SVENSKA INSTITUTEN I ATHEN OCH ROM
INSTITUTUM ATHENIENSE ATQUE INSTITUTUM ROMANUM REGNI SUECIAE

Opuscula

Annual of the Swedish Institutes at Athens and Rome

3
2010

STOCKHOLM

SECRETARY'S ADDRESS:
Department of Archaeology and Ancient History
Box 626
SE-751 26 Uppsala

EDITOR:
Dr Jenni Hjohlman, Stockholm
E-mail: jenni.hjohlman@antiken.su.se

DISTRIBUTOR:
eddy.se AB
Box 1310
SE-621 24 Visby

For general information, see www.ecsi.se
For subscriptions, prices and delivery, see http://ecsi.bokorder.se

Published with the aid and of a grant from the Swedish Research Council
The English text was revised by Dr Carole Gillis, Lund

Contributions to Opuscula should be sent to the Secretary of the Editorial Committee (address above) before November 1 every year. Contributors are requested to include an abstract summarizing the main points and principal conclusions of their article. For style of references to be adopted, see www.ecsi.se/guide-contributors. All articles are sent to referees for peer review. Books for review should be sent to the Secretary of the Editorial Committee (address above). Books not reviewed will be listed under the heading Books received.

ISSN 2000-0898
ISBN 978-91-977798-2-1

Typeset and printed in Sweden 2010 by Motala Grafiska AB

students (among whom this reviewer) for its seeming lack of parallels for the complex unity of its decoration. Of the three different but adjoining motifs, the two extended, multi-figured ones depict four warriors fighting and two male-female couples in an encounter involving weapons, respectively; the third one comprises a single, human huntsman (hat on head) carrying his prey. As for the scene with the two couples, Langdon takes it to represent engagement (*engue*), i.e., an agreement between two men, one the father of the bride-to-be, the other the bridegroom. This accounts well for the position of the two men who stand opposite each other in the centre, one holding a staff that may be a badge of power (sceptre). But all the rest remains opaque, even the two women. Which one of them is the bride, if either? The statuesque, even matronly, woman on the left-hand side whom Langdon picks out is not a convincing option. Some details of hands and weapons make me think (like some before me) that the painter may have had a particular (mythic) story in mind here rather than a generic family event.

The Munich stand introduces an extended discussion of the adult man: how "the freewheeling warrior" is brought "into the control and hierarchy of the evolving state structure" and how the *oikos* thereby becomes the principal arena of his dominance and his efforts of social positioning among high-standing equals (which includes competition for high-ranked brides). This discussion is based in part on modern theoretical work on masculinity but also avails itself of Geometric "manhood iconography" and funerary and domestic archaeology. This forms a good foil for examining male-female and marriage imagery. Here Langdon is careful when trying to sort out Eastern models from Greek ones, Bronze Age prototypes from Iron Age ones, and divine images from profane ones. This is undoubtedly a very complex web where much has to remain hidden from our knowledge. It is, however, clear that male-female-couple imagery, like *parthenos* imagery, is a phenomenon of the 8th/early 7th century, and that at least part of it is to be seen as an expression of the dynamic move towards the polis community.

In this survey I have paid proportionally much attention to the "significant objects" presented by the author. Of course, these do not carry the whole weight of Langdon's central arguments on the connection of Geometric art with social identity; alongside them, Langdon uses a wide array of materials and functions, contexts and backgrounds, and theoretical viewpoints. Yet these objects, the way they are used for introducing the interpretive framework of the ideal gender types—the young man, the young woman and, finally, the adult man and the male-female interrelation of marriage—occupy a foreground position. This puts much pressure on them, perhaps a little more than they can sustain. Their painted scenes are a troublesome lot—they both tease and thwart the modern viewer. Indeed, if the highlighting of these paintings by Langdon should result in their receiving more scholarly attention, all the better. The "significant objects", from the Dipylon vases to the items treated by Langdon, surely meant much as backings for the paintings, yet pictorial painting of this type was an asset on its own merits. The multi-figure and diversified scene formed a more emphatic unit than the single figure: the ability of the former to dissociate or emancipate itself from the clay surface was larger. In some cases, like the Munich stand, one can feel very concretely how the grand design competes with a rotating and restraining clay surface! Thus, while still a novelty, the multi-figure scene is likely to have triggered the viewer to take a more intense look, and thereby to consider more actively what was shown. Its essence was discursive presentation[1], whether mainly descriptive or narrative; the discourse was about the world, the "real-life" one or the divine/heroic one. The development is to be ascribed to new communicative needs among patrons, a thing that merits analysis on its own account.

EVA RYSTEDT

V. Karageorghis, *A lifetime in the archaeology of Cyprus. The memoirs of Vassos Karageorghis*, Stockholm: Medelhavsmuseet 2007. xvi + 226 pp., 187 figs. ISBN 91-89242-14-9.

