFFNEY
UNIVERSITY OF BRADFORD
C.Gaffney@bradford.ac.uk

Peter Schultz and Ralf Von den Hoff (eds). *Structure, Image, ornament: architectural sculpture in the Greek world*. (Proceedings of an international conference held at the American School of Classical Studies, 27–28 November 2004). pp. vi+238, 178 b/w illustrations. 2009. Oxford and Oakville: Oxbow. ISBN 978-1-84217-344-2 hardback \$80.

Greek (and Roman) architectural sculpture has frequently suffered reductive treatment from scholars. Either it has been broken up into stand-alone artworks divorced from their original display-contexts and studied only for what they can tell us of the development of style and subject, or it has been treated as ancillary to the building, or, in the case of temples, preparatory to the worshipper's experience of the statue inside.¹ This is in part a matter of historiography: the removal and display by Grand Tourists of sculptural features such as the Parthenon and Bassai friezes only encourages this kind of looking. It is also in part a matter of logistics: architectural sculpture was always hard to see, and the use of photography to aid its modern study not only separates the sculpture from its setting even further but also magnifies and flattens it, transforming a three-dimensional object into a two-dimensional picture. But this is not all. The flipside to study that does not take the physical context of architectural sculpture seriously is work on ancient buildings that similarly fails to give consideration to their sculptural decoration. For example, in his *The Complete Greek Temples*, Tony Spawforth gives only slight attention to the sculpture used to adorn temple-facades, giving no more than a description of its form and characteristic subject-matter.² Mark Wilson Jones's recent *Origins of Classical Architecture* gives no attention to figurative sculpture.³ Added to this the fact that the iconography of architectural sculpture is typically so standardised as to belie specific significance, or else, in some cases, so enigmatic as to evade certain identification, and it can be hard to know what, if anything, it is trying to tell us.

¹ For an overview of the scholarship, see Osborne 1987.

² Spawforth 2006.

³ Wilson Jones 2014.

REVIEWS

The field, however, is starting to change. Robin Osborne and Richard Neer have already done much to restore agency to Greek architectural sculpture, both thinking carefully about the ancient viewer's experience of looking, emphasizing the particular importance of physical context alongside style, form, material, and subject-matter, in order to comprehend the way in which architectural sculpture communicated meaning, as well as questioning what that meaning might have been.⁴ The volume under discussion here is a welcome complement to their work. *Structure, Image, Ornament* is a collection of 16 essays, nine of which were given as papers at a conference hosted in Athens in 2004 by the American School of Classical Studies, Athens and the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Athens, the aim of which was, in the editors' words, to 'discuss problems specific to this sub-field' of Greek art (v). In so doing, it raises—but does not always answer—important questions about the making, viewing, and interpretation of both the figurative and ornamental elements (e.g. Corinthian capitals as discussed by David Scahill) used to decorate buildings in the Greek world, and does much to redress and reinvigorate the subject.

The strengths of the volume rest in the range of monuments covered, from archaic Greece to Roman Ephesos, and the combination of papers offering different approaches, from the presentation of empirical data, to the development of original interpretations of subject-matter, then to more programmatic discussion of how to read architectural sculpture as a whole; this makes it a valuable resource for scholars and students alike.⁵ Most contributors propose new interpretations of familiar monuments in an attempt to do what Joan Connelly has recently done with the Parthenon frieze, for the most part offering close-grained readings of individual works.⁶ For example, Peter Higgs examines the sculptured coffers from the temple of Athena Polias at Priene, proposing a second- rather than fourth-century BC date for their production and thus indicating two phases of construction for the temple; Katherine Schwab addresses the subject of the Parthenon's east metope 14, identifying it as Helios emerging from the sea, driving a four-horse chariot rather than a *biga* as previously assumed; and Ifigenia Leventi argues that the frieze from the temple of Poseidon at Sounion depicted a Gigantomachy together with scenes from Theseus's adventures in Crete, rather than the generally accepted Kalydonian boar hunt.

Several, though not all, of the contributors push hard at the implications of their interpretations. Notably, Judith Barringer advances a new reading of the east frieze of the Hephaisteion in Athens, arguing that it represents the defeat of the inhabitants of Atlantis by the Athenians. This allows Barringer to place the frieze within a unified decorative programme that presented myths about the autochthonous Athenians and the early history of their city, together with scenes from the myths of Theseus and Herakles, thus bolstering a sense of Athenian citizen-identity and projecting virtues 'appropriate to a civic elite' (112). Central to Barringer's interpretation is careful thinking about the location of the temple and its close proximity to the seats used in the Athenian law-court, and the consequent prioritisation of scenes according to specific sightlines. She does, however, concede that there are no iconographic parallels for the Atlantis myth, which is generally thought to have been invented by Plato;⁷ this need not be a problem, though her argument would benefit from more supporting evidence.

Ralf von den Hoff similarly demonstrates the ways in which the decoration of the Athenian Treasury at Delphi makes Theseus the equal to Herakles, aligning Athenian identity with panhellenic ideals as a means of negotiating Athens' prestige on an international stage. Most compelling is Helen Westervelt's suggestion that, despite Pausanias's identification,⁸ the west pediment of the temple of Zeus at Olympia does not show the battle between the Lapiths and Centaurs but in fact represents the Elean Centauromachy, with Herakles as its main protagonist (identified as figure K, usually thought to represent the Lapith hero, Kaineus). Although figure K lacks Herakles's usual attributes of lion-skin, club, and beard, Westervelt is right to point out that this is also true of his depiction on many of the metopes from the temple, as well as in other contemporaneous media (147). If her reading is correct, the temple's presumed sculptural programme is thus recalibrated, offering a unified narrative with both local and panhellenic significance that is centred more tightly around the hero Herakles and his ancestor, Pelops.

