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 obscuration 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.

[9] Compare Elsner 1996 on the decorative and semantic potential of Augustus's *Res Gestae* in Rome.
[10] Veyne 1988, 11.
[11] Osborne 1987.

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.

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

encyclopaedias, overviews of and introductions to the subject, and monographs on specific figures or themes. Any author wishing to enter the fray must, I imagine, suppress some queasiness at such competition. Not so David Stuttard (hereafter 'S.'). S.'s book is of a very different kind and is perhaps best described as a Pausanias for our times. S. is a gifted and prolific populariser of Classics, renowned for (co)authoring and editing over a dozen books on various aspects of Classical civilization and producing a further dozen translations, half a dozen adaptations, and many a staging of Greek dramas. *Greek Mythology* is a perfect addition to his oeuvre. The dust jacket promises that this book is '[t]he perfect companion to the Greek myths and the landscapes and ideas that shaped them.' As the introduction (12–13) and dust jacket freely admit, it is aimed at real and armchair travellers alike (the quality of the cover suggests the second category is the majority of the envisioned readership). While not written for the specialist, the book may be of interest to (armchair) scholars as well.

What sets S.'s book apart from other books on mythology for the general audience—not to mention all non-English books that cover the same ground and major scholarly resources?[1] And do we really need (or care about) another overview of Greek mythology? The answer to the latter question, on S.'s own terms, is yes. As S. realizes, it is precisely because of their 'universal quality' and their continued 'profound influence' on our culture that myths deserve to be retold.[2] This brings me to the answer to my first question. Not only is S. a masterful narrator of myth, he has also found an interesting and practical mode of presentation. He eschews the format of traditional encyclopaedias with their dry, endless columns of unconnected lemmas on the one hand and on the other hand the extensive chronologies/genealogies that have been in use ever since Hesiod's *Theogony* and *Catalogue of Women* and Apollodorus' *Library* and in which everything from the birth of the cosmos to that of the human race is somehow connected. Rather, S.'s *Greek Mythology* is arranged by city. His book is not a compendium of myth, nor an overly detailed travel guide: it gets the balance just right. While encyclopaedias and genealogical trees are useful for research and teaching, the advantage of S.'s method of selection and arrangement is that it truly lends a *couleur locale* to the topography and helps to bring the (sometimes scant) remains of these once-great centres of Greek civilization to life.

After a brief introduction outlining the history and uses of myth (8–13), the reader is briskly transported across the Mediterranean in 22 chapters, from mainland Greece, to the islands, to Troy, and back. Each chapter averages some 11 pages and opens with an evocative description of the archaeological remains and the flora and fauna of the ancient sites, which are sometimes poignantly contrasted with the concrete humdrum of the modern cities. Next are the myths connected to the locale, which form the bulk of each chapter. Every chapter is rounded off with a section detailing the vicissitudes of the area in historical times, from antiquity until today, and a text box summarizing the principal historical events and giving some directions to important sights. The text is lavishly illustrated throughout, with coloured drawings of choice artefacts, monuments, or landscapes, and further enlivened by apt quotations (in translation) from classical literature from Homer to Nonnus. As every good guide must, S. thus brings his readers not only to the most famous sites, but to less-travelled destinations as well, expertly interweaving well-known stories with more arcane lore. S. leads the reader from heaven to hell: Mt Olympus, Sunium, Eleusis, Delos, Delphi, Ephesus, Paphos, Pylos, Olympia, Thebes, Tiryns, Iolcus and Mt Pelion, Corinth, Argos, Athens, Knossos, Calydon, Sparta, Mycenae, Troy, Ithaca, and Hades. Thus S. follows classical mythographic precedent by largely excluding Rome, Sicily, and the western Mediterranean from the narrative. As a result, much Greek archaeology and mythology is passed over silently for that of the Greek mainland and islands.[3] To maintain readability there are no foot- or endnotes and sources for a particular myth (variant) are acknowledged only occasionally. The volume concludes with a page of 'Recommended Reading' and an index of names, terms, buildings, and institutions.