Three years ago, in 2007, the Museum of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Antiquities in Stockholm published the memoirs of Vassos Karageorghis, the doyen of Cypriot archaeology. The book is entitled *A lifetime in the archaeology of Cyprus*. That Karageorghis would at some point take the step of writing his memoirs comes as no surprise considering his many achievements and experiences over the years in the world of Mediterranean archaeology, his wide-ranging contacts with the international scholarly community and his flair for communication. What could perhaps not be foreseen were only when he would write them and who would be the publisher. The question of when has now been answered. As for the choice of publisher (Medelhavsmuseet), the solid and durable link between Cyprus and Sweden in the domain of archaeology going all the way back to the Swedish Cyprus Expedition (1927–1931)

[1] See E. Rystedt, 'Pictorial matter, pictorial form. A view from Mycenae towards Athens', in *Pictorial pursuits: figurative painting on Mycenaean and Geometric pottery: papers from two seminars at the Swedish Institute at Athens in 1999 and 2001* (ActaAth-4°, 53), eds. E. Rystedt & B. Wells, Stockholm 2006, 245.

certainly accounts for much, as does also the recent Nicosia/Leventis Foundation–Stockholm connection resulting in the new exhibition of the Cyprus collection in the Museum in Stockholm. But old friendships also mattered. Einar Gjerstad, the leader of the Swedish Cyprus Expedition, and Karageorghis were friends. Gjerstad and his wife travelled to Cyprus for a winter stay each year starting from Gjerstad's 80th birthday (1977) and the two scholars maintained a close contact. In fact, they pose together, arm in arm, in a fine black-and-white photo taken in Sweden during a visit by Karageorghis and placed on the front of the book.

The narrative starts in the small Cypriot village where Karageorghis was raised as a child. It ends with his current life touring the world as a true cosmopolitan while steadily promoting Cypriot and Greek culture and often acting on behalf of the Leventis Foundation. The events in between, both small and large, fill the major part of the book. Passing in review one after the other, they paint an extraordinarily rich life serving Cypriot archaeology within its different spheres of activity: excavation and research, administration, and diplomacy.

The most interesting period of his life, presumably both to himself and to the reader who is permitted a view of it, is no doubt his 25 years of service as Director of the Department of Antiquities (1964–1989). It was the period when his career reached its acme, entailing a freedom of action that he did not enjoy in his previous assignments at the Cyprus Museum serving under others. Now he had the possibility to influence, indeed mould, the future of Cypriot archaeology both outdoors in the field and indoors in the museum and in the study premises. Also, the time from 1960 onwards was one of major political transformations in Cyprus with strong and enduring effects on all activity on the island, including the archaeological and scholarly one. In 1960 the colonial (British) sovereignty came to an end and the island set out on its new course as a free republic. In 1974 came the imposition of Turkish rule on the northern part of the island.

In his role as Director of the Department of Antiquities Karageorghis was a champion of the policy of generously allowing foreign missions to excavate on the island. He gave permits both to scholars and institutes who applied for them and to others. Sites and areas were chosen with care, taking into consideration their potential contributions to knowledge. Reading the text of Chapters II and III of the book, we witness how a veritable program of excavation took shape step by step from these decisions, and how Karageorghis acted as the prime mover. Following the post-war foreign expeditions of the late 1940s and 1950s such as that of the French at Enkomi (site shared from 1948 on with the Department), another French mission now arrived at Salamis (alongside Karageorghis' own at the same site), a Franco-Canadian one at Soloi, a Polish one at Nea Paphos, a British (postcolonial) one at the same site, a German-led one (continuing an earlier, British one from the 1950s) at Palaepaphos, a Scottish one at Ayios Epiktetos, a German one at Tamassos, a French one at Cape Andreas, two American ones at Phlamoudi and Morphou, respectively, an Italian one at Ayia Irini, and so on … Karageorghis asserts that he treated the missions well ("as collaborators and friends", p. 77). Yet clearly there was control ("… they had to respect the authority of the Department of Antiquity": *ibidem*), and occasionally pressure, too, if anybody was slow to publish: permits could also be terminated. It is obvious that this situation differed strikingly from that prevailing on the Greek mainland. Here several sizable German, French and English missions had been active for a very long time without any strong Greek authority to heed.

