représentent des navires de fabrication exclusivement chypriote. Les bateaux figurés sur les documents archéologiques en question peuvent aussi bien avoir été construits ailleurs, Chypre ayant été, on le sait, au centre d'un commerce maritime international durant l'Antiquité. De fait, cette étude, pour être complète, aurait dû traiter également des bateaux dans le reste du bassin oriental de la méditerranée.

Dans la seconde partie de son ouvrage (47–68) l'auteur analyse le matériel compilé et se livre à des observations sur les méthodes de construction des navires, leurs différentes parties et leurs gréments, pour en arriver à les diviser en trois types: 1) cargo de haute mer, illustré par une dizaine de documents; 2) prototype des anciens navires chypriotes qui partage plusieurs caractéristiques avec la caïque moderne: c'est dans ce groupe que la plupart des entrées du catalogue ont été placées; 3) petites embarcations et cas particuliers, dont nous avons 6 exemples.

La conclusion très laconique, à mon avis, de ce travail est que ces bateaux n'étaient pas des navires de guerre mais bien des embarcations pour le transport pacifique des marchandises. Ils viennent confirmer l'importance de Chypre dans le réseau commercial international dans l'est de la méditerranée à cette époque. Un glossaire de termes nautiques complète ce petit livre ainsi qu'une brève bibliographie. Bien que cette étude aurait pu être poussée plus loin, elle demeure très valable en raison de son corpus établi pour la première fois. Elle attire enfin l'attention sur cet aspect vital de l'histoire chypriote en attendant la découverte d'autres épaves du genre de celle du Cap Gelidonya.


Ce livre a d'abord été écrit en suédois en 1933, il y a maintenant 50 ans! L'auteur, qui a dirigé les travaux de la fameuse mission archéologique suédoise à Chypre (Swedish Cyprus Expedition) qui s'affaira sans répit dans l'île de août 1927 à mai 1931, soit pendant 4 années consécutives, présente ici d'une manière populaire les fouilles, leurs résultats et leur place dans la reconstitution de l'histoire ancienne de l'île (Ages). En même temps, il raconte la vie quotidienne de l'équipe en mission (Days) dans une Chypre pré-moderne. A ce titre cet ouvrage constitue un précieux document ethnographique. Comme Catling l'a souligné dans son compte rendu du même livre (Antiquity 67 [1983] 71–72; 72) cette époque est maintenant révolue autant que celles révélées par les fouilles de l'expédition. Il est aussi intéressant de noter l'esprit dans lequel Gjerstad menait ses fouilles: "An archaeological expedition is not all excavation. It also includes conversations with the people living near the excavation sites" (78).
Le texte de 1933 a été mis à jour de manière à tenir compte des résultats des récentes découvertes. Ce travail de révision est admirable quand on sait que Gjerstad a actuellement 86 ans. Depuis le temps de sa première visite dans l'île en 1923, à l'âge de 26 ans (il y a donc 60 ans), il est resté actif dans le domaine de l'archéologie chypriote, à preuve sa dernière contribution au Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus (1980) 1-16, sur l'origine de l'âge du Bronze à Chypre à la lumière d'un nouvel examen de la céramique trouvée sur le site d'Ambelikou Ayios Georgios.

L'œuvre de sa vie demeure sans contredit la publication avec ses collègues des quatre volumes de la Swedish Cyprus Expedition (Stockholm 1934–1948) décrivant les 20 sites fouillés par la mission (vol. 1, 2 et 3) et faisant la synthèse des résultats (vol. 4, en plusieurs tomes): toujours l'ouvrage de référence par excellence en archéologie chypriote.

Dans Ages and Days, Gjerstad a choisi de faire suivre à son récit un ordre chronologique dont certains pourraient dire qu'il reflète une déformation professionnelle. En effet, chaque chapitre correspond à une période historique et il procède du néolithique jusqu'à l'époque romaine. Ainsi l'auteur commence par la présentation de la fouille du site néolithique de Petra tou Limniti et termine avec celui d'un site plus tardif: Soloi. Il précise que naturellement les travaux d'excavation ne se sont pas déroulés dans cet ordre! En introduction, le lecteur apprend comment cette expédition suédoise à Chypre est née: une rencontre fortuite dans une gare en Serbie qui fait plus penser à un début de roman d'aventure, et de quelle manière Gjerstad a dû ensuite s'acharner pour parvenir à entreprendre les travaux sur le terrain en s'assurant les services d'ouvriers; ce dernier épisode se compare bien à des anecdotes rapportées par Lawrence Durrell nous dévoilant la mentalité chypriote. Renseignements non-négligeables pour ceux qui cherchent à comprendre les anciens habitants de Chypre.
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Studies in Ancient Greek Topography 3 (Roads) and 4 (Passes).


