

Reviews

VAN DE PUT, W.D.J., *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. The Netherlands*, fascicule 9, *Allard Pierson Museum, University of Amsterdam*, fascicule 3. *Black-Figure. Pattern and Six Technique Lekythoi*. Amsterdam: Allard Pierson Series, 2006. XI+72 pp., 46 profiles, 40 pls; 32.5 cm. – ISBN 978-90-71211-38-6.

VAN DE PUT, W.D.J., *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. The Netherlands*, fascicule 10, *Allard Pierson Museum, University of Amsterdam*, fascicule 4. *Red-Figure and White-Ground Lekythoi*. Amsterdam: Allard Pierson Series, 2006. XII+94 pp., 48 profiles, 7 figs, 39 pls; 32.5 cm. – ISBN 978-90-71211-39-3.

W.D.J. van de Put (henceforth vdP) is the author of two fascicles of the *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum* series from the Allard Pierson Museum. In the first volume, vdP introduces 50 lekythoi of which 39 are black-figure, nine pattern, and three decorated in the Six technique. The red-figure and white-ground lekythoi are presented separately in the second volume, while South Italian lekythoi will be discussed in a forthcoming publication.

Among the positive features of these two volumes is a consistent effort to provide full-scale illustrations of every object, or at least its figural decoration. Quite significant is the substitution of the traditional profile drawings with CT scans. Even though the digital images are poor in some instances, CT scanning does reveal information about the construction and history of vases that would have been impossible to obtain otherwise, especially in the case of closed shapes such as lekythoi. Regarding the red-figure lekythoi, the author has included figures with preliminary drawings of vases that often shed light on the figural scenes. Another useful feature is the addition of numbers from the Beazley Archive Database that correspond to each vase.

In both fascicles, the entries comprise a short introduction to the specific lekythos-shape and the history of research. Then follow the vase's record, an outline of its condition and the state of applied paint (slip may be a more preferable word), and a description of its decoration. Date and attribution precede the commentary, which varies in length depending on issues raised by the author. vdP discusses each lekythos with clarity and precision, and provides parallels for shape and decoration, as well as bibliographical references.

In the first volume, 22 lekythoi have an unknown provenance, while 28 originate from Greece (mainly Athens), eight from South Italy, and three from Sicily. 19 lekythoi are published here for the first time, while vdP makes 21 new attributions, increasing in particular the corpus of Haimonian lekythoi and those of the Beldam workshop. He also ascribes one lekythos to the Diosphos Potter (IN 568, pls 165, 166.7).

vdP begins his examination with an early black-figure lekythos of the Sub-Deianera shape (IN 8589, pl. 144), which is interesting both for its subject matter (a

solitary reclining male figure), and for its association with the Euboean black-figure ware. The style is reminiscent of the Corinthian column krater of Eurytos (Louvre E 635), but its compositional details are closer to later scenes of Herakles as a symposiast, e.g., the bilingual amphora by the Andokides Painter in Munich (Antikensammlung 2301, ARV² 4.9; 1617), and especially the bell krater by the Berlin Painter in the Louvre (G174, ARV² 205.123). In this light, one wonders whether the Amsterdam krater represents Herakles at banquet, and whether the suspended 'mantle' is in fact an arbitrarily rendered lion skin.

Turning to shoulder-lekythoi, one may single out lekythos IN 14335 (pls. 148.1-4) for its particular floral ornament, which is so far without parallels. Regarding the lekythos attributed to the Gela Painter (IN 3731, pls 154.1 and 4, 155), vdP provides an adequate description of the *palaestra* scene, but fails to mention details such as the two right hands of the discus thrower. Also, the 'provincial character' of the Gela Painter has little to do with the presence of the *auletes* in the scene; treating the episode as a snapshot of an actual game ignores the blending of time and space in vase-painting. In the same entry, vdP touches upon the topic of the *gymnasion*, although without making a clear distinction between the institution and building.

For the lekythoi of the Class of Athens 581, vdP provides a short introduction highlighting the presence of this type in the Marathon tumulus and their usefulness as dating tools. He discusses the iconography of eight such lekythoi and comments on some interesting features, such as the rare occurrence of a maenad on a mule (IN 8531, pls 158, 163.1). However, the description of lekythos IN 10466/1 (pls. 162.4-6 and 163.7) is insufficient: the pillar-like object executed in thinner glaze below the horses' bodies is not a tree-trunk, but rather a turning point. This interpretation explains the lack of *isokephalia* of the teams of horses: the inner group closer to the pillar has already started to turn, while the outer one has to cover more distance.

Especially interesting are three lekythoi by the Athena Painter that show respectively Achilles ambushing Polyxena, a bust of Athena flanked by two owls, and two elderly men and a siren (IN 3737, pls 167.3 & 4, 169; IN 3754, pls 167.2, 170.1-3 & 5; IN 8977, pls 167.1, 168, 170.4). Ten black-figure lekythoi have been attributed to the Haimon Group, the Pholos Painter and the Emporion Painter, but, unfortunately, there is no illustration of the Haimonian lekythos IN RALS 575 (the reference number 172.8 does not correspond to any plate). vdP's overview of the development of the Pattern lekythoi is a useful prologue to the discussion of the nine such lekythoi in the Allard Pierson Collection. Lastly, the presentation of three lekythoi in the Six-technique (IN 992, 1357, 9038; pls 182-3) is quite eloquent, except for a misspelling of the word *tetrippon* as tetrippon throughout the entry, and a poor illustration of one of the vases.

In the second fascicle, vdP treats 71 red-figure and white-ground lekythoi. Out of these, 45 have an unknown provenance, 19 come from Greece (Athens, Attica, and

Eretria), four from South Italy and Sicily, and three from Kerch. He also discusses 31 previously unpublished vases and makes 26 new attributions that are on the whole convincing (e.g. IN 6337, pl. 187, fig. 3 attributed to the Nikon Painter; IN B 6024, pl. 210.1-3 attributed to the Tymbos Painter).

Starting with the red-figure cylindrical lekythoi of the Sub-Archaic and Early Classical period, vdP provides more information than a simple description and a commentary, often raising questions on the trade and diffusion of vases (e.g., lekythos from Gela IN 184, pl. 184). After a good synopsis of the emergence of specialization, vdP examines lekythoi produced by specific workshops, such as the Providence Painter, the Bowdoin Painter and others. He shows caution while dealing with ambiguous iconographic subjects, e.g. the questionable identification of the bearded male figure with a staff as a king (IN 698, pl. 185.4-5, 186.2, figs 1-2), but he also stresses the difficulty in identifying a painter's hand on works such as the lekythos IN 9710 (pls 189.3-4, 190.1, 192.1), as neither the circle of the Providence Painter nor the Bowdoin Painter seem to match the style and subject of the vase. As a result, his attribution of lekythos IN 6337 (pl. 187, fig. 3) to the Nikon Painter is well-researched and soundly based, making a significant addition of a rather rare athletic theme to the painter's oeuvre.

With regard to the Icarus Painter, vdP points out that the subject of lekythos IN 2838 (pl. 193.1-3), which shows a Nike filling a hydria at a fountain, is a unicum for the painter. At the same time, he raises the question of provenance, as the same lekythos also appears to be present in the catalogues of the Empedokles Collection, now at the National Museum at Athens. A second lekythos attributed to the Icarus Painter (B 8735, pl. 193.4-6) has a rather unusual motif of reserved zigzags, which could have been given a more full treatment. On the other hand, vdP and his collaborators are to be complimented for the drawings of preliminary sketches, such as of lekythos IN 6251 (pl. 196, fig. 5), which carries an inscription praising the beauty of the Nike. Despite the mediocre quality of most vases, certain lekythoi present interesting iconographic themes, especially scenes with women working wool like the fragmentary lekythos attributed to the Late Manner of Douris/Compare Villa Giulia Painter (IN 3485, pl. 197.3, fig. 6).

In the second section of this volume vdP examines the squat lekythoi of the Classical period. The author rightly points out the frequent presence of busts and heads on these lekythoi, which he argues were based on Boeotian and Apulian prototypes. In the case of the lekythos by the Phiale Painter (IN 6256, pl. 201.3-4 & 6), one should consider the identification of the bust of a woman holding two torches with Artemis.

Non-specialists will find vdP's overview of the development of lekythoi in the late 5th to early 4th century particularly helpful, as well as the impact of the Meidias Painter in Late Classical iconography. However, the three squat lekythoi by the circle of the Mina Painter (IN 10, 733, 9813, pl. 204) will be of interest to the more advanced reader, because of their animal decoration and issues related to the diffusion of the painter's work. Also, Late-Classical lekythoi with wedding scenes carry some fascinating details for the scholars of

iconography. For example, lekythos IN 6255 (pl. 206.1-7) shows a bride's attendant with striking long wavy hair and eastern-looking garments, while another lekythos (IN 3506, pl. 207 - plate reference omitted in the entry) represents two Erotes pulling Aphrodite's chariot above waves in a very lively manner.

vdP concludes this section with a discussion of two Boeotian squat lekythoi, followed by an examination of 14 white-ground lekythoi; the most spectacular is the *prothesis* lekythos by the Sabouroff Painter (IN 567, pls 211.1 and 212). Finally, a significant contribution of this volume is the thorough discussion of five extensively restored, forged and overpainted white-ground lekythoi. vdP provides ample illustrations for all these artifacts, and detailed arguments for their dis-authentication.

Both CVA volumes include indices on subjects, painters and inventory numbers. One thing lacking here is an index on provenance, which would have been useful for the reader. vdP produced two well-researched publications that are almost free of errors. While they adhere to the tradition of CVA catalogues, at the same time they highlight issues of contemporary research interests, utilizing features of modern technology. They are a welcome addition to the CVA series and a useful tool for archaeologists and scholars of Attic vases.

Amalia Avramidou

BORGERS, O.E./H.A.G. BRIJDER, *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. The Netherlands*, fascicule 11, *Allard Pierson Museum, University of Amsterdam*, fascicule 5. *Attic Black-Figure Amphorae, Pelikai, Kraters, Hydriai, Olpai, Oinochoai and Tripod Kothon*. Amsterdam: Allard Pierson Stichting, 2007. XII+86 pp., 45 figs, 64 pls; 32 cm. – ISBN 978-90-71211-42-3.

O.E. Borgers and H.A.G. Brijder (henceforth B&B) have co-authored the CVA fascicle on the Attic Black-Figure pottery from the Allard Pierson Museum. Although the state of preservation and the quality of the material varies from case to case, there is a wide spectrum of shapes here, mainly of closed vessels, such as amphorae (e.g. panel, 'Tyrrhenian', neck, Panathenaic), pelikai, kraters, hydriai, olpai/oinochoai, and a tripod kothon. All vases are accompanied by illustrations, profile drawings, or in some instances CT scans. Drawings of inscriptions and graffiti are provided when applicable, but non-sensical inscriptions are usually not transliterated (e.g. neck-amphora from the Leagros Group, pl. 256.3).

The Catalogue is arranged according to shapes and in relation to groups of painters and potters, while each entry includes detailed information about the vase, a concise commentary, and selected bibliography. It is worth noting that 48 vases are published here for the first time, while 12 vases that first appeared in CVA Scheurleer 1 and 2 are presented again in this volume. Unfortunately, there are no corresponding reference numbers to the Beazley Archive Database for the entries of this fascicle. Even though the provenance of most vases is usually unknown (38), several of them originate from South Italy (33), especially Taranto and Cumae. Fewer vases come from Greece (18), mainly Athens and Attica, and even less from Etruria (3).

The first vase discussed by B&B is an intriguing panel amphora (type B) dating to the middle of the 6th century BC (IN 8561, pls 223-224). Due to its decoration (flying eagle on each panel, base-rays, tongues), the amphora was originally considered to be Corinthian, but the authors argue for an Attic provenance on account of the orange core of its clay. Even more puzzling is the peculiar size and number of the tongues decorating the neck, a feature that recalls Caeretan hydriai rather than Corinthian or Attic motifs. In my opinion this hints at a Ionian tradition.

