

Heracles, who is Eurypylus' grandfather and acts as a father-figure of Philoctetes, plays a pivotal role in these two ecphrasis; thus, it might have been rewarding to analyse them alongside that of Achilles' shield.

The two following chapters essentially pose the same main question from different viewpoints again: how, and why, is Quintus attempting to be simultaneously Homeric *and* un-Homeric? One of Maciver's most compelling arguments is that about the Stoic influences on the *Posthomeric*: these do not simply testify to Quintus' imperial context in the sense that they unmask him as post-Homeric, but they serve a specifically metapoetic function, since they invite the reader to rethink, and appropriate, the Homeric epics from a Stoic perspective. Therefore, ultimately the *Posthomeric* becomes, as Maciver puts it, 'both a reading of Homer and a revision of Homer' (123).

SILVIO F. BÅR

University of Oslo

silvio.baer@ifikk.uio.no

HISTORY

GRECO (E.) *Ed. Lemno: dai 'Tirreni' agli Ateniesi. Problemi storici, archeologici, topografici e linguistici (Napoli, 4 maggio 2011)* and CULASSO GASTALDI (E.) and MARCHIANDI (D.) *Eds Gli Ateniesi fuori dall'Attica: modi d'intervento e di controllo del territorio (Torino, 8–9 aprile 2010)* (Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle missioni italiane in oriente 88 = serie III 10, 2010). Athens: Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 2012. Pp. ix + 537, illus. €150. 0067-0081.

doi:10.1017/S0075426914001694

The proceedings of the two colloquia presented here pertain to the same research project concerning the island of Lemnos. Both proceedings take into full account the results of the archaeological and topographical investigations of Lemnos, and in particular the site of Hephaestia, lead by the Italian Archaeological School over the last 80 years (see also E. Greco and E. Papi (eds), *Hephaestia 2000–2006*, Paestum 2008).

The first proceedings offer a coherent and persuasive picture of pre- and early Athenian Lemnos, by combining archaeological evidence with historiographic and epigraphic sources. Here

I shall confine myself to the most significant research advancements, stressed also by M. Gras in his conclusions.

For the Late Bronze Age, L. Coluccia detects the presence at Hephaestia of a community marked by a strong Mycenaean facet, probably guarding the maritime route towards northern Greece, which might have taken advantage of the isthmus between Koukonisi and Hephaestia. In the Early Iron Age, between the late 12th and early 11th centuries, the presence of a new material culture, marked by the so-called Gray Ware pottery, suggests the arrival or emergence of different peoples.

For Archaic Lemnos, L. Ficuciello detects a phase of Euboian influence (late eighth to mid-seventh century), followed by distinct changes and discontinuities in material culture, necropoleis and cults. In this period (mid-seventh to late sixth century), the island, which was mainly involved in wine production and metallurgy, became an important centre of cultural and commercial interaction between the Cycladic and Near Eastern areas and the northern Aegean. The population lived in nucleated villages, organized around aristocratic clans and subject to a central authority.

The arrival of Athenian settlers between the late sixth and early fifth century is marked by a clear-cut break in the material culture of the island. A. Correale stresses the destruction of the sacred areas of Archaic Hephaestia, which was later put to different uses, while S. Camporeale points to the fact that the fifth-century settlement was completely reorganized in an urban grid with rectangular blocks. E. Greco recognizes here an urban plan *per strigas*, well-known from several western Greek *apoikiai* and usually dated from the late sixth to the mid-fifth century, while L. Ficuciello focuses on the main sanctuaries of the island, where cultic activities were revived in the mid-fifth century by the absorption and reinterpretation of former practices (which also influenced Athenian cults in turn).

E. Culasso argues that both the archaeological and epigraphic evidence reveal the presence of Athenian residents from the second quarter of the fifth century, pointing to a definitive settling in the Cimonian era.

E. Greco and O. Voza tentatively date the early (wooden) phase of the newly-discovered theatre of Hephaestia between the late fifth and the early fourth century, and discuss its importance for the political and cultural organization of the settlement.

