ings (although there is a perceptive analysis of the construction of taste as social differentiation in the past) at the time of fieldwork or in the past. Attitudes to the value of conservation must also have changed across time for the plan has been in operation for many years. A house that is admittedly uncomfortable and damp is now potentially an important cultural and status resource, even for the poor whose sense of injustice must have been exacerbated by the increasing disparities between them and the wealthy. We are also told little on the models that actually inspired the Conservation Planners, or on the effects of literacy, the media, access to magazines, etc., on the construction of taste across time. People do not just conflict with State-imposed conservation efforts over practical/functional issues, but also over differences in aesthetic interpretation and significance. Whilst such aesthetic preferences are often legitimated by reference to historical evocations, this does not exhaust their significance. Aesthetics is often employed as a rhetorical weapon in the conflict of interpretations. Likewise the absence of overt aesthetic evocation, just as its conscious calculation (as in the hands of the wealthy literati who have moved there), are significant rhetorics that should be explored for their social (and class) implications.

Finally, the bureaucrats emerge as less rounded figures, than the attractively and sympathetically presented inhabitants of the old Town, but this may well have been due to the undeniably extreme delicacy required for this type of fieldwork, which Herzfeld carries out with elan and style. We do not know to what extent the original planners, the politicians in Athens, and the local bureaucrats empowered to implement the plan variously hoped to engender through the plan. Some may well have idealistically hoped to initiate through this a type of social engineering whereby Rethymnios would become good citizens and good 'Europeans'. The rhetoric employed by bureaucrats to explain failure or success is less explored. They themselves, I suspect, used a curious blend of localism ("The Rethemniots are like that..."), together with a generic ethnic stereotyping about the (Romeic) Greeks for internal consumption. In a city supposed to express and embody the 'European' heritage of Greece, the gap between the symbolism of the past and the symbolism of the 'non-European' rejection of the value of planning and preservation must have been particularly galling and required a vocabulary of justification, and in some cases of justification, and in some cases of counter-justification.

This is a sensitive, theoretically innovative book important for its contribution to anthropological theory and for archaeologists involved in the preservation of monuments which touch on the lives of ordinary people. It is full of brilliant insights that demistify the rhetoric that lies behind state sponsored architectural conservation, and sympathetically portrays the attempts by ordinary people to come to terms with it. It is also great fun to read.

Paul Sant Cassia
University of Durham


The origins and early development of the Classical Greek city state or polis have been a continual source of fascination for scholars, beginning with Greek philosophers and historians themselves. However the rapid surge of new archaeological material in recent decades, and the invigorating effect of anthropological archaeology on the previously moribund field of classical archaeology, have together stimulated a new wave of original studies, of which this volume is already rightly one of the most influential (the original hardback edition first appeared in 1987).

The book itself is refashioned from Ian Morris' PhD thesis, but it has been well-edited in the transformation, and only in minor details has anything significant been omitted, or too much padding retained from the original. Some of the technical analyses have sometimes been cut to such minimal presentation that the underlying methodology is left unsupported, although the sceptical reader can doubtless chase up the dissertation itself; nonetheless in several cases these important manipulations of data have to be taken at face value. Perhaps the format of the New Studies in Archaeology series is to blame, for trying to compress wide-ranging theoretical discussion and detailed data-analysis into a compact text; at times both aspects seem unduly abbreviated. Morris is however to be congratulated on the clarity of presentation throughout, telling us
in advance what he is trying to do, and with what means; and afterwards how far he thinks he has succeeded (with engaging modesty). The text is remarkably free of typographical errors (I merely noted that on p. 208 a line or two of text is missing).