Equally interesting is the white-ground 'amphora of special shape' from Athens (IN 6268, pls 227-228), which dates around 520 BC and depicts Dionysos on one side and Ajax carrying Achilles on the other. In view of its extraordinary shape (a mixture of an amphora and an olpe), B&B should have elaborated further on its innovative character and particularly the use of a new technique (white-ground) to represent a rather unusual subject (a solitary Dionysos). In the reviewer's opinion, the combination of a special technique with a special shape may be associated with the experimental workshop of Exekias.

Another vase that can be singled out is the neck amphora by the Painter of Vatican 309 (IN 3374, pls 232-234), which carries a graffito (AA) and a red dipinto on the underside of its foot. B&B point out that almost half of the vases incised with this graffito are attributed to the Painter of Vatican 309 and the Circle of Lydos, while the additional dipinto on the Amsterdam amphora may indicate a second merchant. Regarding this final point, I should add that the dipinto might also represent a monetary value or the owner's initials.

B&B make important observations regarding a challenging amphoriskos/lekythos associated with both Attic and Euboean workshops (IN 589, pl. 246) and the rather rare white-ground amphora hitherto unpublished (private collection, pls 243-244). Thanks to B&B's attributions, the oeuvre of the Antimenes Painter was enriched with the previously unpublished fragment of an amphora from the Athenian Acropolis (IN 2109, pl. 254.6) and three more amphorae fragments from Taranto (IN 2155, 2104, RALS 533; pls 255.5-7). They also ascribed the fragment of a Panathenaic amphora to a painter close to the Kleophrades Painter (IN 9646, pl. 250.4).

Turning to pelikai, the most significant entry in B&B's catalogue is the late 6th-century pelike by the Manner of the Acheloos Painter (private collection, pls 259-260). It depicts two komos scenes and has on the underside of the foot a graffito: ΤΕΣΣΑΡΕΣΟΒΕΛΟΣ. B&B stress the inconsistency of the singular use of ΟΒΕΛΟΣ following number four, but one wonders whether this is a shortened accusative plural instead.

Regarding the kraters, B&B publish 17 new examples, comprising of column- (7), volute- (7) and calyx kraters (3), and offer new attributions, e.g. Related to Lydos (IN 2098, pl. 266.1), the Chiusi Painter (IN B 14.408, pl. 266.3). For the Golvol Group fragments (IN 2117 and 2118, pls 268.5, 269.1), the authors claim that they cannot belong to the same volute krater, because their estimated diameters differ considerably. Even though the profile drawings illustrate this divergence, in the catalogue entries the estimated diameter of both vases turns out to be identical (37 cm), which causes some confusion for the reader.

Of the three hydriai examined by B&B, two are published here for the first time (IN 11.644, pl. 270.1-4; IN 2053.4, pl. 270.5), while from the group of olpai and oinochoai one may distinguish the red-colored oinochoe depicting an Amazon (IN 1730, pls 276.2, 277) and the trefoil oinochoe by the Gela Painter representing satyrs treading grapes (IN 3742, pls 278, 280.1). The single tripod kothon included in this fascicle is attributed to the Polos Painter and is of mediocre quality (IN 1942, pls 283-286).

The volume concludes with four indices on concordances, subjects, and painters. It would have been useful to add an index on the findspots, and even attempt a cross-listing of shapes, findspots, and acquisition records to reconstruct potential assemblages, especially in the case of vases originating from Taranto that were purchased around the same period from the same dealer. Overall, B&B offer a thorough examination of Attic black-figure vases with solid documentation, ample commentary, and good illustrations. Their work is an important contribution to the study of Attic vases that will be of assistance to both archaeologists, ancient art historians and advanced students.

Amalia Avramidou

GUNTRAM KOCH/KLAUS FITTSCHEN/ORTWIN DALLY (eds), *Akten des Symposiums des Sarkophag-Corpus 2001, Marburg 2001*. Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 2007. XII+354 pp., 32 figs, 120 pls; 29 cm (Sarkophag-Studien 3). – ISBN 978-3-8053-3501-0.

This volume contains the proceedings of the symposium on sarcophagi held in Marburg in 2001. As with the previous volumes in this series, it is geared toward and will appeal primarily to a specialist audience. That said, there are several interpretive and synthetic papers which deserve a wider readership. I will summarize the volume's contents first before moving to a larger issue that is raised by its (delayed) publication.

The volume is organized largely according to region, so that it begins with papers on sarcophagi from Rome and then turns outward to the provinces. (The table of contents unhelpfully lists the papers in alphabetical order by author and not according to their actual order in the volume.) The first contribution, by R. Amedick, is one of the volume's most important: a long-overdue study of the relationship between Etruscan funerary art and the designs of early Roman sarcophagi. Surveying mythological themes, Galatomachies, and scenes of magistrates, her study engages the Etruscan imagery (and its influential Hellenistic forerunners) as not merely epiphenomenal, but as crucial to understanding the development of sarcophagus iconography in the 2nd century BCE.

The papers that follow are concerned with collections - both large and small - of (mostly) metropolitan works, including the fragments of a lion sarcophagus (M. Fuchs); a new, strigillated example in Warsaw (T. Mikocki and J. Zelazowski); various works in Viterbo, including an Endymion sarcophagus (G. Vatta); fragments in Brescia (F. Morandini); a Muse sarcophagus in Murcia (Spain),

which has enjoyed a busy afterlife (J.M. Noguera); a Dionysiac Eros sarcophagus in Berlin, with extended discussion of its symbolism (E. Heidebroek-Söldner); various works of Attic type preserved in Grottaferrata (A. Ambrogi); and two papers on sarcophagi now at the Museo Nazionale Romano, including various fragments of mythological scenes (P. Baldassari) and unpublished and new acquisitions with decorative and mythological imagery (M. Sapelli). The next three papers tackle iconography: the story of Achilles on Skyros (C.G. Alexandrescu), Herakles in Roman funerary art (D. Grassinger), and Leda and the swan (E. Angelicoussi). The two contributions that follow are concerned with modern interventions: the first on a restored Persephone sarcophagus in Aachen (T.-M. Schmidt), the other on a modern copy of a Meleager sarcophagus (J.H. Oakley).

The collection then shifts focus to the other major centers of production, principally Athens and Asia Minor. These include contributions on sarcophagi in the Athens National Museum (S.E. Katakis); unpublished and little-known Attic works in Arles (V. Gaggadis-Robin); fragments from northern Italy with Attic connections (F. Ciliberto); new Attic sarcophagi fragments from Dalmatia (N. Cambi); a work from Tyros (C. Kintrup); an Eros sarcophagus (E. Papagianni) and two reunited fragments of an Attic sarcophagus (M. Tsimpidou-Avloniti), all in Thessaloniki. Four papers on Spanish material come next: a preliminary study of the Iberian corpus (M. Claveria); a Christian sarcophagus with scene of Susanna in Gerona (I. Rodà); a study of north-eastern production (S.B. Alvarez); and decorative works with pagan themes (J. Beltrán Fortes).

These are followed by contributions on the themes and workshops of sarcophagi produced in Roman Africa (F. Baratte); the ossilegium and ossuaries as Jewish burial practice (G. Foerster); sarcophagi from Moesia inferior, with a focus on a work with Herakles (S. Conrad); examples of the Kline type in Thessaloniki (T. Stefanidou-Tiveriou); two newly-discovered finds of a Palmyrene type (A. Schmidt-Colinet and K. al-As'ad); the centers of production of garland sarcophagi from Asia Minor (F. İşik); various examples from Pisidia (V. Köse), Baalbek (K. Hitzl and L. Petersen), and Tyana (D. Berges); and two new garland sarcophagi from Ephesos (B. Tuluk) and garlanded grave altars in Pamphylia and Lycia (T. Korkut). The collection ends with two notable papers: the first on the *ostothekai* of Ephesos and the rise of sarcophagus inhumation, which - unusual for a volume of this kind - situates the material in the social historical context of local freedmen there (C.M. Thomas and C. İçten); the second, a typically learned piece by the late Hellmut Sichtermann, on the literary reception of sarcophagi. (As noted at the beginning of the volume, the field has suffered a terrible loss with his death and that of Helga Herdejürgen.) A list of abbreviated works appears at the end, followed by 120 (!) high-quality black and white plates. Line-drawings and Renaissance sketches appear scattered throughout the volume.

A closing point concerns the *Sarkophag-Akten*, of which this volume is the latest installment. Conference proceedings can be notoriously difficult to bring to press in a timely manner, and this volume's appearance six years after the symposium's convening reflects that unfortunate reality. This is not to disparage the overall

high quality of the publication itself, which bears all of the trademark features that scholars have come to expect of sarcophagus-related publications overseen by their longtime editor, Guntram Koch: meticulous editing, encyclopedic references, and crisp black-and-white photographs. Rather, my concern is that this series is not sustainable in its present, bulky print form. For in this digital age, it makes little sense to allow six years to elapse between a conference and its publication when the results - which are so heterogenous and documentary in nature - could be more efficiently made available online. A forum to service this need has been anticipated already by the creation of the 'Webpräsenz des Corpus der Antiken Sarkophage', an evolving, cooperative project sponsored by the DAI and the Forschungsarchiv für Antike Plastik, Cologne (<http://www.arachne.uni-koeln.de>). My suggestion, then, is that we expand upon this resource still further and in future post the bulk of the proceedings of the *Akten* on the 'Webpräsenz', which bears the imprint of two of Classical Archaeology's most venerable institutions. Thematic studies of sarcophagi might still find publication through traditional channels (e.g. J. Elsner and J. Huskinson, eds, 'Life, Death and Representation: New Work on Roman Sarcophagi', *Millennium*, forthcoming). But at the very least, this would spare the majority of participants the disservice of a long wait for the publication of their research and, at the same time, make it readily available and easily accessible to others in the field and - ideally - beyond.

Sinclair Bell

BÉATRICE BLANDIN, *Les pratiques funéraires d'époque géométrique à Érétrie. Espace des vivants, demeures des morts*. Gollion: Ecole Suisse d'Archéologie en Grèce/Infolio éditions, 2007. Vol. I (text): 183 pp.; vol. II (catalogue, tables, plates): 133 pp., 216 pls; paperback, 22 x 30 cm (Eretria XVII, Fouilles et recherches). – ISBN 978-2-88474-406-5.

Eretria holds a special place within the archaeology of the Greek Early Iron Age. Both archaeological and historical sources indicate that Eretria was one of the leading political and cultural centres of its time. Probably founded *ex novo* in the 9th century, it has yielded a wealth of archaeological documentation dating to its earliest history. This documentation represents the domestic, 'industrial', funerary and cultic spheres; the last includes the earliest monumental 'urban' temple in the Greek world. These circumstances have made Eretria a rare example of a site that allows us to follow closely processes of settlement organization and polis formation during this formative period in ancient Greek history. Somewhat on the negative side is the often fragmented state of the archaeological information. Since the 1960s, investigations by both the Swiss School of Archaeology and the Greek Archaeological Service have intensified, but due to the later occupation - including the modern town that partly overlies the site - and the present water table, the earliest levels are not always accessible or well preserved. Part of Eretria's early history came to light in rescue excavations that were carried out at

various spots in the ancient town; this - and the fact that excavation reports are scattered over a wide array of publications - has further contributed to the fragmentation of our picture of early Eretria. For this reason alone, Béatrice Blandin's monograph on the funerary practices at Eretria during the Geometric period (900-700 BC) is more than welcome. This study - which originates in the author's doctoral thesis - brings together and analyses information from tombs that since the late 19th century have been dug by both Swiss and Greek excavators. At the same time, B. explicitly seeks to confront her analyses of these data with wider spatial and social issues, such as topography, site development, use of space, and social structures developing within the context of the incipient polis.

