the discovery along the south side of the complex of a series of Byzantine shops off a colonnaded street; most were found abandoned with their contents intact. The excavators attribute their destruction to a Persian attack of A.D. 616, an assumption about which there is considerable controversy (not indicated in the book unfortunately). Paints and dyes, glass, food, hardware—all these commodities as well as owners' quarters are represented.

Chapter IX deals at length with the Jews at Sardis and with the most unusual discovery made at Roman Sardis, a monumental synagogue attached to the south side of the bath-gymnasium complex. A Forecourt and Main Hall some 85 metres in length with over a dozen representations of the menorah as well as eighty inscriptions throw much light on the local Jewish community. The building seems originally to have functioned as a civil basilica, converted in either the later third or mid fourth century to a synagogue, the largest and most prominent known from anywhere in the Roman world. It is striking evidence for the apparent prominence of local Jewish culture that it occupied such a conspicuous place in the heart of the city.

Chapter X sums up the evidence for Christian Sardis, after all one of the Seven Churches of Asia. Most striking here is the construction of an entire Christian quarter just outside the city walls. Ecclesiastical remains themselves are unimpressive although Church EA may be the earliest datable church known from Western Asia Minor while Church E carries us into little known periods of middle Byzantine architecture. A number of Christian cemeteries with several painted tombs have also been discovered. Unusual was a mass burial of over three hundred individuals in a reused Lydian tomb, unfortunately heavily plundered by local villagers. There seems to be no mention of the embolos or late antique colonnaded street for which epigraphic evidence survives.

A final chapter of conclusions draws together the results summarized in this remarkable book: it should be a model to excavators of such major sites who may be thus encouraged to produce similar syntheses for the general academic reader. Sixty-five pages of notes follow and over three hundred plans, figures, and excellent photographs illustrate almost every feature discussed.

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

HECTOR WILLIAMS


In the course of the last twenty years or so, the theory and practice of archaeologists working in the Greco-Roman world has undergone some revolutionary changes. In terms of field method, the new practitioners tend to emphasize survey over excavation; in terms of interpretation, social history and
anthropology over art history. The revolution has not been total, but many of the once-startling pronouncements of the new practitioners have achieved a wide degree of acceptance among professionals in the field.\(^1\) Yet the perception of the lay public, who retain a keen interest in Old World archaeology, has not, I think, so far been much affected by recent trends in archaeological theory and method. For most of the public, Greco-Roman archaeology still means hunting for treasures: artifacts worthy of being displayed in museums of art. This perception is not, I believe, due to an innate disinterest on the part of the public in the sorts of things that the "new archaeology" is concerned with, but rather to the failure of its practitioners to write for an audience outside the academy.

The lively and very readable book by Tjeerd van Andel and Curtis Runnels, describing the results of several field seasons by the Stanford Argolid Exploration Project, represents an important step in the direction of demonstrating to a general audience (and here I include undergraduate students) that the "new archaeology" can be just as exciting as the old. The authors' emphasis throughout is the interaction between human actors and their physical environment. The book is a case study in the ways in which the archaeological and geological records can be read together to reveal how humans adapted to their environment and how they used technology to restructure their environment. Because one of the authors is an archaeologist and the other a geologist, the relationship between humans and their environment is worked out in much greater depth and detail than one might otherwise expect in a book written for a non-specialized audience.

Because the authors are addressing a broad readership there is relatively little use of the technical vocabulary of archaeology, although inevitably some technical geological terms are introduced. These are adequately explained in a Glossary. Once again because of the intended audience, there is rather less documentation than professional archaeologists might hope for. Readers used to detailed field reports may find themselves frustrated by quantities expressed in such terms as "the bulk of," "fairly well restricted," "most of" and so on. But the lack of full documentation is to some extent redressed by a thoughtful bibliographic essay, and the authors promise that professionals can look forward to forthcoming scholarly treatments of all of the material covered here. Furthermore, much of the evidence for the authors' conclusions is summarized in the 26 maps and 14 figures. These are generally clear, readable, and very useful. The book also features attractive sketches of the Greek countryside.

The hope of attracting a wide audience has perhaps led the authors to state their conclusions more boldly than they might have done had they been writing

primarily for a professional audience. The authors propose hypothetical answers to a number of salient questions for which the evidence remains slight or ambiguous. The authors' willingness to stick their necks out in this way should, I think, help to make the book a good deal more interesting to professional as well as to lay readers, although it will inevitably give rise to dissents.