But of course the unique selling point of *Greek Mythology* is the combination of archaeology and mythology. This it does well, despite the fact that some sites are more suitable to this approach than others. There is, for example, relatively little left of Sparta before the Roman resettlement, although there is a wealth of earlier myth to choose from. Nevertheless, in the relevant chapter (pp. 200–208) one does not feel that this is a hindrance, especially when S. aptly invokes Pausanias as evidence that

[1] In the category of mythology for a general readership one thinks of e.g. Buxton 2004, Graves 1955, Graziosi 2013 or Matyszak 2010 (the first and last are produced by S.'s publisher also); major scholarly resources are Fowler 2000–2013, Gantz 1993, and the two massive encyclopedias published under the auspices of the Fondation pour le Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae, 1981–2009 (LIMC) and 2004–2014 (ThesCRA). Preller-Robert 1920–25 and Roscher 1884–1937 are still useful.

[2] Both quotations from p. 8.

[3] This seems to be a programmatic point in Apollodorus: see Fletcher 2008, who argues that he is constructing a Greek identity *vis-à-vis* Roman domination. The mythical history of Sicily in Diodorus Siculus is a happy exception; see Sulimani 2011.

(already) by Roman times Sparta had turned into a bit of a tourist trap where 'almost every street corner had mythological associations.'[4] S., as a thoughtful translator of Greek tragedies, is also very much alive to the particularities of his sources. So, for instance, in describing Odysseus' dealings with the Cyclops Polyphemus (*Odyssey* 9), S. does not fail to point out the famous wordplay in οὔτις/μήτις ('No one') which recalls Odysseus' μῆτις ('cunning')—'the first pun in Western literature.'[5] There is also the occasional reminder of the fluidity of myth and the inventiveness the tragedians displayed in their plots.[6] Such *faits divers* and *petites histoires* are scattered throughout the book and make for excellent reading.

Like all good storytellers, however, S. is sometimes given to favouring the sensational over the rational. For example, S. asserts that at Eleusis the highest degree of initiation, the *epopteia* or 'viewing', 'involved raising a casket containing sheaves of corn from beneath the earth' and that these symbolize 'the seeds of new life', born from something dead.[7] In the same way, the *mystai* would be 'reborn after death'. Similar cults are attested or hypothesized for Adonis, Attis, Hyacinthus, Narcissus, and—according to some—Linus.[8] S.'s source for this must be the third-century theologian Hippolytus.[9] Half a century on, Mylonas' scepticism of such theories is still well-founded. First, how trustworthy is an author whose purpose it is to debunk such superstitions as the Mysteries? Secondly, grain is ubiquitous in Eleusinian iconography and mythology and so can hardly have come as a surprise of metaphysical proportions. Thirdly, it is hard to glean evidence for an actual rebirth, as S. supposes. We know that Persephone or Kore returns from Hades, but of course she does not really die. Another candidate for a magical (re-)birth is the child Brimo, who is mentioned once again by Hippolytus, but it takes considerable ingenuity (and a degree of credulity) to make the evidence fit, as Mylonas has shown.[10] It is more plausible that the Mysteries somehow allowed the initiates to gain a better afterlife, as Cicero implies.[11]

Similarly, I find it unlikely that the Athenians after the Persian wars 'proclaimed the Eleusinian message of rebirth on the Parthenon frieze.'[12] This is misleading in more than one way. To begin with, one wonders how and where exactly this was done: no indication or reference is given, but one suspects S. intended to cross-reference his own book on the Parthenon.[13] There he argues that the Athenians, in the wake of the sack of Athens and the destruction of the Old Parthenon, embarked on a programme of death and rebirth that permeates the architecture and iconography of the Parthenon and indeed of the entire Acropolis: just as the initiate is born again, so too Athens will rise from the ashes.[14] S.'s argument is dangerously close to being circular: because he takes it for granted that death and rebirth formed the great secret of the Eleusinian Mysteries, he consequently views the archaeology of Eleusis and the Acropolis as shot through with hidden messages relating to this secret, ultimately 'proving' both theories. Like other iconoclastic interpretations that seek to displace the traditional reading of the frieze as a Panathenaic procession—one thinks of J. Connelly's reading of the central scene on the east frieze as referring to Erechtheus' sacrifice of his daughters or J. Boardman's suggestion that the 192 figures on the cavalcade on three sides of the frieze stand for the Athenian dead of the Battle of Marathon—S.'s too will have its supporters.[15] I, for one, find the holistic approach to the Acropolis quite reasonable, but rebirth I do not see, even if one accepts S.'s identifications of the figures on the frieze as deities associated, however tangentially, with Eleusis.[16] At any rate, to present the supposed Eleusinian message of death and rebirth as one of the Parthenon's central