B.'s argumentation is organized as follows. Volume I is dedicated to the analysis and interpretation of the funerary record. In the Introduction, B. presents her argument and main objectives; this is followed by an overview of the excavation history of Geometric remains and a description of Eretria's place within the wider regional setting of the Early Iron Age. After a discussion of the site's topography and geomorphology in Ch. I, a detailed description of distinct burial rites, tomb types and grave markers is given in Ch. II. Ch. III provides an in-depth analysis of various classes of grave goods, their typochronology, provenance and distribution, primary use and place in the funerary rites. A recurring point of interest relates to the question whether specific goods or classes of objects can be identified as the deceased's personal belongings, gifts from the next of kin, or the remains of funerary feasts or other ceremonials, and - connected to this - whether objects were made specifically for funerary purposes. The role of animals in the funerary ritual is discussed in Ch. IV. In Ch. V, B. seeks to reconstruct a framework of the possible stages of the funerary ritual (for a large part necessarily based on external literary and iconographic information), and describes how data pertaining to Geometric Eretria fit into this. In Ch. VI, the outcomes of the preceding chapters are related to the current state of research regarding the social structure of early Greece in general and of Geometric Eretria in particular, mainly by means of a discussion of three models suggested by C. Bérard, A. Mazarakis Ainian and J.P. Crielaard, respectively; these researchers have expressed differing views on the role of Eretrian aristocrats in the establishment of the polis and the place that is reserved for them afterwards. This discussion serves as a framework for a reconstruction of the diachronic development of funerary practices from the 9th to the late 8th century, including their relation to class, sex and age differences. In Ch. VII, B. pursues this diachronic perspective further by discussing the available archaeological evidence for the three sub-phases (9th c.; MG II; LG), in order to create a more dynamic picture of the development of the Eretrian community. The last sections of Volume I are devoted to general conclusions and suggestions for further research, and to summaries in English, German and Greek.

Volume II presents the data on which B.'s research is based. For each of the 22 excavation areas that have yielded Geometric burials, B. gives general information about the site, excavations, stratigraphy, finds and problems of interpretation. This is followed by an inventory

of the tombs, which includes a description of each tomb, a catalogue of its contents and its date. Next come reports on the osteological research on human and animal remains from the Swiss excavations (analysed by M.A. Porro and I. Chenal-Velarde, respectively). The remainder of Vol. II (almost two thirds of it) is reserved for illustrations, namely maps, plans, photographs and drawings of virtually all elements of the Geometric burial record that are discussed, as well as of many other finds and find complexes of the same period. All tomb information is brought together in a set of tables at the end of the volume.

The great strength of this study lies in the fact that the author does not study the funerary evidence in isolation, but relates her dynamic model of funerary behaviour to various facets of this period's archaeological record, particularly settlement dynamics. She is thus able to argue convincingly that the organization of burial grounds corresponds to that of the settlement: a dispersed type of settlement with separated nuclei of houses is paralleled by the aggregation of tombs in small clusters, both of which are attributable to groups of households (*oikoi*). Burial zones move centrifugally, probably following an expansion of the settlement during the Late Geometric period. Two important, additional points that B. wishes to make go against ideas that figure in the above models regarding Eretria's social structure: one relates to the presumed binary opposition between the elite burial plot of urn cremations under the Heroon and the supposed commoners' cemetery of *fossa* cremations near the coast, the other to the supposition that urn cremation was the only aristocratic form of burial. B. argues instead that some of the late 8th-century *fossa* cremations in the Hygeionomeion area on the coast can also be attributed to members of the elite. The reader can only agree with this (in fact, in an article that appeared just after this study (ref. in note 1579 on p. 142), the present reviewer made a reassessment of the coastal burial plots near the Hygeionomeion and Od. Eratonymou and revised his earlier model, arriving at conclusions that are very similar to the ones that B. draws). What B. avoids discussing, however, are the principles on which the groups of *oikoi* and corresponding burial plots were organized, and what relationship existed between the groups of aristocrats that apparently coexisted during the Late Geometric period.

B. makes her case painstakingly in a long drawn-out and carefully constructed argumentation. Almost every aspect of the burial record is scrupulously discussed. To give one example, in the section on grave pottery in Ch. III (which is on tomb goods), she successively discusses the style and production of the local pottery, production sites, chronology, imports and the possible variation in use of classes of pottery in different forms of burial (76-89). The reader may be somewhat surprised to learn that in the author's analyses of the burial data, she hardly makes use of archaeological or anthropological theory, although in this particular field such theory has proven very valuable. B. considers specific finds or complexes in relation to the totality of data from Eretria - or on what she calls 'l'échelle du site' - or in comparison to contemporary sites in the larger region (Lefkandi, Chalkis, Oropos, Kyme-Viglatouri). Lefkandi is often taken as a point of reference, despite the fact that some

important finds from this site are more than two centuries older.

The result of all this is a very comprehensive overview of Eretria during the Geometric period. It has much to offer also to the more general reader, who will find the synthesizing chapters (VI and VII) particularly helpful. Not everything will be new for specialists, but this is unavoidable with a study of this scope. Besides, some evidence - such as the tombs under the Heroon - was published in an early phase of the systematic excavations at Eretria. The time is evidently right for a systematic reassessment of the interpretations of the original excavators in the light of research done since then at Eretria as well as at neighbouring sites, and, more in general, within the perspective of recent insights into the early history of Greece. Something similar may be said of the illustrations in Vol. II. A number of these have been published before, but scholars who are working on this period will profit enormously from the fact that all this material has now been brought together. More importantly, a large amount of new artwork is presented in the form of plans and maps, and photographs and drawings of trenches, sections, ceramics and other finds that Swiss excavators have brought to light over the years. All of this is of excellent quality. In addition, some finds - especially those from the Heroon area - are republished, such as the iron swords and spearheads that have been cleaned, restored and redrawn.

The osteological research of human and animal bones provides an entirely new dataset, one that is not available in the original excavation reports. The examination of the human bone material also makes it possible to make firmer statements about connections between age and sex on the one hand, and specific grave goods, burial modes and tomb types on the other. Significant in this context is that it has now been established that the urn cremations without weapons under the Heroon indeed belong to females. A minor but interesting detail is that three of the warriors accompanying them appear to have suffered from hernias (p. 126): it appears that wielding spears and performing 'the brutal work of swords' in which according to Archilochos 'the lance-famed lords of Euboa' (fr. 9) excelled, took a heavy toll.

Jan Paul Crielaard

GUDRUN BÜHL/ANTHONY CUTLER/ARNE EFFENBERGER (eds), *Spätantike und byzantinische Elfenbeinbilderwerke im Diskurs*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2008. 281 pp., 174 plates of which 29 in colour; 25 cm. – ISBN 978-3-89500-497-1.

This well illustrated book contains seventeen papers on the production, use and iconography of ivories dating to late antiquity and the Byzantine period. These papers were presented at a colloquium held in March 2002 organised by the Museum für Byzantinische Kunst der Staatlichen Museen in Berlin. The aim of this colloquium was to bring together the leading specialists on ivory, both from the field of art history as well as technological material research, to discuss the current issues in the research into ivory. The papers in this book all discuss different aspects of this research. Specific objects, groups of objects, production techniques, production

places, iconographic issues, research techniques and restoration ethics are all dealt with in the different contributions.

The first paper by Arun Banerjee presents the results of non-destructive investigation of ivory by FTIR and Raman Spectroscopy. By means of these complementary methods substances can accurately be identified. This makes it possible to distinguish different sorts of ivories, like for example walrus ivory and the ivory from the Asian elephant and African Bush and Forest elephants.

The contribution by Gudrun Bühl discusses the making of Early Byzantine *pyxides* and in particular the way the makers produced the bottoms of these circular boxes and fixed them to the walls. For a long time the metal joints found on a number of *pyxides* were disregarded as later additions. Bühl, however, makes it plausible that this was the original way of fixing walls to bottoms and that metal parts formed a considerable component of these boxes. Furthermore she discusses which parts of an elephant tusk were used for the production of *pyxides*.

Jean-Pierre Caillet's contribution discusses the iconography of Mary and Christ, on the large 6th-century diptychs of Murano, Etschmiadzin and Saint-Lucipin, in the theological context of the place and period of their production.

Carolyn L. Connor discusses restoration ethics in her paper on colour on late antique and Byzantine ivories. The fragile remains of polychromy on ivories has in cases been dismissed as being not original or medievalizing and has been removed during restorations. Connor argues for a more reticent approach of colour remains on ivory. For even the cleaning of seemingly non-coloured ivories undoubtedly also removes possible traces of any original polychromy.

In Anthony Cutler's paper on carving in Byzantium and Ottonian Germany, he investigates the differences and similarities between Ottonian and Byzantine carvings in ivory. Instead of stressing the different traditions he underlines the porous character of the putative cultural borders between East and West.

Josef Engemann's contribution discusses the depictions of games held by Senators and Consuls on commemorative presentation objects like Consular diptychs and North African terracotta plates.

Helen C. Evans discusses the imagery on a Middle Byzantine rosette casket in The Metropolitan Museum of Art. She identifies the depiction, earlier often interpreted as scenes based on mythology, with scenes from the Digenis Akritis, an epic poem from the middle Byzantine era about the defence of the Eastern borders of the Empire.

The contribution by John Hanson looks into the use and reuse of Byzantine ivories depicting the Joseph narrative originating from a secular context, in a Western medieval religious context. In his contribution the author focuses on different secondary uses of these ivories.

In Petra Janke's paper on the Byzantine diptychons in the church treasury of the Dom of Halberstadt she investigates the appropriation of two 10th-century diptychons into two reliquaries somewhere during the 13th century.

Hilfrud Jehle's contribution discusses the techno-

logical aspects of the production and possible colouring of ivories. Furthermore she presents a re-interpretation of the so-called Leonsceptre as being a ritual comb.

In his paper on first-generation ivory diptychs, Dale Kinney argues for a complementing discourse to the solely art historical study of these objects: the discourse of visual culture. It forces us to re-examine our habitual language and the encoded assumptions in it.

Holger A. Klein discusses the ivory reliquary of the holy cross in Cortona. This 10th-century reliquary stands out by means of its size and material, for ivory is not often encountered in other cross reliquaries.

The contribution by Ulrike Koenen looks into the phenomenon of 'copies' of late antique works of art in the corpus of Carolingian ivories. In this paper she expresses her doubts whether copy is a correct phrasing to indicate these pieces for the copied models are putative.

Barbara Schellewald's contribution gives a general overview of the early research into ivories in Germany during the late 19th and early 20th century. She outlines a tradition of research initiated by Graeven, Goldschmidt and Vöge that forms the foundation of modern research.

In his paper on ivory horns in medieval church treasuries, Avinoam Shalem discusses the varied methods of keeping and displaying these oliphants in medieval European churches.

Paul Speck's contribution opposes earlier criticism on his observations concerning the Trier ivory, depicting the translation of relics, Middle Byzantine rosette caskets in general, and the Barberini diptych.

The last paper in the book is by Archer St. Clair Harvey and discusses the remains of a late antique and early medieval carving industry on the northeast slope of the Palatine hill in Rome. These came to light during excavations carried out from 1989 to 1994. The archaeological data indicate a flourishing urban industry working both bone and ivory that spanned the first through the mid-6th centuries AD.

The studies presented in this book are all varying in character and show many different approaches towards the ivories discussed. Together they span the whole field of research concerned with ivories. The many, in general good quality, illustrations make it a pleasure to read and enhance the reader's understanding of the discussed pieces and theories. It is therefore unfortunate that two illustrations on plate 14 and 15 are shown in reverse. Nonetheless this collection of papers attains its end, for it gives a perfect overview of the current issues in the research into ivory. Although the details in some papers will partly be interesting by mainly specialists this book forms an adequate update and addition to the already existing literature on ivories. It shows that there still is a lot to gain in our knowledge of even some of the most well known antique ivories.

Maarten van Deventer

FLORIAN STILP, *Die Jacobsthal-Reliefs. Konturierte Tonreliefs aus dem Griechenland der Frühklassik*. Roma: Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, 2006, pp. XII+281, Farbtaf. A, 1 Abb., Taf. I-LXXXV; 30 cm (Supplemento 29 a Rivista di Archeologia). – ISBN 88-7689-211-7.