Chapter 1 is a general introduction to the history and goals of the Stanford Survey project; chapter 2 introduces the reader to the field survey method employed by the Stanford team. The account of field walking and record taking is clear and pleasantly anecdotal. The problems faced by the survey team in terms of limited access due to legal restriction and to vegetation and topography are set out in some detail. On the other hand, there is relatively little discussion of epistemology: the question of how the archaeologist moves from evidence to explanation. Personally, I would like to have seen at least a brief discussion of the functionalist/economic rationality assumptions which inform the authors' analysis throughout. The authors invariably seem to prefer an economic explanation for phenomena perceptible in the archaeological record; some readers may wonder whether incorporating ritual/symbolic explanations at certain points (e.g. 60-61, 67) might have made more sense of the evidence.

Probably less controversial to the primary audience of the book is the authors' overt distaste for the effects of economic development on the countryside of modern Greece. They strongly favor "traditional" modes of social and economic behavior, based on agriculture, over those based on industry and tourism. The conflict between the scientific goals of the archaeologist and the financial goals of the segment of the population of the southern Argolid actively involved in the tourist industry is a subtheme of the book. Ironically, tourism is at the center of the current relationship between the local economy of the Argolid and wider "external" economies; analysis of this relationship provided the authors with their central explanatory model for understanding the changing pattern of settlement and exploitation within the survey area (23).

Chapters 3 through 7 present a chronological history of human occupation of the southern Argolid, based on the Stanford survey and on earlier excavations at the Franchthi cave and at classical Halieis. The stress the authors are forced to place on the Franchthi excavations in discussions of pre-Bronze Age human development (chs 3-4) is a sobering reminder of the limits of even the best survey. The coming of the Bronze Age led to a considerable, although not a sudden, increase in the number of occupied sites. Beginning with the Bronze Age sites, the surveyors were able to make major positive contributions (rather

---

2 E.g. on 8, 17, 73, 104.
3 E.g. on 21-22, 24 ("tourist-infested"), 39 (sites "falling victim to progress at a discouraging rate"), 66 ("the organized state and its inevitable companions: offices, officials, and officiousness").
than speculative arguments based on the absence of sites) to the reconstruction of
the history of the region. Not only are there more sites in the Bronze Age than
there had been in the Paleolithic and Neolithic periods, but site specialization is
evident, especially at the site of Fournoi, which the authors speculate was a
center of obsidian tool manufacture. Strikingly, the authors hypothesize that
significant soil erosion due to human agricultural activity began as early as the
end of the Early Bronze Age. Site numbers decreased by the end of the EBA, but
increased again (slowly) through the MBA and LBA.

The archaeological record of the southern Argolid is a blank from the end of
the LBA until the late Dark Age, but from ca 850 B.C. onward the number of
sites increased fairly steadily, to reach a peak in the early Hellenistic period (ca
323-250 B.C.). Less favorable soils were being exploited by the end of this
period, which the authors attribute to the influence of external markets for the
agricultural produce of the southern Argolid. Another long period of decline
lasted from ca 250 B.C. through ca A.D. 100, but site numbers began to
increase in the middle Roman imperial period and reached a new high in the late
imperial period (3rd-6th centuries A.C.), only to collapse to zero by ca A.D.
600. By the beginning of the tenth century another era of slow improvement had
begun, and the region has been continually occupied ever since.

Chapter 8 discusses the soil in relationship to agricultural exploitation.
While arguing that the soil would not have been deep even if humans had never
occupied the Argolid (and thus by extrapolation that the bare, rocky landscape of
Greece is essentially natural rather than a product of human mismanagement),
the authors suggest that much of the alluviation pattern within the survey area
can be attributed to human agency. Relatively slow erosion during the EBA and
Byzantine periods was the result of poor maintenance by farmers of fields planted
on steep slopes. More rapid soil erosion during the third to first centuries B.C.
is attributed to the practice of allowing herds to graze on the terraced slopes.
Chapter 9 returns to the issue of growth and decline. Here the economic
rationality and market economy arguments implicit in the earlier chapters are
made explicit. The authors acknowledge the difficulty of determining site
function on the basis of archaeological evidence alone, but they argue that the
changing ratio between a nucleated and dispersed settlement pattern can be
explained by market forces. Nucleated settlement, they suggest, was typical of a
subsistence economy; dispersed settlement (especially clear in the classical
period) meant that many small farms were producing export products (especially
olive oil) for external markets.