[4] Quotation at p. 206; S.'s paraphrase from Pausanias' *Description of Greece* must be from 3.16.

[5] Quotation at p. 241 (though puns are also found in the *Iliad* and in Hesiod).

[6] See e.g. 155 (Medea)

[7] All quotations from p. 42.

[8] For most of these figures, see, e.g., the excellent study by Alexiou 2002: esp. 55–62.

[9] Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium* 5.8.39–45 (pp. 163–165 Marcovich). The relevant bit in Hippolytus is 5.8.39: Λέγουσι δέ αὐτόν [sc. τὸν τελείον ἄνθρωπον], φησί, Φρύγες καὶ 'χλοερόν στάχυν τεθερισμένον', καὶ μετά τοὺς Φρύγας Αθηναῖοι, μυοῦντες Ἐλευσίνια καὶ ἐπιδεικνύντες τοῖς ἐποπτεύουσι τὸ μέγα καὶ θαυμαστὸν καὶ τελεώτατον ἐποπτικόν ἐκεῖ μυστήριον ἐν σιωπῇ, τεθερισμένον στάχυν ('And the Phrygians, he says, also call him [sc. the perfect man] "a reaped green ear of grain" and after the Phrygians the Athenians, when initiating people into the Eleusinian rites and showing it to the *epoptai*, call it the great, wonderful, and most perfect mystery for the highest initiates there, an ear of grain, reaped in silence'). That Hippolytus is explaining one mystery cult through another should in itself be a warning that his narrative must be treated with circumspection.

[10] On the ear, see the sensible discussion in Mylonas 1961: 275–276; on Hippolytus, see his 305–310 (in the Appendix).

[11] Cicero, *De legibus* 2.14.36 (Powell): *nihil melius illis mysteriis, quibus ex agresti immanique vita exculti ad humanitatem et mitigati sumus, initiaque, ut appellantur, ita re vera principia vitae cognovimus, neque solum cum laetitia vivendi rationem accepimus, sed etiam cum spe meliore moriendi* ('there is nothing better than these Mysteries, through which we are raised from our boorish, inhuman life and prepared for humanity, and we have learned that in this way the initiations, as they are called, really are the principles of life, and not only have we gained a manner of living happily, but also of dying with better hope.'

[12] S.'s p. 43.

[13] Stuttard 2013.

[14] Stuttard 2013: *passim*, but esp. 10–11, 77–78, 153, 215.

[15] See Boardman 1977 and Connelly 1996, recently reiterated in 2014: 161–188, 236–246. My disagreement with S.'s overstatement of Eleusinian influence is not to say, of course, that it is entirely absent from the frieze: cf. e.g. Spaeth (1991) on the west pediment. Connolly's reading may receive partial support from Neils and Schultz 2012.

[16] For discussion of the identities of the figures on the frieze and pediments, see e.g. the still-useful Brommer 1963, 1967, 1977, and Palagia 1998.

themes, as S. does in the book under discussion, is a misrepresentation of the facts. Luckily such instances are few.