Obiettivo della dissertazione, discussa da S. a Freiburg i. Br. nel 2004, è un riesame complessivo dei 'rilievi melii', già oggetto nel 1931 di una celebre monografia di Paul Jacobsthal e per questo molto opportunamente (ri)denominati già nel titolo 'Jacobsthal-Reliefs'. Il catalogo (pp. 159-255), che include i rinvenimenti più recenti, comprende più di centocinquanta pezzi, allargando in misura significativa la precedente base documentaria, ed è allestito con grande cura nelle molte 'voci' anagrafiche previste (Aufbewahrungsort, Provenienz, Erhaltungszustand, Masse, Technik, Farben, Ikonographie, Block (i.e. gruppo stilistico), Datierung, Literatur). In apertura del volume, la storia degli studi (pp. 9-22) appare dettagliata, con attenzione particolare alle diverse ipotesi formulate nel corso di più di un secolo di ricerca sulla possibile destinazione d'uso - funeraria (come sosteneva in primo luogo lo stesso Jacobsthal), votiva, domestica - di questi piccoli 'konturierte Tonreliefs': giusta enfasi in proposito viene data alle (poche) notizie, vecchie e nuove, sulle circostanze di rinvenimento, che ad ogni modo sembrano confermare con buon margine di sicurezza tanto un uso decorativo privato che una destinazione tombale e santuariale. Il capitolo dedicato ai diversi momenti del ciclo produttivo (pp. 23-34) appare analitico e chiarificatore di molti aspetti tecnici fondamentali, come l'uso della matrice, le modalità di rifinitura dei rilievi, l'aspetto della superficie posteriore dei medesimi. Fondamentale è altresì il riconoscimento della notevole variabilità di colore e consistenza della terracotta anche all'interno di un medesimo gruppo o bottega, con ogni probabilità derivante da differenze di 'venature' del tutto occasionali all'interno di un medesimo banco di argilla e dai processi di cottura, le une e gli altri destinati poi ad essere stemperati grazie allo strato di ingubbiatura e di colore stesi sulle superfici. La divisione in gruppi (pp. 35-55) nel complesso non si discosta molto, né avrebbe potuto, da quella già a suo tempo proposta da Jacobsthal. Suscettibile di puntualizzazioni appare però l'indagine stilistica, grazie anche ai vistosi progressi della ricerca archeologica rispetto agli anni in cui fu compiuto lo studio di Jacobsthal. I comparanda proposti si limitano essenzialmente alla ceramografia attica e non viene accordato il giusto risalto alle coeve creazioni della plastica fittile (non solo votiva) o al multiforme artigianato toreutico che si impone sui mercati proprio a cavallo tra VI e prima metà del V sec. a.C., cioè all'incirca nei medesimi decenni in cui vengono prodotti i rilievi oggetto di studio. Una analisi del genere avrebbe forse consentito di riconoscere con maggiore chiarezza il carattere internazionale di un linguaggio che appare sostanzialmente di derivazione ionica, ma nel quale assumono valenza caratterizzante, in un processo di stratificazione, sedimentazione e reinterpretazione, contributi formali di tradizione innanzitutto peloponnesiaca e attica (cfr. in questo senso, *Orizzonti* 7, 2006, pp. 49-81, con rimandi

ai numerosi studi, anche recenti, sull'argomento). In questo senso, in definitiva, sarebbero forse apparsi più chiari e fondati il ruolo ispiratore di Corinto, ipotizzato dallo stesso S. (p. 151) anche in un settore così specifico come quello dei rilievi a ritaglio, e l'oscillazione tra Atene e 'Inselionien' nel problematico percorso che porta S. al riconoscimento dei diversi gruppi. Il dato, poi, dell'altissima percentuale dei pezzi definiti 'isolati' (p. 48), all'incirca un terzo del totale, avrebbe da solo dovuto consigliare una impostazione più prudente dell'indagine formale e del conseguente tentativo di localizzazione delle botteghe, portando a riconoscere innanzitutto una sostanziale unitarietà di fondo dei rilievi. Un cenno rapido viene fatto alle altre due classi di rilievi coeve tecnicamente e (almeno in parte) stilisticamente e funzionalmente simili, i pinakes di Locri e le appliques capuane (e.g. pp. 118, 143). Anche in questo caso il confronto incrociato avrebbe potuto portare a discutere con maggior rigore non solo il profilo stilistico dei rilievi melii, ma anche, forse, le modalità della loro diffusione: come i rilievi melii, infatti, anche le appliques capuane, benché rinvenute quasi esclusivamente in tombe, conoscono sporadiche attestazioni in Sicilia e in alcuni grandi santuari internazionali, quali Olimpia e Naukratis e, dunque, testimoniano anch'esse di una ambivalenza di uso e della trasversalità di certi soggetti figurati; come i rilievi melii, anche le appliques sembrano essere appannaggio di una utenza 'media', che tuttavia conosce ed apprezza le creazioni della torcetica e delle altre forme di artigianato artistico di prestigio contemporanee, senza per questo essere condizionata da contingenze storiche del tipo di quelle evocate da S. (p. 148, i.e. le ristrettezze che fecero seguito alle guerre persiane). Più attenta appare la disamina del repertorio figurato degli Jacobsthal-Reliefs (pp. 73-118) e apprezzabile la discussione sull'uso 'flessibile' delle medesime iconografie in ambito privato (domestico), funerario, santuarioale (pp. 116-118): un elemento, questo, di notevole rilievo nel quadro delle indagini che negli ultimi decenni hanno visto impegnata tanta parte degli studiosi di antichità classica, ed hanno oscillato, in una polemica apparentemente senza sbocchi, tra lettura politicamente e programmaticamente orientata del mito e dell'immagine ellenica (anche negli ambienti periferici di accoglienza) - attraverso una selezione preventiva degli oggetti e delle tematiche da essi veicolate - e lettura ideologico-genealogica che contempra l' 'annessione' a questa o quella narrazione di significati di volta in volta consoni alle diverse destinazioni d'uso. Il volume di S. costituisce nell'insieme un apprezzabile progresso per gli studi della plastica fittile di epoca severa e proto-classica, ponendo al contempo le premesse per futuri, ulteriori approfondimenti.

Fernando Gilotta

M.C. BISHOP/J.C.N. COULSTON, *Roman Military Equipment. From the Punic Wars to the Fall of Rome*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2006². 321 pp., 153 figs, 8 pl.; 24 cm. – ISBN 1-84217-159-3.

This lavish handbook, the second edition, presents Roman military equipment in all its aspects. The primary aim of the first edition was to bring this very

important field of study to a wider audience, by covering the complete range of Roman weaponry from the Republic to the later empire. The already impressive study has been extended and revised in this second edition, after a decade that saw an explosion of international research in the subject. This forced the authors to integrate a lot of studies in their existing work and dramatically increased the amount of notes. The excellent illustrations remained for the most part unchanged.

The wealth of evidence is presented in ten chapters. The first three chapters outline the different sorts of evidence: representational (chapter 1), archaeological (2), and documentary (3). After which the authors focus on the important periods in the development of Roman military equipment, which are: the Republican period (chapter 4), from Augustus to Hadrian (5), the Antonine revolution (6), the Army in crisis (7), and the Dominate (8). They then explore the production and technology of the equipment in chapter 9, to end with a chapter on the social aspects of the subject (10).

The three chapters about the sorts of evidence are necessary, because of the numerous misunderstandings in the past. Bishop and Coulston succeed very well in outlining the advantages and limitations of archaeological and other data. This information is helpful when reading the next chapters about military equipment in the different periods. It becomes easier to understand on which type of evidence the authors base their conclusions about aspects of the equipment and why they do so.

The chapters discussing the equipment in the different periods seem to have profited the most from the bulk of new evidence, which was available for the second edition. It was now possible for the authors to go into more detail and incorporate more variations of the equipment. The updated chapters are thus even more valuable as a reference for research on the subject; even military standards and musical instruments are discussed. Very interesting is the influence of barbarian military equipment on the development of Roman weaponry. Besides the impact of the Roman army upon other cultures, the Romans themselves adopted technologies and strategies from their allies and enemies. This study could possibly shed more light on the discussion about Romanisation, especially in the northern provinces. The enormous amount of evidence of two frontier zones, the Rhine and the Danube region, makes it possible to go into greater detail with this research. In this aspect the amount of sites in the Near East, the other frontier zone, hopefully will also increase in the near future, allowing the interaction in this region to be studied better.

Considering this wealth of available evidence the last chapters, which discuss the technical and social aspects, are relatively short. The army is probably one of the most important elements of society in the Roman empire. Its presence in the provinces very much stimulated the development of local cultures and economies. This should be an invitation to many new types of research. For the moment the authors more or less only give an overview of the existing study on Roman military equipment. Given the fact that the amount of articles on the subject has dramatically increased in the last ten years, this is not surprising. But the chapters can also provide many new aspects for study, with the popularity of Ro-

man military equipment as a focus of research, and the improved excavation methods, it is very well possible that the study of social aspects will develop swiftly.

Perhaps Bishop and Coulston should not wait another 13 years to present a third edition, but write it much sooner. A suggestion to make this publication easier to use as a reference, is to add a catalogue with an overview of the development of the weapons. When you are looking now for a specific type of equipment, you do not have a direct access to all types. However, already this second edition is an indispensable handbook for all students of the Roman army.

Peter Hazen

GABRIELE CIFANI, *Architettura romana arcaica. Edilizia e società tra Monarchia e Repubblica*. Roma: «L'Erma» di Bretschneider, 2008. 401 pp., 270 figs; 28.5 cm (Bibliotheca Archaeologica 40). – ISBN 978-88-8265-444-3.

Cifani's reworking of his 1993 PhD thesis done for prof. Carandini at Rome's La Sapienza University is a remarkable feat. It tries to re-assess the building record of archaic Rome and its province in the light of the last several decades of discoveries and research. The aim of this bulky study of architectural types, building technology and prime materials during the period 610-390 BC in the area between Fidenae and Ficana in the East to Veii in the West, is to better understand mid- and long term social dynamics. The subject used to be called Early Rome (E. Gjerstadt), but is now defined in a much less ideologically coloured way as a city community in transition between monarchy and republic.

Such a synthesis is dearly needed for anyone trying to engage with the ever growing mass of both official and 'grey' literature following the countless excavations, surveys, and academic research projects in this core region of the ancient world. The importance of its practical use - the book quotes over 1,000 publications - is underlined by the fact that it is co-edited by the Directorate General for Archaeology. Cifani's approach is fourfold. After a lengthy but enlightening introduction to the history of research (with remarkable visual records of the protagonists, starring Lanciani, Lugli and Pallottino), Cifani presents a 121 item catalogue of the building evidence in the area under consideration, including a full digest of the literary sources, wherever present. Particularly the sections dedicated to the Capitolium (30 pages), S. Omobono, and the Palatine including the four famous archaic *domus* recently found there constitute veritable essays in themselves. Next, building technique is discussed, focussing on prime materials (tufa, clay, metal, wood), quarries, wall construction, and protective systems (floors, walls, roofs). Lastly, the societal context is investigated. Surprisingly, a balance is being struck here between traditional concern for highly visual urban development and religious architecture on the one hand, and rural contexts, infrastructure (roads, drainage, cisterns), and funerary evidence, on the other.

The question is whether Cifani is successful in his endeavour. I think the answer is only partially affirmative. Because of its detailed and systematic descriptions,

drawings and intelligent discussion of resources, the volume can be used as a source book by anyone working on archaic Rome, Etruria and Latium. All too often the study of any phenomenon from this period and region is hampered by the inaccessibility of publications, or, if accessible, by the closed circuit of discussion and debate by the *adetti ai lavori*. I think it is important that Cifani took the trouble of opening up this field to many interested but uninitiated scholars. In addition, what he has to say about temple architecture, the beginnings of Roman art and the political-societal developments in the obscure period 540-480 BC, is clear and informative. I was taken in particular by his reconstruction of the commissioning process (Ch. IV.10), evidence of a fresh approach.

Yet the nature of digests like these renders them quickly out of date. Even though the manuscript was closed in 2007, only a year before publication, important studies that came out very shortly afterwards, such as Karen's and Mats's *The Temple of Castor and Pollux II.2 - The Finds*, may well make this book less than topical. In fact, the catalogue section, by far its most useful feature, would do much better in a wikipedia form, accessible to all and with continuous, high frequency updates.