Morris’ particular approach is to take the evidence of changing burial traditions in Early Iron Age Greece as a prime resource for reconstructing the evolution of city-state society from what preceded it. It has to be stated at once that the book’s subtitle is more than a little misleading, not just to the reader, but as will appear shortly, to the author, since almost the entire volume is focussed on the origins of the city-state of Athens, and there is no treatment in depth of the remaining Greek world. The chief reason doubtless lies in the great quantity of burial data and early literary sources for Athens, and the equally disproportionate amount of historical material for the nature of Classical Athenian society compared to almost every other state.

Allowing for the dominance of Athens, Morris’ thesis is both daring, highly significant, and generally convincing. Current orthodoxy considers the complex Bronze Age Mycenaean civilization to have collapsed c. 1200 BC into a Dark Age of many centuries’ duration, typified by minimal population and an absence of political hierarchy (SubMycenaean, Protogeometric and Early to Middle Geometric eras), followed by a remarkable recovery of population and the rapid rise of urban, aristocratic society from Late Geometric times (c. 750 BC onwards). Morris demonstrates with elegant sophistication and an appropriate variety of complementary statistical exercises, that the picture given by Athenian cemeteries tells a very different story. Based on the age, sex, range of grave goods and burial rites, and spatial clustering, of burials, we are led to the clear conclusion that for most of the Dark Age only a minority of the population received formal burial; these are most likely to have been adults of non-plebeian status, and the size of this elevated social group can be set at 25–50% of the total population. In the twilight era of Mycenaean culture on the other hand, the SubMycenaean, the total community is buried together, and the same custom is revived in Late Geometric times, when all other indications point to the creation of the city-state form of polity. Morris offers the highly plausible view that throughout the Dark Age society was ordered into two classes, and that just as the polis is distinctive for the unity of its citizens and their shared rights, so we can document its archaeological beginnings in the concession that commoners are allowed formal burial in defined cemeteries. The dramatic upswing in recorded burials in the late c. 8th BC in southern Greece is therefore as much a consequence of seeing previously ‘invisible’ populations as of any real population rise, though significantly Morris admits to the existence of population growth at this time. This interpretation furthermore resolves a curious paradox of Athenian cemeteries, that in subsequent Archaic times of the c. 7th–6th BC the number of recorded burials declines drastically to Dark Age levels, before a second dramatic rise at the dawn of the Classical era around 500 BC; Morris is highly persuasive that the c. 700 BC experiment at citizen-state formation failed and there was a return to noble exclusiveness in burial till the end of the c. 6th. That Athens was gripped by a social crisis throughout the Archaic era is well illustrated by the semi-historical accounts for that era, and the advent of Cleisthenes’ constitutional reforms in 507 BC, broadening the citizenry to include the poorer classes, coincides neatly with the lasting shift to total community burial.

The existence throughout the Dark Age of a hierarchical society does of course make sense of two anomalous features of the period: firstly the well-known continuity of the term for a local official or noble—basileus—from Mycenaean to Archaic times, and secondly the growing evidence for lavish ‘chieftain’ or ‘hero’ burials during the Dark Age (the most striking being at Lefkandi).

Part I of the book sets out the argument, and in Part II (much the most successful) the central analysis of the burial data is presented: Part III attempts to broaden the discussion to interpret the entire phenomenon of the rise of the Greek polis, and to this reviewer it is here that the more ambitious aims of the author fall apart.

The heart of Morris’ failure in Part III to resolve the meaning of the burial patterns for the origins of the city-state, lies in a fundamental confusion over what he understands by the polis. Always at the back of his mind there seems to be the Athenian model, which is of course a very extreme case of citizen democracy, where all but slaves and foreigners have full civic rights. The parallel opening up of formal burial coincident with the wide democracy created by Cleisthenes
agrees very well with expectation, but not only do we then have to suppose that the same process occurred unsuccessfully around 700 BC in Athens, but throughout the rest of the Greek world the shift to communal burial in Archaic times occurs without an equivalent rise in general citizen franchise. Indeed it is a glaring omission of Morris’ analysis that he fails to mention that in almost all states apart from Athens, for all or most of Greek history, full citizen rights were confined to the aristocratic (knighthly) class and the wealthier farmers (the hoplite class). It is thus quite erroneous for him to equate the rise of the Greek polis with a classless society. Indeed he is forced to curious and unconvincing explanations in trying to account for the fact that the polis generally emerges in terms of burial changes, civic evidence and literary testimony, around 700 BC, whereas the political structures remain aristocratic for some time afterwards, and only gradually transform into ‘citizen polities’ (in reality middle and upper class power sharing) through the Archaic period.