Thus the newly won political independence of Cyprus together with the new strong-willed man at the rudder of the Department injected fresh energy and international flavour to Cypriot archaeology. There was a rise in scholarly engagement and knowledge. Naturally, Karageorghis' own, successful excavations contributed a lot. Foremost among these was the excavation at Salamis. Karageorghis was active here between 1952 and 1974. The sensationally well-equipped tombs from the eighth century BC at once came to occupy a central place not only in Cypriot but also in Mediterranean archaeology as a whole. In addition, a theatre and a gymnasium and much marble sculpture from later periods came to light. Parts of these buildings were restored, with a view to the site's potential for attracting visits by non-academics and tourists. It appears that Karageorghis at all times considered very seriously the resources for cultural tourism that are offered by the physical remains. Alongside and after Salamis, and with equal personal investment, Karageorghis excavated at Kition for many years (1974–1981), financed by funds reserved for the archaeological activities in the north that had to be abandoned after the Turkish takeover in 1974. The finds at Kition proved extremely important for the history of the island by showing that this site was inhabited long before the traditionally accepted Phoenician immigration. Karageorghis also conducted some more restricted but still important excavations at other sites. In all these operations he carefully and skilfully selected his assistants and technicians; his report on the proceedings of these excavations, and on the ensuing work with the publications, make clear that the success was in no little measure due to their competence, assiduity and loyalty. Additional work in the field was car-

ried out by colleagues at the Department, naturally under the supervision of the Director. Other scholarly areas of importance that were more or less strongly influenced by Karageorghis include the upgrading of the *Reports of the Department of Antiquities* to a flourishing scientific journal and the launching of a row of international conferences on Cypriot and Mediterranean archaeology. The Turkish invasion of course had a big impact. Karageorghis' native village Trikomo was drawn into the area of Turkish dominance. So was Salamis, the project especially close to his heart, with negative consequences for the site. Much of this explains the unusual zeal with which Karageorghis after 1974 has constantly been raising support for Greek culture and Greek language as global assets.

Apart from his years as Director, the study years are an especially fascinating read. We first meet a pupil at the Famagusta Greek Gymnasium at Trikomo and the Pancyprian Gymnasium at Nicosia who is intent on being best in class and the best in school, and is therefore studying hard and ardently. Later, after an ineffectual study interval at the University of Athens, we see a Classics student at University College in London whose teachers are Martin Robertson, T.B.L. Webster and A.H.M. Jones, who attends lectures by Gordon Childe, Max Mallowan and Mortimer Wheeler and who is taught practical archaeology for the first time at a summer course at St. Albans, under the direction of Wheeler and his assistant. He is still hard working but also finds time to look around a bit and discover a world very different from the one that he is used to. Studying abroad around 1950 was a rare experience for young students from the Mediterranean countries, and Cyprus especially. Foreign habits that were indeed very foreign had to be mastered, but an open mind helped. Great things could happen suddenly. Passing once by train from Italy to France he met a group of French schoolgirls, and among these he found his future wife and formed a family with her. As a senior citizen now, Karageorghis has not only children but also grandchildren.

The memoirs provide a wealth of information on the professional management of archaeology on Cyprus at a very interesting and significant historical juncture permeated by political difficulties. The fact that the memoirs emanate from the pen of a gifted and exceedingly energetic individual who was at the very heart of the events heighten their value. The only thing that the reader might regret is that he or she is not introduced at length to the heart itself, especially the Department of Antiquities and the Ministry to which it belonged (Ministry of Communications and Works), so as to benefit from the exceptional knowledge of the working of these institutions that Karageorghis gathered during his long period of office. A sustained tour of this heartland to learn about the internal stirrings, long-term and short-term, underlying the visible undulations on the surface, would have been most welcome alongside the piece-by-piece presentation of single acts and responses; in this way some of the difficulties between Karageorghis and his colleagues and collaborators could have appeared in even more interesting perspectives than they already do. Yet we must of course respect Karageorghis' choice in building his story more on concrete, observable matters than on underlying forces. Probably the inclusion of an analytical element would have given the book a more academic slant than the author wished, given that the work is a memoir.

The book is full of lively details. A whole gallery of individuals is presented with whom Karageorghis maintained, and maintains, links. Many of the personages were, or still are, important academic names. The reader is offered accounts of his meetings with them, often sprinkled with good humour and exciting minutiae. This stuff forms light courses that effectively complement the heavier one of the author's own achievements and especially the unending series of rewards and honours received. Sometimes archaeological objects are used as props for good stories. One story that I myself particularly enjoyed is about a Mycenaean pictorial krater found at Kourion (the so-called Window Krater). Due to the find circumstances, the fragments of the krater ended up both in Cyprus (Cyprus Museum at Nicosia) and in London (British Museum). The poor vase had to endure being restored as *two* vases (a true case of split personality) before the solution arrived with Mortimer Wheeler: all the fragments were assembled into a single vase exposed in the Cyprus Museum at Nicosia and the London parts were registered as "on permanent loan" in the inventory of the British Museum.

The book is happily supplied with an index of persons and places. There are no less than 187 pictures, many of which are good colour photos. These pictures form a veritable historical archive in itself. Karageorghis' memoirs, text and pictures, thus contribute substantially to the history of archaeological scholarship in the Mediterranean. The book deserves a wide readership.

EVA RYSTEDT