A second critical issue is the editorial accuracy. Almost every page shows printing errors, particularly so in but certainly not confined to Latin quotations and foreign language publication titles. For the ever increasing prices L'Erma is asking for its books, the editor might have taken the trouble of better overseeing the correction process. Were this defect acceptable when trying to understand Cifani's often very interesting reasonings, I found also a gross factual mistake in another area. In his chapter on religious architecture (IV.3), Cifani tries to connect the explosion of size witnessed in the dimensions of the Jupiter Capitolinus temple with the monster temples on Samos and at Ephesos and Athens. The evidence adduced, among which a comparison of groundplans of some twenty central-Italic temples, however, is not correct in at least one case I am intimately familiar with (no. 8 in Fig. 254, Satricum temple II, is represented half-size), rendering the result as a whole - alas! - less than reliable.

To close on a high note: it is welcome to get acquainted with a new generation of high potential specialists, who place themselves in the best traditions of Italian scholarship but do not hesitate to look at old things in new ways.

Riemer Knoop

NATHALIE DE HAAN/MARTIJN EICKHOFF/MARJAN SCHWEGMAN (eds), *Archaeology and National Identity in Italy and Europe, 1800-1950*. Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2008. 263 pp., figs; 24 cm (Fragmenta 2). – ISBN 978-2-503-52406-1.

This volume of essays is the product of a conference on archaeology and national identity in Italy held at the Royal Netherlands Institute in Rome in 2007. In an enviably short period of time, the editors managed to collect and in some cases translate the essays, and they

are now presented here, together with extensive bibliographies and in many cases detailed footnotes. While the essays have very different aims and are of varying quality (the quality of the translations into English also varies enormously), together they represent an impressive attempt to piece together the history of archaeology in Italy, a much under-studied subject by comparison to the rich recent work on Greece, Germany, France, and the British Isles. The volume is particularly noteworthy in the authors' reliance on archival sources, and in their commitment to showing the wide variety of relationships between scholarship and politics over the course of the 19th and 20th centuries. In the following review, I will not try to describe every essay, but rather to offer a few comments on what this reviewer (an historian) found most interesting in the essays, and on the work that remains to be done.

The volume opens with several well-done essays, on the transition from amateur to professional work in Pompeii (in which Alexandre Dumas plays a starring role), and on the Vatican Museum's collection and display of Egyptian and Etruscan works. In the latter essay, Mirjam Hoijtink begins to describe an important transition, from the Catholic-Enlightened pursuit of universal history, to the more specifically national-historical exhibitions. She makes the very important point that 'The process of what one may call the dawn of nationalism was actually a remarkably slow one,' (p. 41), an observation whose verity is demonstrated in many ways by other essays in the volume, such as Stephen Dyson's discussion of American classicism, in which he shows how important Rome and especially Greece were to American culture, despite the fact that neither Caesar nor Alexander set foot on North American soil. Jürgen Krüger offers rich documentation of the passion for Rome Christian Carl Josias von Bunsen shared with Prussian Crown Prince Friedrich Wilhelm, who looked to the Forum Romanum, rather than to Nuremberg or Aachen, for models for Berlin's new city center. Later essays in the volume, such as Rachele Dubbini's on Giulio Emmanuele Rizzo and Nathalie de Haan's on Umberto Zanotti Bianco, nicely illustrate the Graecophilia some Italian scholars refused to give up, even in the era of state-backed *Romanità*. Thomas Fröhlich, in his essay on the study of the Lombards and Ostrogoths by German scholars in Italy during the late 1930s and early 1940s, reminds us that for the whole of the 19th century, prehistorical archaeology 'was not taught in the universities and field work was basically carried out by enthusiasts and amateurs' (p. 185). Even in the Nazi era, the study of things German was by no means German archaeologists' only pursuit, and Christian Jansen reminds us that the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, the outgrowth of the international Instituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica, fought many a battle with other, *more* nationalistic organizations. Rather ironically, then, in my view, one of the major achievements of the volume is to show how the aristocratic and humanistic traditions of previous eras continued to shape scholarly institutions, careers and tastes, despite the rise of new forms of nationalist politics. Indeed, without understanding both the confluences and conflicts between the humanist tradition and the advent of national (and sometimes nationalist) institutions, we will find it im-

possible to understand the history of archaeology, especially as practiced in humanism's heartland, Italy.

Of course, there is much more readers can learn from this volume. A number of the essays are based on extensive archival research, and scholars interested in these specific subjects will learn much, for example, about Rodolfo Lanciani, a hugely important and influential scholar and official in Rome whose career lasted from the 1870s to the 1920s, and about Umberto Zanotti Bianco, whose wealth, political liberalism and love of the Greeks made him an archaeologist - and an enemy of the fascists. Some of these essays - like the two just mentioned - succeed in integrating careful, specialized research with a wider view of the historical context; others, I'm afraid, just offer some facts about particular individuals or institutions and fail to make these meaningful by linking them to the cultural, social and political worlds around them. One cannot write the history of archaeology now in the way it was sometimes done in the past, as hagiography, or as simple documentation of what happened when - and, as this volume shows, there is still some of this kind of work being done. But by no means is this the prevailing tendency, and this volume gives us every reason to hope that we will soon see more and better histories written, and that the history of archaeology in Italy will at last get its due.

Suzanne Marchand

MAURIZIO SANNIBALE, *La raccolta Giacinto Guglielmi. Parte II. Bronzi e materiali vari*. Roma: «L'Erma» di Bretschneider 2008. 374 pp., numerous ill., 24 cm (Musei Vaticani. Museo Gregoriano Etrusco. Cataloghi, 4/2). – ISBN 978-88-8265-X.

Whereas M. Buranelli (ed.), *La raccolta G. Guglielmi, Parte I. La ceramica* (Rome 1997), is dedicated to Greek and Etruscan vases, now the second part, mainly written by Maurizio Sannibale (but assisted by many technical experts), deals with bronze artefacts, a terracotta head of an ancestral(?) statue, and some iron, golden and bone artefacts.

As is well known, two parts of the Guglielmi collection from Vulci entered successively the Vatican Museums, in 1935 and 1987 (pp. 7-14). They came to belong to the splendid Museo Gregoriano Etrusco. In this catalogue micro-contexts (e.g. no 87, a tiny iron axe found inside a pseudo-Panathenaic amphora) could be reconstructed and elements which originally belonged to one object, could be integrated. All objects are supposed to originate from Vulci, although not one precise find-spot is known. Most of them are Etruscan but an Egyptian statuette of Osiris (no 1, ca 664-525 BC) certainly was imported.

Sannibale and incidentally colleagues, G. Alteri, B.B. Shefton (publishing in English), and A. Testa, describe, interpret and date in a meticulous way 205 objects. These are well illustrated, some even by colour or radiographic photos and drawings. A very positive and extraordinary point is that a metal analysis of most bronze objects has been executed by U. Santamaria and F. Morresi. The artefacts were subjected to qualitative surface

analysis by energy dispersive X-ray fluorescence (XRF). This method, calibrated by the results of five types of destructive analyses (p. 283-284, Table 2), informs us about the composition of metals affording the percentages of Fe, Co, Ni, Cu, Zn, Sn, Pb and As (also presented in Table 3, pp. 285-288, with the addition of S, Au and Ag). Unfortunately, total percentages are missing. Many samples exceed 100% but these excessions are due to margins in the exactness of measurements. In practice most significant are the quantities of copper, tin and lead. Comparison, however, with the alloys of bronze mirrors published in the ca 30 volumes of the *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum* is difficult as mirrors usually hardly (or not all) contain traces of lead, in contrast to other cast bronzes and massive handles of mirrors.

The catalogue contains the following sections: bronze statuettes and a terracotta head, *instrumentum* (bronze vases, utensils, elements of furniture, candelabra and *thymiateria*, mirrors and *cistae*), arms and horse harnesses, decorative and ornamental objects (*fibulae*, rings etc.) and coins. The countless references to *comparanda* and relevant publications mentioned in the margins of the pages are abundant, up to date and to the point.

Finally Sannibale presents a material history of Vulci, from ca 900 until modern time, based on all the objects dealt with (pp. 289-297). Updated concordances of both Guglielmi catalogues (ordered to class, inv. no, material and date), an index according to catalogue numbers and a bibliography conclude the book.

The text is excellent apart from little slips of the pen like the Italianized *krobilos* instead of *króbylos* (p. 21).

Some artefacts are unique and fascinating, e.g. an elegant bronze statuette, dedicated by Arnth Muras to the deities *Thufl(thu)* and *Šu(u)ri* (Lat. Soranus/Dis Pater/Apollo). The dedicant may have been buried in the main, rear *cella* of the Tomba François. The statuette is now dated to ca 250-200 BC, therefore after Rome's conquest of Vulci. It represents a young man with *endromides* and *nebris* only, holding a (closed) *kantharos* (or *krater*?) in his left hand and a birdlike, damaged attribute on his head. His raised right arm is incomplete. Sannibale rejects the recent interpretation of N. de Grummond (in *Ancient West & East* 40, 2006, 296-317) as Favor trying to catch a bird. Her assumption is based on Propertius 4.2.33-34 who mentions Favor (or Fautor) as one of the metamorphoses of the originally Etruscan main god Vertumnus. Favor would be identical to *Thufltha*. Sannibale's *comparanda*, however, show that the young, tailless statuette does not represent a satyr as was suggested by M. Bentz but probably *Fufluns/Dionysos* making a libation (pp. 27-36). I would like to add that the male statuette cannot represent *Thufltha* as she bears a female name judged by the suffix *-tha* (cf. Ramtha). That an image of a god is offered to other gods, is not exceptional (cf. a famous bronze statuette in Ferrara representing *Apulu* but dedicated to *Aritimi* (H. Rix, *Etruskische Texte* OB 3.2)). Among the bronze tang mirrors especially the early no. 119, dated to ca 500 BC, is interesting as the exergues show oriental and Egyptian elements: winged, rapacious bird heads which are probably death demons and probably a pair of *uraei* (see also M. Sannibale, *Tra cielo e terra*, *StEtr* 72, 2006, 117-147).

Who studies the catalogue, will find artefacts of material classes, e.g. the so-called *graffioni*, probably

bronze torch holders (pp. 150-157) and *kottaboi* (pp. 139-140) which deserve a separate monograph, especially in the light of possible, ritual uses.

Catalogues are indispensable but very expensive. Let us hope that museums all over the world will publish their artefacts (also) online, with the permission to reproduce, for education and research scopes, illustrations without time and money consuming bureaucratic fuss.

L.B. van der Meer

J. SCHEID (ed.), *Pour une archéologie du rite. Nouvelles perspectives de l'archéologie funéraire*. Rome: École française de Rome 2008. 358 pp., 220 b. & w. figs, 4 colour figs, 14 tables, 23 plans, 3 maps; 28 cm (Collection de l'École française de Rome - 407). - ISBN 978-2-7283-0816-3.

This book contains 23 contributions, written in four languages, which were presented on scientific meetings in Paris and Cambridge, both in 2005, in the context of the European program *Vivre et mourir dans l'Empire romain. Nouvelles perspectives de l'archéologie funéraire. Influences culturelles du centre vers la périphérie*. Scope of the interdisciplinary project is to elaborate a common set of excavation- and registration procedures (by model databases), to promote the study of Roman imperial cemeteries in Rome, Italy and northwest Europe and to stimulate international contacts and debates. In his Prologue the editor, John Scheid, pleads for a correct use of written ancient sources in the study of funerary rites: they have to be contextualized. Often they are focused on elite cremations (rarely on inhumation). Many ritual details, which are visible in the field, are not mentioned in texts. It appears that Scheid uses the French words *rite* and *rituel* indiscriminately. For him rites imply the whole *modus operandi* (among others the sacrifices before, during and after the placing of the mortal human remains in a tomb). Here is a very short summary of the articles in a reshuffled order as they are not all clustered according to place or period. S. Martin-Kilcher pays attention to the archaeological traces of exposition (of the corpse), procession, cremation, deposition in, closing and marking of a burial place, and memory aspects in northwest Europe (pp. 9-27). A. Aberg-Wigg analyzes in the same area *Aschengruben*, places where only ashes, pieces of charcoal, ceramic and glass fragments, and sometimes calcified animal bones and carbonized vegetal remains were found (243-257). J. Pierce analyzes the differences between urban and rural cemeteries in Great Britain. In the latter case formal burial is visible in central and southern England, but only in the late Roman period (29-42). P. Booth et al. enlighten burials in England from the Oxford archaeology perspective (127-136). M.R. Picuti stresses the importance of Latin funerary inscriptions (43-58). A. Buccelato et al. present a reconstruction of rituals which took place in the necropolis Collatina (Rome). Bones of a *sus scrofa* in a cinerary *olla* confirm literary sources that the sacrifice of a swine in honour of Ceres guaranteed the reception of the deceased in the afterlife (59-88). C. Leoni et al. present the excavations of cemeteries of Classe at Ravenna.