So if not democracy, even in Athens (for the state of Athens is considered to be created c. 700 BC and is not dissolved by the apparent retrenchment of noble privilege till 507 BC), what exactly does the birth of the polis mean? Morris correctly focusses on the concept of koinonia or community, yet we immediately want to know why Greek state formation at this small geographical scale is any different from parallel city-state developments in Early Iron Age Etruria or Phoenicia, not to mention Hallstatt Europe. Early on in this volume Morris makes a conventional statement of the uniqueness of the Greek political experience, that totally disregards these patent analogues, and must rest on the conflation of the Athenian polis with the very different class-based states that were the norm elsewhere in the Greek world. I suspect a great deal can be made, in fact, of these parallel state formations.

Two models that Morris advocates allow us to go further in probing the more complicated realities of the period. Firstly he suggests that the noble class (or agathoi) represent some 25–50% of the community throughout the Dark Age, the rest being commoners (kakoi) of serf status. Secondly he makes the provocative statement that the essence of the creation of the polis was the emancipation of the commoners, so that the opposition noble versus commoner, is transformed into citizen (= former agathoi + kakoi) versus slave. Now this model works very well in the special case of Athens, but as we have seen is entirely inappropriate for almost all other Greek states, where power and full citizenship were not extended to the lower classes and where it can be argued slavery was much less prevalent because these commoners provided fundamentally their equivalent as tied/hired labour. Now we can put an average figure on the size of the effectively politically enfranchised classes in most Greek city-states, the knights and hoplites, suggesting that between one third and a half of the free population were included; surely significantly this is exactly the proportion Morris finds to be given exclusive burial in the Dark Ages. It is very hard to resist a very different broader interpretation of the burial data to that proposed by Morris: from the collapse of Mycenaean civilization onwards, a class structure survived until the renewed rise of Classical civilization onwards, a class structure survived until the renewed rise of Classical civilization in Greece.

The numerically large group of ‘nobles’ ranged from yeoman farmers (like Hesiod) to genuine aristocrats or basileis with outstanding control over resources and power (such as those given ‘hero’ burial). Yet around the late c. 8th BC a real transformation took place, temporarily in Athens, but lasting in most other regions, with the creation of the city-state, refocussing loyalties from commoner-to-noble and lower noble-to-basileus, to communal identification with the concept of the integrated town-country unit of the polis. Civic monuments redirect display from noble tombs to communal temples and other public buildings, laws are created and inscribed which protect all free classes, whether politically active or not. But essentially, the norm outside of Athens is for power to remain with the same large minority as is revealed in Dark Age burials. Ian Morris has provided us with first-rate evidence for this sequence, but I don’t think has really begun to offer an adequate social and economic explanation for what he has found.