Discussion of *what* ancient viewers saw of course leads to more crucial discussion of *how* ancient viewers saw. Two strategies for understanding architectural sculpture are presented in the volume's key programmatic papers, both of which emphasize the importance of seeing the sculpture on the building, and its affect on the beholder. In his opening discussion of the prevalence of frontal chariots driven by gods in sixth-century BC temple

⁴ E.g. Osborne 1987; Neer 2010: 92–99. Neer's discussion of pedimental sculpture draws on Osborne's contribution to this volume (chapter one).

⁵ The production is slightly below-par, however, with numerous typographic mistakes throughout.

⁶ E.g. Connelly 2014.

⁷ Vidal-Naquet 2005.

⁸ Pausanias 5.10.8.

decoration and the contrasting absence of depictions of satyrs, Osborne argues that architectural sculpture carried meaning in both its form and its content, and was loaded with theological (or political or cultural) significance that was contingent upon the style, subject-matter, and specific location of the individual works. Tonio Hölscher, however, re-frames the communicative power of architectural sculpture by instead emphasising its decorative function. Recognising the often-restricted visibility and limited repertoire of subjects, Hölscher argues that the ‘meaning’ of architectural sculpture rested less in the narrative content of its subject-matter—which was likely not always seen or considered—and more in its aesthetic and semantic properties, which allowed it to act as a sign ‘convey[ing] cultural emphasis and value’ (62) by distinguishing important buildings and signalling wealth and prestige.

Hölscher’s dissertation finds echoes in this volume in Patricia Butz’s contribution, which takes inscriptions seriously as visual artefacts and explores what their placement on a building does to our understanding of that building’s function.⁹ It also resembles (though does not acknowledge) Veyne’s anti-iconological argument, centred on discussion of Trajan’s Column in Rome, that the imagery of imperial monuments did not ‘inform’ their viewer through the details of their iconography but instead constituted visual statements (of wealth, power, authority) ‘not heard but passed...offering a discourse that was only generally understood.’¹⁰ Hölscher is surely right to question the degree of contemplation a monument permitted its viewer, and the extent to which the subject-matter of its sculpture would have been understood in intellectual or metaphorical terms by all onlookers, but Osborne has already argued elsewhere that obscurity could be a powerful mode of depiction in its own right,¹¹ and the potential for the subjects of the figurative scenes depicted on Greek buildings to have deeper relevance seems clear. The answer surely must be that both realities are true, with architectural sculpture functioning as both sign and story—as structure, image, and ornament.

With no all-encompassing conclusion or guiding introduction, however, the reader is in the end left to decide for him- or herself how much they want to buy either level of interpretation. Indeed, the volume suffers as a whole from a lack of cohesion, and one is at times left wondering to what extent the desire to identify a decorative programme has overwhelmed more radical rethinking of how ancient viewers might have perceived and been affected by the sculptures

in question, or how far a more nuanced reading that considers possible different ways of looking might take us. Indeed, Peter Schultz reminds us in chapter six that the appearance of architectural sculpture may have been driven by nothing more (or less) than the individual talents and ambition of the artists themselves. The volume also fails to address the ways in which different viewers (women, foreigners) may have looked at architectural sculpture, or how looking may have changed over time. There is also little attention given to the ways in which architectural sculpture may have worked in tandem with the other sculptures displayed in the sanctuary or agora—Barringer’s contribution is an exception. Ultimately, we are left with a series of stand-alone essays—many of which are provocative and insightful in their own right—but with no sense of how they might work together to answer the ‘problems specific’ to architectural sculpture in the Greek world.

- Connelly, J.B. 2014. *The Parthenon Enigma: A Journey into Legend*. London: Head of Zeus.
- Elsner, J. 1996. Inventing imperium: texts and the propaganda of monuments in Augustan Rome, in J. Elsner (ed.) *Art and Text in Roman Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 32–54.
- Neer, R. 2010. *The Emergence of the Classical Style*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Osborne, R. 1987. The viewing and obscuring of the Parthenon frieze. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 107: 98–105
- Spawforth, T. 2006. *The Complete Greek Temples*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Vidal-Naquet, P. 2005. *L’Atlantide: petite histoire d’un mythe platonicien*. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Wilson Jones, M. 2014. *Origins of Classical Architecture: Temples, Orders and Gifts to the Gods in Ancient Greece*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

RUTH ALLEN
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
ra332@cam.ac.uk

David Stuttard. *Greek mythology: a traveller’s guide from Mount Olympus to Troy*. pp. 272, 71 colour illustrations. 2016. London: Thames & Hudson. ISBN 978-0-500-51832-8 hardback £14.95.

⁹ Compare Elsner 1996 on the decorative and semantic potential of Augustus’s *Res Gestae* in Rome.

¹⁰ Veyne 1988, 11.

¹¹ Osborne 1987.

Is there anything new to be said about classical mythology? Recent decades have seen a flurry of