Thanks to the wet conditions remains of wood sealed by clay were preserved. G. Montevocchio shows the use of File Marker 5.0 for creating databases of these necropolises (243-257). H. Duday et al. analyze tomb 77 there (with a wooden coffin) from the taphonomic perspective (197-210). J. Ortalli analyzes pre-burial rites, among others at Classe. I. Béraud et al. apply the 'lessons' of Classe on old excavations at Fréjus (223-231). S. Lepetz et al. cast light upon the ritual practices in a section of the cemetery of Porta Nocera at Pompeii (105-126). H. Duday analyzes a child's inhumation in the same necropolis (211-221). D. Joly presents a database of the cemetery (281-295). C. Gaeng et al. show traces of the rites sketched by Scheid in cemeteries of Luxemburg (Clemency; Goebblange-Nospelt) (161-170). M. Witteyer analyzes remains of cremation places and manipulation of bones during the *ossilegium* (171-195). Similar themes, cremation in fossae and cremation in other burial places, are dealt with by V. Bel et al. (233-247). P. Meniel illustrates excavation methods and laboratory studies of animal sacrifices (259-268). V. Matterne presents a similar study on the remains of fruits and grains (268-279). M. Angelini et al. show the delicate recuperation of parts of mobile artefacts (metal, textile etc.; 305-323). S. Minozzi et al. present the archiving of archaeological and anthropological remains in file models of databases (337-349). At the end there are summaries of all articles. There is no general evaluation nor an index. The illustrations are of good quality. This book is a must for all those who study cemeteries and funerary rituals. The main accent is on methods and models. Whether these will be followed by young scholars internationally, remains to be seen. The planned English and French versions may be helpful. Anyhow, the exchange of ideas about the detection of funerary practices (sometimes rituals) is a laudable initiative. Many articles prove that a science-based approach (by anthropologists, archaeozoologists and palaeo-botanists) is fundamental for the reconstruction of ritual gestures outside, inside and on burial places. They prove, moreover, that the rituals were not universal but varied from region to region.

L.B. van der Meer

SINCLAIR BELL/HELEN NAGY (eds), *New Perspectives on Etruria and Early Rome. In honor of Richard Daniel De Puma*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2009. xxiv and 305 pp., 75 b/w photos, 42 line drawings, 6 maps, 26 cm (Wisconsin Studies in Classics). – ISBN 978-0-299-23030-2.

This beautiful, well readable and rather well illustrated book is a *Festschrift* with 18 articles presented to Richard Daniel De Puma, the F. Wendell Miller distinguished professor emeritus of classical art and archaeology at the University of Iowa, where he taught for more than thirty years. This every inch gentleman-archaeologist and ancient art historian was among others co-director of excavations at Crustumium. The title of the volume suggests that some essays are dedicated to Etruria and the other ones to early Rome (which is only partly true). Most interesting are P. Gegory Warden's and G. Camporeale's thought-provoking contributions. Warden suggests

that Etruscan representations of anthropophagous animals, from ca 700 BC onward, symbolize a transformative rite of passage: 'animal consumes human; human assumes the animal.' Actaeon in the pediments of the famous Amazonomachy sarcophagus from Tarquinia (ca 350 B.C.) for example would in fact show him not only as a victim of dogs but also as *potnios theron*. Camporeale goes a step further, taking as starting point Arnobius, *Adv. nat.* 2.62: Etruscan *libri Acherontici* promise that souls become divine and immortal by the blood of certain animals for certain gods. He lists tombs, tomb-sculptures, -cult rooms, and -theatres trying to prove that many cases of ancestral cult should rather be interpreted as deifications of deceased. Although his theory is suggestive, hard proofs, for example by indications in funerary inscriptions are lacking. L. Bonfante illustrates diachronically the motif of *anasyrma* (the Baubo gesture) in Assyrian, Greek, Etruscan and Roman art. The motif first meant the exhibition of beauty and power, gradually it became apotropaic. A.A. Carpino enlightens in a subtle way the *interpretatio etrusca* of duelling warrior scenes (of Greek origin) on Etruscan bronze mirrors. As mirrors were usually property of women, war scenes seem misplaced. However, Eos and Athena point to female agency in the apotheosis of male heroes. P.J. Holliday pays attention to Civitalba's famous terracotta pediment showing the discovery of Ariadne by Dionysos and the frieze showing plundering Gauls, both dated by him to ca 180 BC and Roman programs of commemoration and unification (in Umbria). The author cannot explain why the terracottas never were displayed. It seems to me that the *Senatusconsultum de Bacchanalibus* of 186 BC has been prohibitive. D. Soren and E. Nell meticulously demonstrate the transition of a cold water cult at Mezzomiglio in Chianciano Terme from Etruscan (3rd century BC) to Roman times (2nd century AD). The 'cultural interface' sanctuary and spa may have been dedicated to Selene/Tiv/Luna. A. Tuck tries to demonstrate that the Etruscan death goddess Vanth would be of Celtic origin (cf. Irish *badhb* or *bean sí*), a female death bringer who is not represented in art. Tuck's argument that Vanth only appears after ca 400 BC when Celts invaded Italy, is incorrect as her name is already known in the 7th century BC (see H. Rix (ed.), *Etruskische Texte* II, 126, AV 2.3). The general opinion is that the iconography of Vanth is influenced by South Italian death demons with a cross belt over their naked breasts, Furies like Lyssa (see Bonfante in the same volume, p. 166). Other articles on Etruria are object-focused. S. Steingraber shows that many Etruscan artefacts in Japan are fakes (forgers unknown); J. MacIntosh analyzes the 'Etruscan' gold from Cerveteri and elsewhere in the University of Pennsylvania Museum, and M. Nielsen dates a terracotta lid couple (the man missing) in the Museum of Arts at Boston to ca 100 BC. Its provenance appears to be Perugia. I. Rowland discusses the lost *Iter Hetruscum* of Athanasius Kircher (1665-1678) and I. Edlund affords an amusing essay on real Etruscans in modern fiction. So far Etruria. Early Rome is more or less represented by P. Togninelli's excellent observations on the first Iron Age phases and finds from the Archaic phase in the area between Crustumium and Eretum, a border region near the Tiber, between the Sabine ter-

ritory and Latium Vetus, not far from the intercultural sanctuary Lucus Feronia in the Faliscan area. F. di Genaro's article suggests preventing looting (which happens at Crustumerium) by 'exchanging loans for the preservation of cultural patrimony'. C. Green focuses on the gods of the Circus Maximus in Rome: Consus (at the *meta*) and Sessia, Messia and Tutela (along the *spina*). She concludes that they were guardian deities marking a sacred city boundary. Consus would not be a god of stored corn but of secret counsels (cf. *condere*: to hide). A weak point in Green's hypothesis is that Seia (associated with Tutilina?) cannot derive from Lat. *serere* ('to link'). The remaining articles do not focus on early Rome. J.R. Clarke tries to reconstruct how painters created near-exact copies (in Pompeii); J. Penny Small asks herself why linear perspective would be necessary, and C. C. Mattusch pays attention to bronze portraits from the Villa dei Papyri at Herculaneum and the conflict between Winckelmann and the Reale Accademia about identifications. It is a pity that the articles are presented in a random order. There are some flaws, e.g. on p. 23 Q. Fabio Rulliano and P. Decio Mure should be Q. Fabius Rullianus and P. Decius Mus. Grosetto (p. 30) should be Grosseto. Fuinis has to be *Φuinis* (< Gr. *Phoinix*), Hippolytus Hippolytos, *Aruspicinae libri Haruspicipini libri* (pp. 236-238). Sometimes references are made to inaccessible MA-theses. If they are worthwhile, they should be published. The *Festschrift* includes good indexes.

L.B. van der Meer

SILVIA ROZENBERG, *Hasmonean and Herodian Palace at Jericho IV. The Decoration of Herod's Third Palace at Jericho*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society & Institute of Archaeology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2008. XIV, 594 pp.; 31 cm. – ISBN 978-965-221-071-5.

The monumental complexes of the Hasmonean kings at Jericho have been under research by American and Israeli scholars for more than fifty years and Ehud Netzer, the zealous director of studies, has published several large volumes. Rozenberg has worked with him and others for three decades and presents in this large, well edited volume the wall, floor and vault/ceiling decorations in paint, stucco and mosaic c.q. *opus sectile* belonging to the palace built after 30 BCE by Herod the Great (73-4 BCE). The first chapter (pp. 1-245) contains a full description of the remains *in situ* and the fragments found in the various rooms, mostly illustrated with black-and-white drawings. When possible, she inserts reconstructions of the decoration schemes in the shape of simple drawings. As to the wall decorations, dark dadoes, sometimes with linear decorative motifs, prevail, whereas the main zones often have central *aediculae* flanked by panels. The upper zones are almost always absent in these reconstructions, so that the reader has to guess, whether they did not exist or cannot simply be reconstructed. Columns in the various courtyards and in *triclinium* B70 (that I would rather call an *oecus corinthius* like those in the Houses of the Labyrinth and the Silver Wedding at Pompeii) were also covered with plaster and paint and looked like being hewn out of marble. The ceilings and domes mostly had decorations of reg-

ular patterns with coffers executed in stucco. The floors were lavishly executed in *opus sectile* (one older pavement in *opus tessellatum* is shown on p. 186).

Chapter II (pp. 247-282) concerns the technical aspects of paintings. Rozenberg gives both general and specific data, beginning with remarks about literary sources and fresco, tempera and secco techniques. Chemical analyses have been carried out on several pieces, whereas pigments found in bowls (p. 198: painter's workshop) could be studied in detail. The Jericho paintings technically correspond to murals found all-over the Roman Empire. Since Rozenberg discusses really all aspects in a readable way, this chapter would fit as a masterly section in a manual on ancient painting.

Chapter III (pp. 283-424) discusses mural decorations in the area that Jericho belongs to. Many barely known or unknown complexes in Israel, Jordan and Lebanon are presented, so that this chapter also surpasses the simple discussion of parallels, adding a large amount of information to our knowledge of late Hellenistic paintings in the ancient Near East (e.g. Cypros, Masada, Herodion, Samaria-Sebaste, Jerusalem, and Petra). Rozenberg has a great command of the comparanda in the Roman world and is able to present a coherent image of the decoration *koine* existing in the Mediterranean at the end of the 1st century BCE, in which the decorations presented here take a logical place. Probably mainly for the local readers, Roman and Pompeian examples are discussed at length, so that the match between East and West becomes more clear. She refers to three or four visits of Herodes to Rome (esp. p. 463), where he may have got inspiration for the interior design of his numerous palaces and other dwellings all-over the Land of Israel.

In Chapter IV (pp. 425-473) these data are used to match the results of the recomposition of decorative systems in the palace at Jericho. Rozenberg starts with the adaptation of colour schemes to specific rooms and notes the fondness of strong contrast, e.g. between yellow and red and the spatial effects these schemes could give. A peculiar aspect is the large amount of marble imitation in a time that it was no longer used in Italy (and it would reappear in the time of Nero), probably to be seen as an oriental more or less local feature (p. 429), which suggestion I am inclined to follow rather than seeing it as a proof of retardation.