I wonder whether in places not more could have been made of the landscape as a factor both in the shaping and understanding of myth—this is, after all, promised on the dust jacket. Geomythology has been around for some time and such an approach might have been applied profitably.[17] Argos, for instance, from the earliest time onwards was known as πολυδίψιον ('very thirsty')—an epithet that is as valid today as it was back then, judging by S.'s autopsy ('the dusty riverbed of the Inachus').[18] Surely it is no coincidence that there is such an abundance of hydrological myth in a dry and porous karst landscape that could be seen to 'gulp up' all water.[19] One may here point to the founding by the river-god Inachus; the forty-nine Danaids, who in the afterlife are condemned to pitching water for all eternity; the princess Psamathe, 'Sand' (< ψάμαθος), who bears the name of a spring; Heracles and the Stymphalian birds as well as the Hydra of Lerna, whose very name suggests water (< ὕδωρ) and who is associated with a lagoon. Famously, Inachus' testimony that the Argive land belonged to Hera rather than Poseidon resulted in the latter punishing the Argives for Inachus' insolence by causing a drought.[20] With respect to Heracles' feats at Lerna and the Stymphalian lake scholars have attempted to see in these (and other) myths a reflection of drainage works designed to get rid of some particularly insalubrious, stagnant waters.[21] It is tempting to think that in popular belief Argos' legendary 'thirst' for drinking water was to be quenched by these and other waterworks, whose descendants, the Roman baths and nymphaea, can still be seen *in situ*.

The book is well-produced and a pleasure to read. Unfortunately, it is a reviewer's sad fate to mention the imperfections also. There is a stray orange line printed halfway through the text on p. 206 (presumably a leftover from the lay-out process, when the illustration that is now on p. 205 was moved there). Typo's are mercifully few and far between. I have noticed the following: the name of Heracles' wife is best spelled 'Deianeira' instead of 'Deineira' (pp. 131–2 and in the index s.v.); Mount Pentellicon > Pentelicon (171); an incomplete reference ('Homer, *Odyssey* 172–79' should be 'Homer, *Odyssey* 19.172–79') (184); a lost 'after' ('Immediately he wrote the lines, Stesichorus saw again' > 'Immediately after he wrote [...]') (205); 'othwerwise' > 'otherwise' (230); 'Matysak' > 'Matyszak' (262). Those who are sensitive to it will find the repetition of 'unprepossessing' in the description of Tiryns (122 and 135) somewhat jarring, particularly because S. writes so well. Mild confusion may be caused by 'Mount Lycabettus' (171) being indexed as 'Mount Lycavettus'. Confusion on a grander scale is achieved when S. calls the arch-liar Sinon—the Greek who infamously told the Trojans that the horse was empty and so was directly responsible for the Sack of Troy—'Sinis' on p. 230 and in the index, ostensibly through a mix-up with the barbaric serial-killer of that name dispatched by Theseus (narrated on p. 177). Another mythographic mistake occurs on p. 171, where it is claimed that: '[o]thers said the *aegis* was the flayed skin of one of Athene's goatish enemies, either the Titan Aex or the Giant Pallas, from whom she derived one of her epithets'. To my knowledge, Aex was not a Titan, but rather a Gorgon whose face was feared by the Titans—reason enough for the young Zeus to acquire it as the *aegis* with which he eventually defeated them. Afterwards Zeus gives it to Athena and it becomes catasterized as the 'Goat' (*Aix* in Greek).[22]

These are but minor blemishes in an otherwise excellent book. S. writes eloquently and knowledgeably, while the publisher has clearly made an effort to present the material the way it deserves. The result is an affordable, handsomely produced book with a fast-paced and engaging narrative that will make the armchair traveller want to go out and see the real thing and enthuse the actual traveller to experience something of the awe and reverence the Greeks themselves may have felt at the intersection of archaeology and mythology. And that, surely, is the hallmark of a good travel guide.

Alexiou, M. 2002[2] (1st 1974). *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*, rev. D. Yatromanolakis and P. Roilos. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford: Rowan and Littlefield Publishers.

Boardman, J. 1977. The Parthenon Frieze – Another View, in U. Höckmann and A. Krug (eds) *Festschrift für Frank Brommer*: 39–50. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.

Brommer, F. 1963. *Die Skulpturen der Parthenon-Giebel: Katalog und Untersuchung*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.

[17] Coined, it seems, by Vitaliano 1968 and subsequently expanded upon in *eadem* 1973.