These two volumes contain 21 essays most of which attempt to retrace routes (and places along routes) taken by ancient travelers and armies through Greece as described in literary accounts. Particularly important chapters treat the general subject of Greek road building (3, chap. 5) and the Greek section of the Tabula Peutingeriana (3, chap. 6). Other chapters
deal with roads, sites, and passes in Northern Greece, especially Ther­
mospylae (3, chaps. 9 and 10; 4, chap. 9), Central Greece (3, chaps. 7 and 8; 4, chaps. 6, 7, 8, 10), and the Peloponnese (3, chaps. 1–4; 4, chaps. 1–5). Several chapters are devoted to answering critics who have doubted Pritchett's previous identifications (3, chaps. 7 and 10; 4, chaps. 6 and 9). Since detailed discussion of even a sample of the individual essays would take more space than is available here and would necessarily be of limited interest, I confine my discussion to some of the implications of Pritchett's methodology.

Pritchett's main concern is the identification of ancient remains, because the roads and passes he treats are often described in the sources in terms of the nearby towns, sanctuaries, and fortifications. He reviews relevant archaeological studies and discusses the significance of ancient walls, architectural members, and sherd concentrations which he himself has seen. This is not, however, an archaeological inquiry in the modern sense of the word, nor is it meant to be. It is topography in the antiquarian tradition of the great travelers of the mid-seventeenth through early twentieth centuries, amateur or professional classicists such as Wheler, Clarke, Lolling, and Leake, who toured Greece, usually on horseback, collected antiquities, copied inscriptions, and attempted to assign the correct ancient place names to the remains they saw in the course of their journeys. The antiquarian interests of the travelers naturally led to the modern science of archaeology (Schliemann dug at Hissarlik to prove it was Troy, not just because it might provide a fine example of pre-classical civilization), and even when, in the early and mid-twentieth century, archaeology was becoming increasingly professionalized and archaeologists were turning away from questions of site identification (e.g., C. Blegen's excavations at Zygouries, for which no ancient name could be proposed) topographers such as A. Milchhoefer continued the valuable work of describing visible remains in the countryside, away from the major centers of excavation. Others, such as A. R. Burn and N. G. L. Hammond, by concentrating on the locations of ancient battles, made important contributions to the study of communication routes. Pritchett is extremely well versed in the bibliography of topographical literature and his studies not only represent the culmination, but also provide a history, of over 300 years of scholarship. Pritchett's collection and collation of older descriptions of sites and roads is a tremendous service, especially since many heavily graded asphalt automobile roads have replaced older mule paths, and economic modernization (particularly deep plowing and growth of towns) has led inevitably, if regrettable, to the destruction of many of the antiquities once visible in the Greek countryside.

The essence of topography has always been autopsy, however, and Pritchett makes a point of trying to visit the sites and walk the roads in which he is interested, and is highly critical of "chimney corner topo-
practitioners" who draw conclusions without benefit of personal observation (see especially 3, chap. 10). Pritchett is certainly correct to stress the importance of field work, but his field methodology raises some serious questions about the place of topography (at least as Pritchett defines it) in modern scholarship. The early travelers were for the most part amateur "archaeologists" and their descriptions of sites are often vague; they tended to refer to "Hellenic" walls, or remains of "a temple" without feeling the need for making a more detailed record or measurements. Pritchett is certainly far better versed in archaeological procedure than most of his predecessors, but he has a tendency to refer, for example, to "pottery of the Hellenic period" (3.291; cf. 4.17-18), a style of description that tells the reader less than he may wish to know. While Pritchett makes an effort to include measurements of road widths, etc., he mixes metric and English units willy-nilly (e.g., 3.19, 100, 148-149; 4.16) and sometimes resorts to pacing or rough estimates (e.g., 3.15, 97; 4.22). Although interested in the important question of the grade of ancient roadbeds, Pritchett was unable to take measurements and seems to be confused about the difference between degree and percent of grade as noted in published accounts.

A major flaw throughout is Pritchett's willingness to base arguments on negative evidence—the fact that he was unable to find surface remains (3.10; 4.90), that earlier travelers report no remains or sherds of a certain period (3.44; 4.168), or that local residents know of no antiquities (or, perhaps, are unwilling to discuss them?) in a given area (3.10, 45; 4.90). Arguments based on the absence of sites, pottery, roads, etc., must, of course, be revised if and when new material is subsequently discovered. Pritchett is also quick to jump to conclusions based on slim evidence—for example, he claims to have identified the site of the temple at Delion on the basis of two blocks (which subsequently disappeared) found on a hill selected for investigation more or less at random (3, chap. 8). Because of these factors and because of the necessarily limited scope of his investigations in any given area, Pritchett often changes his mind, and many of the essays presented here consist of corrigenda or addenda to his previously published studies (3, chaps. 7-10; 4, chaps. 4-6, 9). Consequently, scholars must be careful not to cite Pritchett's earlier studies before checking these volumes.