Strikingly, the dimensions and forms of the architectural elements of these murals are no longer similar to those of the late Second Style or the paintings of the early-Augustan buildings on the Palatine, but look more like those belonging to the early Third Style, viz. Boscotrecase and Villa Imperiale. This makes them a good testimony of the rapid expansion of the simpler artistic language Augustus wanted to divulgate in the run of his reign. In my view, therefore, the parallels with the paintings from the so-called Villa della Farnesina and the Houses of Augustus and Livia on the Palatine are less convincing, since these decorations are not only of a much higher level, but also - which is more important - the mindset of Augustus and his circle in the early years of his reign, around 30-25 BCE. This conviction of mine does not diminish the importance of Herod's paintings as expressions of his zealous imitation of the emperor, but only refines this 'Kunstwollen' to a slightly

later date, much in correspondence with Herod's own data of contact with Rome, being the most important years 18-17, 12 and 10-9, hence exactly the period of a greater simplicity in mural decoration. The connection with the political world is made correctly by Rozenberg, in that she sees the decoration of the palace at Jericho as good expressions of Herod's wish to be a good follower of his real sovereign. The absence of figural motifs, on the other hand, should suit the Jewish reserves against figures on the basis of their belief.

The section on the design is less convincing than the previous discussions, for the decorations are no longer seen as compositions of entire walls, but as a mix of various elements like lines, panels, architectural forms and curly motifs. Of course, many details have their counterparts in Rome, but they make part of a whole, like the pinnacles as acroteria (pp. 442-443). Even where Rozenberg highlights painted architectures, she loses her way in putting the accent on details instead of discussing the whole. A problem in this respect is the already mentioned almost total absence of data for the reconstruction of the upper zones. It is not probable that these sections remained mainly white (as argued on p. 361): the reconstructions often show a central aedicule in the main zone jutting out above the upper bands of the panels next to it, suggesting the presence of other features under the closing border of the wall.

The much briefer chapters V and VI (pp. 475-521; 523-543) present the stucco decorations (architectural and ceiling adornments) and the floors in *opus sectile*, Naama Viloshni describes in Chapter VII the terracotta fragments (pp. 545-547), few pieces only, probably belonging to the wall decorations like the well-known Campana reliefs or to the roof systems. An extensive bibliography concludes the work that unfortunately lacks a topographical index.

It may be clear from what is written here, that the importance of Rozenberg's study surpasses that of the thorough presentation of a fascinating complex. The author makes clear that the Land of Israel in the time of Augustus wanted to be a satellite state of certain relevance, as expressed in Herod's building and decoration programme. Further studies on exchange of ideas and forms between centre and periphery will gain great profit of studying Rozenberg's monograph.

Eric M. Moormann

CLAUDIA LUCCHESI, *Il mausoleo di Alicarnasso e i suoi maestri*. Roma: Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, 2009 (Maestri dell'arte classica 1). XI, 71 pp., 15 figs, 14 pls; 21 cm. – ISBN 978-88-7689-219-2.

This small book about one of the most famous works of art in the eastern Mediterranean of the 4th century BC is presented as the first of a new collection of monographs on important creations by Greek artists edited by Luigi Todisco. He hopes these major expressions of the Greek mind to become better known to students and people not familiar with the subjects. Lucchese succeeds in clearly exposing the many problems concerning the reconstruction of the original form and decoration of the mausoleum. She gives an excellent overview of the various proposals and shows a good

command of the vast bulk of literature about the topic. There are four chapters, the first of which describes the cultural and urbanistic basic data. The second chapter discusses architectural features (as far as known), proposals of reconstructing the monument, decoration, architects, and artists. Without being conclusive, she adheres Jeppesen's reconstruction (see fig. 7) that is based on the scholar's peculiar knowledge as the excavator of the remains in modern Bodrum. She is cautious as to the use of the ancient sources regarding the architects Pytheos and Satyros and the famous sculptors Skopas, Leochares, Timotheos, Bryaxis, and Praxiteles. As to dating, Lucchese does not expressively adhere an early dating (to the reign of Mausolos) or a late one (Artemisia after M's death), which one may understand. At the least, we observe the integration of the Mausoleum within Mausolos' new town planning of Halikarnassos.

All this has its consequences for the following chapter on the meaning of the sculptural decoration and its reconstruction. Novelty for the general reader will especially lie in the definition of the cultural environment, viz. the southwest coast of Turkey in that period, when the satraps and lower dynasts of Lycia and Caria built lavish funerary monuments. The Mausoleum is big, showing wealth and power, but not unique or rising *ex nihilo*. Apparently the local dynasts sought to satisfy their sovereigns in far Persepolis (or the controlling officers acting for them) as well as the population at home, enhancing, finally, their own prestige by erecting this sort of funerary monuments.

A puzzling aspect is the interpretation of the iconographic themes used on the Mausoleum and other satrapic monuments of the kind. One sees many mythical machai (Centaur, Amazons, Troy), whereas heroes like Perseus, Bellerophon (indeed, from this area), Theseus and Herakles feature as the saviours of mankind by killing monsters and barbarians. Seen from a Greek standpoint, they often reflect the superiority Greece pretended to have over the Persians, thanks to the victories in the Persian Wars. Within a Greek contexts, there could even be special accentuations, making one of the fighting groups specific enemies or winners. This adaptation of a Greek cultural language at first sight puzzles us, when we look at it from a Greco-centric point of view, but might it not be a similar expression of rethinking values. Could it not be the Persians identifying themselves with these saviours? Consequently, I suggest that they asked Greek artists to display a 'Greek', to them familiar programme, that now should be seen within their realm as showing the Persians, Carians or other local groups as beholders of civilisation. Because of their background, knowledge and skills, these Greek artists warranted a high-quality execution of the works of art asked for, but the public would associate these images with the man (or woman) entombed here. Perikles of Limyra could even show a double play by inserting caryatids à la Erechtheion and so referring to his Athenian name-sake. Typically Persian aspects did not fail: see the dynast on a throne in the lower register, the hunting scenes and the heraldic animals walking or standing on the pyramid-like roof, that in itself also reflected eastern architecture.

The original sources, a rich bibliography and foot-

notes conclude the work. The book does not look very attractive in its layout and has very bad images, which, moreover, are all taken from existing publications. As to the maps, we see two in Italian (fig. 1-2) and one in German (fig. 11). The circle on fig. 2 has sense in Corso's original publication but is here superfluous. The reproductions of the line drawings are weak and miss a scale, which is especially clumsy, when one wants to compare the various reconstructions of the building. If the editor wants to attract new readers, he does not succeed by this form of presentation.

Eric M. Moormann

A. FILGES (ed.), *Blaundos. Berichte zur Erforschung einer Kleinstadt im lydisch-phrygischen Grenzgebiet*. Tübingen: Ernst Wasmuth Verlag, 2006. XIII, 351 pp., 285 figs, 2 colour plates, 4 'Falttafel'; 3 maps; 30 cm (Istanbuler Forschungen, Band 48). – ISBN 978-3-8030-1769-7.

Asia Minor is rich in impressive urban sites, some excavated, others simply standing on the earth, clearly visible to visitors in a more or less preserved state and constantly threatened by local people who for various reasons demolish them (for the latter cf. pp. 15, 31/32, 223, 284, for saddening examples); many more still lurk under the earth waiting for skilled excavators but unfortunately often a prey for illegal diggers. Many urban ruins have been visited and described in the 16th-19th centuries and have suffered ever since. It is the more regrettable that Dutch archaeology is by and large invisible in Turkey. We do have an institute in Istanbul but its focus is on Ottoman history and it dabbles somewhat in prehistory, whose sites are least threatened by illegal diggers, bent as they are on building blocks, precious objects and metals.

The volume under review concerns the site of the city of Blaundos, visited in the 19th century by Arundell and Hamilton, described in 1894 by K. Buresch as 'eines Stückes entschwundener Märchenwelt' and in the period 1999-2002 intensively studied by a team of German experts led by A. Filges (F. from now on), and generously supported by the German Institute in Istanbul. In 1995 K. Akbiyrkoğlu has executed an 'emergency excavation' yielding sculpture and building blocks of a temple. The word 'Notgrabung' is significant (see above). Blaundos, ca 200 km. east of Izmir and 40 km. south of Uşak, lies on a high plateau, surrounded on three sides by steep canyons and only accessible through a narrow strip in the north: see the splendid and almost awe-inspiring drawing by Arundell on p. 8. The city's necropoleis consist of ca 270 rock-cut tombs, some of them with vestiges of wall-paintings and all more or less 'ausgeraubt' (p. 223) by the locals.

After introductory chapters on previous research and ancient travellers, on the territory (*chora*) and the history of the city from Hellenistic to Byzantine times, the 'real thing' begins with a detailed report on the investigations of the various (remnants of) buildings on the plateau: two temples (one for Ceres/Demeter, witness a bilingual inscription), the city wall with its gates (dating from the 4th century A.D. and enclosing a much reduced part of the urban space), stadium, theatre, gym-

nasion (?), main street (*plateia*) with stoas, a market-basilica (?), the aqueduct (ca 14 km. long, bringing water to the city from a spring in the village of Inay, north of the city, which is still active today; nowadays almost entirely demolished, whereas in the early 19th century Hamilton followed it over three miles!) and the Byzantine remains (predominantly traces of houses). A study of the tombs and an analysis of the various finds (sculpture, sarcophagi, coins, ceramics) follow. The book is concluded with some brief reflections on the urban development in Hellenistic and Roman times, the city's function in the region and a very welcome Appendix in which F. von Saldern presents 55 Greek and Latin inscriptions found in the city and its territory (44) and in some places in the vicinity north, south and west of the city, which probably belonged to other cities (Güllü, Çırpıcıllar, Eşme; 11). The quality of the figures, maps, photos and lay-out is simply superb and in line with the contents of the book.

The city started its existence as an indigenous settlement called Mlaundos and in the Hellenistic period became a Seleukid settlement of Macedonian veterans under the name Blaundos; the present ruins exclusively date from the Roman and Byzantine period. Nothing has been found which can be related to the pre-Hellenistic, let alone prehistoric, period. For the identity of the city the Macedonian origin remained essential. On coins and in inscriptions the citizens called themselves *Blaundeis Makedones*. In the Roman period Romans settled down in the area, whether as veterans (so p. 22) or as a result of private initiative (my own preference). In Inay a group of Romans, living there (*katoikountes*), is attested, and in the city itself quite a few individual Roman citizens are on record, both original 'Italians' and enfranchised Greeks; Latin inscriptions confirm the Romanization of the city. Italian and indigenous features are also observed by F. in the architecture of the city. Blaundos' coinage, except for a few late-Hellenistic specimens dating from the 1st to mid-3rd century AD, also mention quite a few enfranchised Greek magistrates. Roman settlers may well have been a crucial factor in explaining the growth and prosperity of Blaundos in the imperial age; a prosperity otherwise rather limited when compared to what happened in major cities like Hierapolis, Laodikeia, Sardis *vel sim.* but nevertheless prosperity. F. writes on 'kleine Impulse - auch von Seiten der römischen Machthaber -' which brought about an 'Eigendynamik' (p. 314). But the extant evidence points to individual Roman citizens of Italian descent financing the (re)construction of public buildings in the 1st century AD (Mummius Macer and Cn. Octavius), with an enfranchised Greek, Tib. Claudius Menekrates, as *epimeletes* (why F. writes about 'the son of a manumitted ('freigelassenen') provincial (Menekrates; p. 319) remains obscure to me). Evidence for emperors or governors injecting money into the Blaundian building projects is lacking for the 1st/2nd century AD. The Italian settlers may conceivably have raised the productivity of the land by applying Roman agronomic expertise. F. seems somewhat inconsistent here. On p. 316 he writes about the 'Finanzkraft einiger zugereisten Italiker', minimizing their role in the formation of the city's budget; on p. 319 one reads about a 'Zuzug von Italikern'; and on pp. 22/23 Von Saldern thinks in terms of a large number of Roman citizens.