[18] S.'s words at p. 160; curiously, his presentation of local myth overlooks Argos' preoccupations with water. For πολυδίψιον Ἄργος, cf. e.g. Homer, *Iliad* 4.171 and the Cyclical epic *Thebaid* fr. 1 Bernabé (= *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi* 257 Allen); much later Quintus of Smyrna, *Posthomerica* 3.570.

[19] For this kind of 'hydromythology', see Clendenon 2009 and Luce 2006.

[20] Apollodorus, *Bibliotheke* 2.13 (2.1.4.75–77) (Papathomopoulos).

[21] See Luce 2006: 25.

[22] See e.g. Eratosthenes, *Catasterismi* 13.23–41 (Aἴξ) and Hyginus, *Astronomia* 2.13.4.5–20 (*Capra*)

— 1967. *Die Metopen des Parthenon: Katalog und Untersuchung*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern
— 1977. *Der Parthenonfries: Katalog und Untersuchung*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern
Buxton, R. 2004. *The Complete World of Greek Mythology*. The Complete Series. London: Thames & Hudson.
Clendenon, C. 2009. *Hydromythology and the Ancient Greek World: An Earth Science Perspective Emphasizing Karst Hydrology*. Lansing: Fineline Science Press.
Connelly, J.B. 1996. Parthenon and Parthenoi: A Mythological Interpretation of the Parthenon Frieze. *American Journal of Archaeology* 100.1: 53–80.
— 2014. *The Parthenon Enigma: A New Understanding of the West's Most Iconic Building and the People Who Made It*. New York: A.A. Knopf
Fletcher, K.F.B. 2008. Systematic Genealogies in Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* and the Exclusion of Rome from Greek Myth. *Classical Antiquity* 27.1: 59–91.
Fondation pour le Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (eds) 1981–2009. *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*. 10 vols. Zürich/Munich: Artemis Verlag.
— (eds) 2004–14. *Thesaurus Cultus et Rituum Antiquorum*. 9 vols. Los Angeles: Getty Publications.
Fowler, R.L. 2000–13. *Early Greek Mythography.* 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Galinsky, G.K. 1972. *The Herakles Theme: The Adaptations of the Hero in Literature from Homer to the Twentieth Century*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources.* 2 vols. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Graves, R. 1955. *The Greek Myths*. 2 vols. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
Graziosi, B. 2013. *The Gods of Olympus: A History.* London: Profile Books.
Luce, J.V. 2006, Herakles and Hydraulics. *Hermathena* 181: 25–37.
Matyszak, P. 2010. *The Greek and Roman Myths: A Guide to the Classical Stories*. London: Thames & Hudson.
Neils, J. and P. Schultz. 2012. Erechtheus and the Apobates Race on the Parthenon Frieze (North XI-XII). *American Journal of Archaeology* 116.2: 195–207.
Palagia, O. 1998[2] (1st 1993). *The Pediments of the Parthenon*. Leiden, Boston and Cologne: Brill.
Preller, L. and C.G.L.T.H.J. Robert. 1920–1926[4]. *Griechische Mythologie*, ed. O. Kern. 2 vols. Berlin: Weidmann.
Roscher, W.H. 1884–1937. *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*. 6 vols. Leipzig: Teubner.
Spaeth, B.S. 1991. Athenians and Eleusinians in the West Pediment of the Parthenon. *Hesperia:* 60(3): 331–362.
Stafford, E. 2012. *Herakles*. *Gods and Heroes of the Ancient World.* London and New York: Routledge.
Stuttard, D. 2013. *Parthenon: Power and Politics on the Acropolis*. London: The British Museum Press.
Sulimani, I. 2011. *Diodorus' Mythistory and the Pagan Mission: Historiography and Culture-Heroes in the First Pentad of the Bibliotheke*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
Vitaliano, D.B. 1968. Geomythology: The Impact of Geologic Events on History and Legends. *Journal of the Folklore Institute* 5.1: 5–30.
— 1973. *Legends of the Earth: Their Geologic Origins*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Gary Vos
University of Edinburgh
g.p.vos@sms.ed.ac.uk