1 One might note, however, that Pritchett's description of the passes over Mt. Tsemborou (4.47-51) is largely dependent on earlier reports. Pritchett makes a rather peculiar argument against the existence of "easy passes" over the mountain based on a supposition that if "easy passes" had existed they would have been used by the engineers of the railroad. But railroads must maintain grades less than 3 percent and Pritchett informs us elsewhere that carriageable ancient roads could have grades as steep as 30 percent; see note 2.

2 In discussing the grade of carriageable roads Pritchett cites T. Despotopoulos (Technika Chronika 17 [1940] 329-338, at 330-331) as proof that ancient roads could be as steep as 30 percent or more (3.97, 193), but elsewhere (3.169; 4.81) Pritchett erroneously cites the measurement as 30 degrees (= approximately 57 percent grade).
for his revisions. This is, unfortunately, no easy task, since the titles of the articles often give little hint of the contents and no index is provided to either volume. An index to all of Pritchett's topographical studies is a great desideratum, but as Pritchett writes that his researches are to continue (4.x), a general index would be premature at this time. Meanwhile some scholars may be wary of citing the present conclusions, anticipating revision in future contributions.

The resolution of these difficulties is not to be found in better topography—it should be stressed that Pritchett's work is topography at its best—but in the adoption of different research methods altogether. Pritchett takes as his preserve the whole of mainland Greece and one must be impressed by the breadth of his reading and the energy of his hiking. But as long as scholars limit themselves to the search for sites mentioned in the ancient sources and spread their (always limited) field time over a vast area, of which, with the best will in the world, they can see only a part, conclusions can only be preliminary, subject to revision when the next student walks a different route. Citation of earlier topographical studies and quizzing the natives is not a real solution to this problem. The earlier travelers missed much (as Pritchett notes, 4.80 n. 1, despite his tendency to adduce the collective knowledge of his predecessors when arguing from negative evidence) and local informants are often wrong (as Pritchett knows, 3.35–36, but sometimes chooses to ignore). It is only by the methods of intensive survey, whereby all the visible sites in a given area (or at least all sites of a particular type) are accurately recorded and studied in relationship to the terrain and climate, that definitive answers to topographical riddles will be found. This is, of course, a time-consuming process and an individual surveyor or surveying team can cover only a relatively small area in a season's work, but the results, which can resolve social, historical, and economic (as well as topographical) problems are well worth the effort.3

A couple of quibbles: Some of the essays in Passes have little or nothing to do with passes (4, chaps. 1, 3, 6) and, given the title, one might have hoped for a general descriptive essay (comparable to the very useful one on Greek roads in 3, chap. 5) on the nature of mountain passes and their importance in determining communication routes and military movements. Pritchett's arguments at times become very involved and are not always easy to follow; the difficulty is compounded by frequent digressions and asides. Of course, casual digressions provide much of the charm of topographical literature and readers attempting to follow in Pritchett's footsteps may well be glad of advice on a good spot for a picnic (3.63).

None of the preceding comments, however, take away from the fact that Pritchett has amassed a great quantity of extremely useful material in these volumes and has made significant contributions toward solving many knotty problems of site identification. The maps are well drawn and the numerous plates are very helpful.
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Kirkwood has written the first extended Pindar commentary in English since the century-old work of Gildersleeve and Bury. His selection is wise and generous: Ol. 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14, Pyth. 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 10, Nem. 1, 7, Isthm. 1, 6, and a representative group of fragments. Most of the important odes are here, and, although the book is intended for beginners in Pindar, difficult poems such as Pyth. 2 and Nem. 7 are not omitted. I should have liked to see Ol. 3 and Pyth. 3 and 11 in place of Isthm. 1 and the short Ol. 11 and 12, and among the fragments it is a pity not to find the call to Aphrodite's Corinthian girls (fr. 122).

There is a comprehensive Introduction (3–40), which provides the background needed by the student (life of Pindar; choral lyric and epinician; the Games), discusses the Pindaric epinician and the dialect and metres, outlines the text history and gives a bibliography of all kinds of relevant work with the exception of translations. This introduction is clear, orderly, and helpful.

Each poem and fragment is presented with introduction, metrical schema, text, and a commentary slightly more ample than that of Gildersleeve (whose Introduction, however, was far longer). The scale seems exactly right, and the help given with grammar, syntax, and interpretation is usually well-judged. Critical assessments of the style, imagery, and unity of the poems are sensible and cautious: Norwood's methods, for example, are rejected; Bundy is given due attention but is not always followed. Throughout there is a welcome absence of rancour, although the description of a conjecture as "a paradigm of misspent ingenuity" almost makes one wish for more of the kind.

My principal regret is that Kirkwood did not seize the opportunity to treat the poems in chronological order: he has much that is interesting to say about Pindar's development between the earliest and latest datable poems (Pyth. 10 and 8, both included); but the hapless student must still begin with