The second set of proceedings focus on post-500 BC Lemnos and on other Athenian colonies. In this last respect, the focus of the contributions ranges from the fifth-century colonization of Histiaia-Oreos (C. Lasagni) and Amphipolis (M. Mari), to the fifth- and fourth-century *klerouchiai* in the Thracian Chersonese (S. Gallotta), at Potidea (A. Rhomiopoulou), Samos (F. Landucci Gattinoni) and Imbros (B. Ruhl), and to the fourth-century Athenian occupation of Oropos (D. Knoepfler), while L. Gallo offers a useful outline of the administrative structures of the Athenian *klerouchiai*.

Among the contributions concerning Lemnos, D. Marchiandi presents new interesting data about the aristocratic status of some of the first Athenian settlers, as revealed by traces of an elitist funerary ritual, while L. Ficuciello focuses on the economic exploitation of Myrina's territory and detects the presence of vast properties and intensive farming, as opposed to the small and medium properties of Hephaestia's territory. E. Culasso gives a general account of Lemnian history, institutions and society through the epigraphic evidence, and considers the island as a 'suburb' of Athens, closely integrated with the political and administrative structures of its mother-city.

The debate about the nature of the Athenian colonization of Lemnos (*apoikia* versus *klerouchia*) and its implications for the political and administrative status of the island in the fifth and fourth centuries (independent *polis* versus dependent administrative unit) runs through most of the contributions and intertwines with more general questions concerning the form of the Athenian colonization and the accuracy and consistency of the ancient vocabulary referring to the different forms of colonization (M. Moggi, M. Lombardo). The coexistence of discordant views does not impair the coherence of the proceedings, but encourages a closer examination of more individual case studies and crucial related topics, such as the citizenship and fiscal rights of the Athenian settlers, the practical exercise of those rights and the contribution that archaeological, epigraphic and historiographic evidence can make to our understanding of these issues.

The volume offers many significant research advancements and new insights into the history of Lemnos and constitutes a useful instrument for those particularly interested in the Athenian colonization of the fifth and fourth centuries.

CRISTINA CARUSI

The University of Texas at Austin
carusi@austin.utexas.edu

MACÉ (A.) *Ed. Choses privées et chose publique en Grèce ancienne. Genèse et structure d'un système de classification* (Collection HOROS). Grenoble: Éditions Jérôme Millon, 2012. Pp. 492. €35. 9782841-372690.

doi:10.1017/S0075426914001700

The book, part of a wider project that has previously seen the publication of another volume edited by François de Polignac and Pauline Schmitt Pantel (*Public et privé en Grèce ancienne. Lieux, conductes, pratiques* (Ktéma 23) Strasbourg 1998), is a wide-ranging exploration of the development of the concepts of 'public' and 'private' in Archaic and Classical Greece. It provides discussions of relevant terms and concepts, and French translations of relevant passages, in various corpora. It aims therefore to be both a discrete piece of research and a useful and accessible reference work for those interested in the topic. It also provides helpful tables that trace the usage of the relevant terms (463–81).

Macé's introduction (7–40) first sets out the rationale of the study and its methodology. It stresses the importance of investigating concepts such as 'private' and 'public' in the ancient world according to their own lexical usages and trying to connect the development of such usages to the development of conceptions of a public and a private sphere. In this sense, Macé states that terms such as 'privé' and 'public', 'État' and 'chose publique' are used only as approximations of ancient concepts marking the dualism between *demosios* and *idios* or *koinos* and *idios*. The very act of translating is an attempt to trace the borders of the realities the Greek terms marked in their own social and cultural contexts. The individual chapters by and large are consistent with these remarks. Yet while later chapters focus specifically on the terms *demosios*, *koinos* and *idios*, the first three chapters on Homer, Hesiod and the Homeric Hymns collect passages which are relevant to the concepts of 'public' and 'private' but do not stick to these three terms (and to *xynos* and *oikeios*), which are very rarely attested in these corpora.

Macé's introduction then proceeds to provide an account of various conceptual and terminological distinctions and developments. It shows that while in the late fifth and fourth centuries *demosios* and *koinos* were often used as synonyms, the former was originally connected with the sphere of the state and the latter with