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bearded male figure, tenderly carry bodies of deceased Athenians.

Many key personifications, including the female figures Peitho (Persuasion) and Paidia (Playfulness) and the winged erotes Himeros and Pothis (Eros is omitted), who denote forms of desire, are associated with the retinue of Aphrodite. Evidently, through depictions of the seduction of Helen by Paris, these personifications were linked to the Athenian bride and groom. Elegant, stylishly coiffed female personifications, wearing delicate chions and fine jewelry, proliferate in the latter part of the fifth century. Particular favorites of the red-figure Eretria and Medias painters, such personifications have received recent treatment in the monographs on these painters by A. Lezzi-Hafer (Der Eretria-Maler, Mainz 1988) and L. Burn (The Medias Painter, Oxford 1987). Shapiro's focus, however, is on the developing iconography of personifications beyond their role in defining an individual artist's personality. While he cautiously proposes the inventiveness of vase painters, he also acknowledges the probably significant seminal influence of lost monumental art, particularly painting. Shapiro frames this book with reference to Apelles' lost allegorical painting Diabole (Slander), and he alerts the reader to the extraordinary transition from personifications identified primarily by inscription to the bold physiognomic characterizations that, at least according to Lucian's ekphrasis, inhabited Apelles' fourth-century work.

Beth Cohen
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The slipcover of this revised dissertation features an evocative photograph: a massive stone fortification wall standing before a mountain pass (also fig. 4). One might suppose that the structure in the foreground had something to do with the defense of Attica, the Dema wall, or the Boiotian War of the book's title. On the contrary, the photograph depicts not the Dema wall, but the north wall of the garrison fort at Eleutherai (Gyphokastro), which Munn believes was built after the Boiotian War (169 n. 60). He claims that garrison forts like Eleutherai were intended as "passive" refuge centers and never served to defend Attica from invasion (15–25)—even though Eleutherai (among other forts) was built on the border in the fourth century and Munn argues that as a result of an innovative defense strategy, "Attic territory was virtually inviolate" and "Attic soil was never trodden on by an enemy army" between 378 and 322 (194–95). Eleutherai is some 30 km from the Dema wall and is not among the fortifications Munn wishes to associate with it. The jacket's visual mise en scène was certainly not meant to deceive, but it reminds readers to proceed carefully as they assess the evidence presented in this erudite and intricately argued military history.

The author sets out to prove that the Dema wall, a field fortification in the Aigaleos-Parnes gap (the most detailed publication remains J. E. Jones, L. H. Sackett, and C. W. J. Eliot in BSA 52 [1957] 152–89), was built in the spring of 378 B.C., under the direction of the Athenian general Chabrias (the book's hero: "prudent generalship combined with steel-cool discipline," 194), as part of a defensive strategy aimed at Sparta. Once this "fact" has been established by a combination of archaeological evidence and historical/strategic inferences, Munn claims that the Dema "system" (wall plus several towers) provides a securely fixed point in the history of military architecture and the chronology of Attic black-glaze pottery. Thus, the history and chronology of the four-year (379/8–375 B.C.) Boiotian War can be rewritten (129–83). Ancient sources can be corrected (e.g., 216–21). The proper role of territorial defense in fourth-century Athenian history can be defined (187–95), while alternative theories about how Attic fortifications worked are exposed as fabulous figments. The nature and magnitude of these claims require that the wall be dated with certainty ("without reservation," 103). The year 378 must be the only reasonable date for the wall's construction; relative plausibility is not good enough.

Yet the archaeological evidence adduced by Munn for the 378 B.C. date of the Dema system is, in his words, "almost absurdly miniscule" (112). It consists of four sherds from three black-glazed pots: a saltcellar, which "was spotted by Mr. Sackett as he was sitting atop the wall" and removed "with some difficulty" from the rubble fill of the wall (199–201); and two bits of a cup handle and part of the base of a cup, which Munn found during excavation of a tower site near the wall. Masonry style is also invoked, but is a two-edged sword: Munn's argument demands simultaneous construction of the light-rubble tower (figs. 25–26), the much better built Dema wall (figs. 10–16; Munn considers the light-rubble northern extension of the wall a 19th-century addition, 202–209), and several other well-built Attic towers (figs. 34–40). Why was the Dema tower, the linchpin of the author's hypothetical defense system, relatively poorly constructed?

The saltcellar might have been built into the wall after the first destruction of the nearby Dema house (per Munn's interpretation), but there is simply no way to know how or when the shed got into the fill. Munn's date for the saltcellar is a quarter century earlier (no later than 375) than that proposed by the original publishers (mid-fourth century); his argument puts more chronological weight on a single sherd than it can bear. The handle and bowl fragments from the tower may date to the late fifth/early fourth century as he now supposes, but precise dating of such small fragments is impossible and they may be strays: in a preliminary paper describing the excavation, he himself suggested that the handle sherds might be sixth-/fifth-century strays. All other datable pottery from the tower is late fourth/third century B.C. or late Roman. Munn explains this body of material in terms of casual reuse (first by a beekeeper and then by misguided Romans who supposed the place to have been a sacred tumulus. But see now G. Fowden in JHS 108 [1988] 48–59). No sectional drawings are provided to clarify the scant stratigraphy of the excavated area. Based on the author's description, it seems entirely possible that the tower site was built and occupied in the late fourth century. The Dema tower, with its light-rubble masonry and its mostly late
fourth-century pottery, actually weighs against his thesis of an integrated wall-plus-towers building program in 378 B.C.—a thesis that remains precariously balanced on the small base of a single, casually collected, dubiously redated, saltcellar fragment.