In the space available I will not attempt to elaborate alternative scenarios, but simply point to neglected areas of discussion where we might now go for closer understanding of these empirical phenomena. Firstly to the significance of the creation of city-state urbanism: here the remarkable monograph of Ernst Kirsten (1956 Die Griechische Polis) gets the closest to pinning down the specific nature of polis origins as a Stadtdorf, yet Kirsten doesn’t even make Morris’ bibliography. Secondly, in correctly showing
that population fluctuations over the whole post-
Mycenaean period have been exaggerated, Morris
calls unintentionally into the trap of forgetting
about demography entirely; all available data
still point to Dark Age populations being a frac-
tion of Mycenaean, with a marked rise in Late
Geometric and a veritable explosion in Archaic
and earliest Classical times to levels often higher
than today’s. I suspect Morris has obscured this
further by taking the wide spread of small, mul-
tiple Dark Age cemetery sites over later urban
sites to imply equivalent sprawling settlements;
it is notable that settlement remains are much
more confined, opening up the possibility that
many burials could be marked ‘rural’
landholdings. At the close of the Dark Age, with
concomitant surges in land intake and economic
transformations of a remarkable order, just at the
critical times of change in burial formats, it is
surely necessary to take account of the impact on
political life of these underlying processes. Thirdly,
Morris dismisses totally from consideration the
important role traditionally given to state for-
mation by the ‘hoplite reform’, the supposed shift
in the c. 7th BC from warfare dominated by
individual aristocrats to that dominated by massed
corps of heavily-armoured footsoldiers (the
hoplites). Morris’ critique is enthusiastic but I
find it highly problematic and ultimately un-
convincing. Let us recall that in Hesiod’s world,
at least, the hoplite class was seemingly under the
thumb of the basileus, and I wonder if Morris has
not unintentionally hit the nail on the head in
suggesting that the Dark Age agathoi comprised
politically potent aristocrats and non-power-wield-
ing yeoman farmers. Did a genuine hoplite re-
form occur when the hoplite class grew dramatic-
ally in size in Late Geometric and Archaic times
and demanded power-sharing as their role in
warfare pushed out the true aristocrats? A large
hoplite army rests on the kind of economic trans-
formation that seems to have been occurring at
the time of state formation.

John Bintliff,
University of Durham

As with most volumes deriving from confer-
ences, this collection of papers is of variable
quality, not always hanging together coherently,
and includes contributions more appropriate to
specialist journals than a book clearly intended
for a wide audience. On the whole, though, there
is a solid spread of interesting and insightful
papers which fully justify the volume’s public-
ation. Nonetheless, the book would certainly
have gained from an editorial introduction that
sought to bring the various contributions into
comparative perspective. Perhaps this reinforces
existing prejudices about the poverty of theory in
Byzantine studies.

Section 1, ‘Teaching the Past’, opens grandly
with Bishop Kallistos evaluating the meaning of
the mass for Byzantine worshippers. In contrast
to the designers of churches and their murals, and
the official teaching, both of which saw church
services as literal meetings of the congregation
with Christ and the Saints, contemporary accounts
reflect modern practice, with people chatting and
coming and going continually, not listening to or
finding inaudible the priestly invocations. More-
over as the centuries passed, the priests and their
rituals became increasingly distanced from con-
gregations, at the same time as the frequency of
mass declined. Beyond these well-known im-
ages of the pronounced tendency towards formal-
ism and remoteness in the development of
Orthodoxy, which Bishop Kallistos makes no
attempt to deny, we remain uncertain of the
average ‘participant-observer’ view of the service.
Mary Cunningham
underlines these trends in her
study of preaching, a part of the service involving
direct personal communication with the congre-
gation that became likewise peripheralized after
the c. 5th–7th centuries AD. Jörgen Raasted
openly admits that we cannot imagine the effect
of Byzantine church music on participants or
audience, and in any case ethnomusicological
research indicates that written versions bear only
a remote relationship to actual performances
(skeletal reminders not restrictive scores). Once
again one can at least analyse composers’ inten-
tions, for example bringing out the full signi-
ficance of a text, and occasionally pick up audience
response from contemporary reports.

Part 2 concerns itself with Law and Morality.
Ruth Makrides reminds us of the lack of any clear
boundary in Byzantium between the power and
sphere of operation of the Imperial authorities

Morris Rosemary 1990. Church and People in
Byzantium. Society for the Promotion of Byzan-
tine Studies 20th Spring Symposium, Manchester
1986. Centre for Byzantine Studies, Birming-