Many of the conclusions presented in Beyond the Acropolis are quite
speculative, as the authors are the first to admit. Much of the speculation seems
very reasonable, although no professional reader will be likely to find all of it
completely convincing. There remains the troubling issue of whether the data
base developed by the survey is biased because of the necessarily selective
coverage of the field walkers: although the Stanford survey was intensive in the
areas covered, only sample areas of the southern Argolid could be surveyed. Regrettably, due to the realities of modern settlement, much of the coast was off limits to the survey team. This raises questions about the argument that there was no permanent settlement other than at Franchthi during much of the Paleolithic and Neolithic periods. As the authors themselves point out, coastal plains were favored habitation sites during the Neolithic.4

There also remains the issue of the relationship between the archaeological evidence and the models that are used to interpret that evidence. Mute artifacts alone tell us nothing; they become meaningful only when they are interpreted within the framework of a theoretical model.5 But the sort of evidence turned up by surveys does not always fit neatly into any existing theoretical mold.6 The gap between evidence and theory is especially evident in the economic arguments which form a central part of the authors' interpretation of the settlement pattern. As I pointed out above, the authors do not discuss the theoretical background in detail, but they can be located at the "modernist" extreme of the continuum of scholarly opinion on the nature of the ancient economy. The debate over whether ancient economies were essentially modern (and so primarily concerned with markets) or essentially primitive (and so chiefly based on subsistence and barter) continues to rage, and this volume will surely become involved in the controversy.7

The authors propose a subsistence economy only for the early and middle Neolithic and for "siteless" periods of extreme decline. For all other periods, including the Paleolithic, they assume that markets and trade were an essential part of the economic picture.8 For some eras (for example the late classical and early Hellenistic) the market economy argument is supported by the survey data

4 Limited number of sites, 50-51, 56-58, 67, 75-77. Limited surveying of coastal areas, map 4 on 32. Neolithic preference for coastal plains elsewhere in the Peloponnesse, 70.
7 The modernist-primitivist controversy: S.C. Humphreys, "History, Economics, and Anthropology: The Work of Karl Polanyi," History and Theory 8 (1969) 165-212; Trade in the Ancient Economy, edited by P. Garnsey, K. Hopkins, and C.R. Whittaker (Berkeley 1983), passim. Van Andel and Runnels' assumption that modern economic market behavior is a proper model for antiquity is made explicitly (169). But they recognize that their own emphasis on trade may not find universal acceptance (182).
8 E.g. 88, 93, 109, 116, 126-127.
and seems quite strong. But in other sections, e.g. the discussion of the Paleolithic, the trade and market argument is based primarily on the silence of the survey record (58-61). In these cases, the market explanation sometimes seems forced and, while certainly not impossible, may fail to convince many of those who currently harbor doubts about the modernist economic paradigm.

Though I remain skeptical about some of the conclusions in this book, I heartily applaud the authors’ willingness to set forth a bold series of arguments that readers can ponder, evaluate, and either accept or reject as they see fit. The authors challenge us to rethink our understanding of the relationship between human and environment, between city and countryside in the ancient world, and they do so in an engaging manner. This book deserves a wide audience, which should range from professional historians and archaeologists to interested laypersons. If it becomes available in paperback, it will be an ideal text for undergraduate courses in Old World Archaeology. The combination of practical discussion of survey method with strong conclusions (and the absence of mind-numbing quantities of catalogued artifactual material) is likely to convince students that the "new" archaeology offers as much to delight and fascinate them as any nineteenth-century treasure-hunt or any perusal of an art museum’s antiquities cases.

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY

JOSIAH OBER


The task of writing a comprehensive, yet succinct, survey of the art of the Greek world in the Archaic and Classical periods is formidable. Furthermore, the crafting of an introductory text that is both lucid and thought-provoking is a truly Herculean labor. Although many art historians and some archaeologists have attempted to fulfil one or the other of these objectives, most have failed. Woodford’s book, commissioned by the Joint Association of Classical Teachers in the United Kingdom, represents a rare triumph on most accounts.

9 Some dubious historical assumptions are employed here, however. The authors seem to overestimate the significance of the Spartan naval hegemony, Athenian population growth in the fourth century, and the extent of Athenian loss of olive trees in the Peloponnesian War. See, respectively, C.D. Hamilton, *Sparta’s Bitter Victories* (Ithaca 1979); M.H. Hansen, *Demography and Democracy: The Number of Athenian Citizens in the Fourth Century B.C.* (Herning, Denmark 1985); V.D. Hanson, *Warfare and Agriculture in Classical Greece* (Pisa 1983).