If archaeology cannot prove the thesis, what of historical/military arguments? Munn argues plausibly that the construction of the wall best suits the military conditions and theory of the Late Classical period (ca. 425–300), but this will not prove his specific 378 thesis. He therefore seriously proposes that it is possible to derive a secure and precise date for a monument for which there is no textual and little archaeological evidence by a process of exclusion—when all other possible building dates have been disposed of, the one that is left (i.e., 378) must be the right one. This exercise depends on two very dubious assumptions: that our extant literary sources signal every possible occasion that such a wall might be built and that a modern scholar’s own strategic sense can determine what ancient fortification-builders and generals “must have had” in mind at any given moment.

An example of this approach illustrates the difficulties. According to Munn, the Dema wall could not have been built in 339 because “it is unlikely that the possibility of defeat [of Athens by the Macedonians in Boiotia] would have been so openly admitted as to divert funds and manpower to a major wall-building project in Attica at this time” (121). Yet by Munn’s calculation, the project (the wall—which he regards as comparable to the Athenian Long Walls—plus several watchtowers) would have taken no more than a week. Since in 339 the Athenian army had been called up and was stationed at nearby Eleusis, funds to pay soldiers were already committed and the manpower readily available. Building the wall at this time would not have been a diversion of resources; but a rational use of soldiers’ time. His “unlikely” is a bald assertion; no one can prove that the Dema was built in 339, but neither can Munn show that such a date is beyond the bounds of plausibility. Nor, for that matter, can he positively exclude a host of other possible dates: we simply do not know enough about the week-by-week details of what was happening in Athens and going through Athenians’ minds for this precision-dating method to work. Munn buttresses his exclusionary argument by an appeal to strategic logic: any attempt to defend Attica against a foe capable of operating in Boiotia “must have” entailed building similar walls across the other northern passes. But this assumes that garrison forts were merely passive centers to which property could be evacuated. Munn’s evidence for his passivity thesis is the interpolated decree at Demothenes 18.37–38; he optimistically supposes that the (Hellenistic?) forger imitated the language of real (but now lost) Athenian decrees dealing with military emergencies (26 n. 55).

Slight ceramic evidence, when combined with historical and strategic analysis of the sort deployed by Munn, may point to a rough date for a monument, but cannot nail it down to a single year. Attempting to attach a monument to a specific historical event, in the absence of literary testimonia and in the face of exiguous archaeological material, can lead to tortured evidence and excessive special pleading based on what “must have been” the case. This book displays much energy and ingenuity in the construction of circumstantial arguments, especially about the generalship of Chabrias. It usefully quotes many ancient sources at length and in Greek. It promises several future studies (e.g., on the use of flags for signaling) and is handsomely produced, featuring valuable maps, plans, and plates. But neither the mortar that binds the edifice (the argument from exclusion) nor its foundation (the redated saltcellar) inspires confidence. And thus Munn’s history of Athenian land war in the mid-370s B.C. remains a tissue of “maybes” and his claim to have established a chronological benchmark for evaluating future archaeological discoveries is untenable.
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Until relatively recently, Etruscan mirrors were studied primarily for the information their engraved scenes provided about Etruscan culture. Traditional iconographical and stylistic analyses were employed to group mirrors or associate them with specific sites and, to a very limited extent, to assign them to specific workshops or hands. A few scholars have attempted to take advantage of new data such as chemical analyses, more rigorous physical measurements, and mirror sections or profiles to test various hypotheses about mirrors (e.g., P. Moscati, Analisi statistiche multivariante sugli specchi etruschi [Rome 1986] or R. De Puma, in Secondo Congresso internazionale etrusco, Atti II [Florence 1989] 695–711). Ingela Wiman’s dissertation for Lund University is the most complete and systematic attempt so far to integrate art historical and statistical approaches to the study of Etruscan mirrors.

The major source for scientific data is the Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum (CSE). Since its inception in 1981, 16 fascicles have been published. Of course, because the CSE series is far from complete and Wiman had to restrict her investigation to fascicles published before January 1989, her conclusions must be considered tentative. Certain other limitations are important to bear in mind. Excluded from her study are 1) mirrors for which well-documented chemical analyses of the alloys are not available (e.g., the 64 Bologna mirrors [CSE Italy 1–2] are excluded because they were tested by X-ray fluorescence on the mirror surfaces, a non-destructive but unreliable method; and the 70 mirrors in the Cabinet des Médailles [D. Rebuffat-Emmanuel, Le miroir étrusque, Paris 1973], the 83 Louvre mirrors [CSE France 1], and the 62 mirrors in former East Germany [CSE DDR 1–2] because they were not chemically analyzed at all); 2) undecorated mirrors, relief mirrors, box mirrors, separate mirror handles, and mirrors associated with ancient Praeneste (“since they are not Etruscan by strict definition”); 3) mirrors considered “forgeries” either in part or whole; and 4) some hand mirrors whose sample sites were not indicated in the CSE. On the other hand, Wiman does include the chemical analyses of 41 mirrors published by R. Lambrichts in Les miroirs étrusques et préenestins des Musées royaux d’art et d’histoire à Bruxelles (Brussels 1978) and a selection of 30 mirrors in the British Museum (whose anticipated CSE fas-