In addition to the Romanization of Greeks, we also see the familiar Hellenization of Romans. C. Mummius Macer established a foundation for the provisioning of the local gymnasium of the *presbyteroi* with oil; far away from conservative circles in Rome, he was glad to support rather than criticize the body-culture of gymnasium-visitors. An inscription (Appendix no 18) records manumitted slaves of Macer honoring their patron in Greek; their master obviously did not impose Latin!

A few details to conclude with. The stadion is said to have measured 113 m; this elicits no more than the brief comment 'etwas zu kurz' from D. Roos, who knows that the average stadion is closer to 170-190 m than to 113 m. Blaundos does not seem to have organized any major 'international' athletic contest; the city probably restricted itself to purely local *agōnes*; in addition, the local gymnasium may have used the stadion for its own contests. Is that the reason why the Blaundians developed their own version of a stadion-race? Or has the measuring not been fully reliable? In the coin catalogue P. Matern mal-treats some names. Coins with 'Apollo(ni) Theog' are assigned to 'Apollon Theogen[...]'; the magistrate is, of course, 'Apolloni(os), son of Theogenes', 'Theogen' being the abbreviation of Theogen(ou(s)). Similarly 'Aur. Papias. Er(Mo)' is not 'Aur. Papias Her(mou)?' but rather 'Aur. Papias Hermo(genes, *vel sim*)'. The non-initiated may not know that 'Ar. A.', recorded on many coins, stands for 'first archon' (*archōn prōtos*). The new bilingual epigraph no 29 (pp. 337/338) records a Lucius Peticus. The name is 'sehr selten im Osten belegt'. SEG XXXVIII 679/680 mention a Peticus in Stobi (Macedonia) as father of two Greek ephebes and, more interesting, XLII 1800 throws light on a merchant family of Peticii, which, however, does not justify the conclusion that *all* Peticii were *negotiatores*; some of them may have been involved in commerce. For brief comment on some of the inscriptions see G. Petzl, *Klio* 90 (2008) 262.

Filges and his colleagues have done a truly magnificent job; in ca three months they have studied the site in all its aspects thoroughly, published an exhaustive report on it in due course and tried to integrate the archaeological-epigraphical data into a general history of the city. F. writes that a survey in Blaundos' territory remains a desideratum (p. 318 note 1283). Let us hope that the resources and the time will be found which enable him and his collaborators to accomplish that survey.

H.W. Pleket

F. İŞİK, *Girlanden-Sarkophage aus Aphrodisias* (mit einem Beitrag zu den Inschriften von Joyce Reynolds und Charlotte Roueché), Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 2007. XVI + 202 pp., 112 pls; 29 cm (Sarkophag-Studien 5). – ISBN 978-3-8053-3729-8.

This lavishly produced book consists of two parts. In the first F. İşik offers a detailed, art-historical analysis of 215 sarcophagi found in Aphrodisias and environs up to 1993. In a catalogue (105-143) he briefly describes and dates all these pieces; in the preceding pages (1-104) he points out that two main types of sarcophagi can be distinguished. Type I-pieces have heads (rams; bulls; Gor-

gos) carrying or supporting garlands, whereas in Type II the heads are replaced by complete figures ('Vollfiguren'). The latter type is subdivided into two categories: II 1 concerns sarcophagi with garlands on the upper part of the chest, just under (below) the rim, whereas in II 2 the garlands are located lower on the chest. Finally, II 2 has two variants: II 2 1 has in the centre a *tabula ansata* instead of a garland; in II 2 2 the 'Vollfiguren' are replaced by columns and pillars.

İşik argues that the various types were manufactured in three specialized workshops; one (A) for type I, another (B) for II 1 and a third (C) for II 2 1 and II 2 2. Workshop A was influenced by Ephesian ateliers and is termed 'ephesisch-aphrodisiastisch'. Only eighteen specimens belong to this category; workshop B is supposed to have been responsible for II 1 ('einheimisch-aphrodisiastisch'); workshop C produced II 2 (1 and 2), adopted motifs from colleagues in Rome and is therefore called 'römisch-aphrodisiastisch'. The general typology of İşik may be acceptable but why each type required a workshop of its own is not explained by him; it is simply an assumption. One large workshop with craftsmen capable of working in different styles is at least conceivable, the more so since specimens of B and C are frequently dated by I. to the same periods.

İşik invests much energy and even more acumen in the analysis of developments or changes in style-elements: garlands, heads, figures and their anatomy. He systematically locates specific developments in a highly detailed chronological sequence and never considers the possibility of a much broader and vaguer periodisation, let alone of a chronological juxtaposition, i.e., of the simultaneousness of variations in the representation of specific style-elements. When it comes to the actual 'Datierungen' (38-41 for B; 67-77 for C), we get a very refined chronological system, often operating with periods of ten to twenty years. I cannot help feeling that all this results into a system of over- or perhaps even pseudo-precision. I give one example of workshop A, viz. sarcophagus no 5. On 10 İşik assigns this piece to the 'Anfang der Produktion', together with no 3 which he relates to a sarcophagus from Maionian Kula (precisely dated to 61/62 AD). On the same page, twenty-five lines lower, I. assigns it to the end of the 1st century AD (after the Flavian period of no 4; possibly 'late-Flavian' in the catalogue on 106) on the basis of minute developments in specific elements (grapes, garlands, heads and eyes). It remains obscure what precisely the basis is for a theory which relates such minute stylistic developments to specific decades in the 1st century AD. In this way İşik proposes a very precise chronology for the eighteen pieces of A all the way from 'Flavian', 'late-Flavian', 'Trajanic', 'Hadrianic' to 'early-, middle- (160-170 AD) and late Antoninian' (170-190 AD).

The same chronological refinement is proposed for B and C, with the addition of 'early-, middle- and late-Severan', 'late Severan to post-Severan' (= 225-250 AD), 'Gallienic', 'post-Gallienic', 'Tetrarchic' and a 'Sonderkategorie' (250-300 AD). For these two groups we are fortunate in having quite a few sarcophagi with inscriptions, which are discussed by Reynolds and Roueché in Part II of this study.

Alltogether R./R. present 44 sarcophagi with inscriptions: twenty old and twenty-four new ones; among the

latter two are illegible (nos 109 and 186). R./R.'s corpus has the usual quality which we have come to expect from these two distinguished epigraphists: reliable texts, good translations, succinct but relevant commentaries, cautious dating and complete bibliography. In a brief section they discuss the criteria used for dating the inscriptions (nomenclature; eponymous officials; fines; lettering). Most texts are assigned to the 3rd century AD and further refinements (first half; second half; middle) are only proposed with caution.

Remarkably enough Işik rarely, if at all, confronts his own very detailed chronology, based on art-historical criteria, with that of the epigraphists. It must be said at once that in many cases Işik's dates can be accommodated within R./R.'s chronology. Işik dates no 104 to 200-210 AD, whereas R./R. propose '200-250 AD'; but for no 107 (MAMA VIII 566) the situation is less rosy for Işik, who dates it again to 200-210 AD. R./R. firmly and confidently propose 250-300 AD for the inscription; the text is not secondary and thus hardly later than the sarcophagus itself. An important element in R./R.'s proposal is the mention of an eponymous *stephanephoros* and the high probability that his tenure is to be dated to the period indicated by them (cf. also SEG LIV 1064). In this case the verdict must be that the art-historian should adapt himself to the epigraphists and not the other way round. I am unable to spell out the implications for Işik's entire chronological system but implications it is likely to have.

Another case in point is no 116, dated by Işik to the 'middle-Severan period' (210-225 AD). R./R. assign it to '200-250 AD'. So far, so good, except perhaps for the fact that Işik would be well advised to use longer time-spans. There is more, however. R./R. point out that no 116 was found in the same chamber-tomb as the nos 173, 178 and 179 and that all four nos. should be 'approximately contemporary' (viz. ca 200-250 AD). Işik dates nos 173 and 178 to the time of Gallienus (250-270 AD) and no 179 to the 'frühgallienische' period (ca 250/255 AD', I suppose). These propositions are clearly at variance with the principle of 'simultaneousness' claimed by R./R. for all four numbers.

A similar case concerns nos 81 and 227. Işik dates no 81 to the very broad time-span 'Antoninisch bis tetrarchisch', viz. ca 140-300 AD, and no 127 to '210-225 AD' ('mittelseverisch'). R./R. point out that both sarcophagi were found in the same funerary court, are therefore likely to be roughly contemporary and date both numbers to the first half of the 3rd century AD. Işik's date for no 127 can be integrated into R./R.'s scheme, though one wonders whether the epigraphic date would not have been more cautious, but why does he not adapt his suggestion for no 81 to that scheme? It would have narrowed down the very loose and imprecise '140-300 AD' considerably.

Comparable discrepancies occur with nos 110 and 112 ('mittelseverisch', i.e., 210-225 AD; ca 250 AD, R./R.), no 142 (250-270 AD according to Işik, whereas R./R. propose the 4th century AD), no 155 (270-300 AD versus 200-250 AD) and no 156 (190-200 AD versus 200-250 AD).

Işik undoubtedly has a sharp eye and an admirable sensitivity for changes and developments in the representations of specific ornaments on sarcophagi. He describes them very precisely and succinctly. Especially to

be recommended are his observations on the representations and meaning of the various objects on the sarcophagi (wreaths; rosettes; masks; sphinxes etc.) which I cannot discuss here due to constraints of space. But I am not sure that his subtle art-historical analysis can support the very (and in my view over-) precise chronology he proposes for his sarcophagi. Fine-tuning with the epigraphists would have been desirable.

H.W. Pleket

J. BINTLIFF/PH. HOWARD/A. SNODGRASS (with contributions from O. Dickinson, M. Gillings, J. Hayes, R. Schiel and J. Vroom), *Testing the hinterland. The work of the Boeotia Survey (1989-1991) in the southern approaches to the city of Thespiiai*. Cambridge, UK: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, 2007. XVIII, 320 pp., 458 figs, 47 tab.; 28.5 cm. – ISBN 1-902937-37-6.

The Boeotia survey started in 1979. Large blocks of landscape, incorporating the territory of Thespiiai, Haliartos, Hyettos and the sites of the cities themselves, have been intensively surveyed in the 1980s and 1990s. The directors of the survey decided to publish the results in a series of free-standing volumes before embarking upon the publication of a single, synthetic volume. The volume under review is the first in that series and deals with a relatively small section of Thespiiai's territory south of the city, ca 5.2 km² (ca 520 ha) large and systematically explored in 1989 and 1991. Let it be said at once that the authors are to be praised for their attempt to integrate the results of their survey into a general account of the ups and downs of the history of Boeotia in general and Thespiiai in particular over a long period, with special reference to demographic problems and their impact on the cultivation and organization of the country-side. They are familiar with the main publications in the field of ancient history and archaeology on these problems in Greece in general. They use a detailed catalogue of the findings in the territory surveyed to present a long-term sort of 'histoire totale' of the area concerned. Not all archaeologists try so emphatically to transcend the purely descriptive level of the catalogue.

In this survey two field techniques were pioneered in combination: registration and dating of all the scattered artefacts and their relation to the locations identified as 'sites'; the latter 'become "peaks" on a quantitative "contour" map of density' (9). All this is expected to yield 'a multi-layered interpretation - - - in which the "sites" can be fully integrated into the surrounding terrain in terms of landscape history, intensity of agricultural exploitation, functional role, relation to urban centres, and several other aspects' (XVII). This is a truly ambitious claim; and the innocent reader gets excited about the prospect of an 'histoire totale' of the Boeotian agro-towns, written largely on the basis of an analysis of the countless, uninscribed ceramic artefacts found in varying degrees of density. In this project new technology, from computer data bases to GIS (GIS standing for Geographical Information System) analysis allowing to relate spatial to archaeological data, plays a prominent role. All this makes up for ca 320 pages of

hard, pretty technical reading; fortunately, the hard core of the book consists of 182, otherwise very dense, pages, the rest being devoted to a huge 'detailed site-by-site analysis' (183-312), which in fact is an elaboration of chapter 6 ('The analysis of the individual sites'; 43-94). To complete the technological miracle a CD is offered, pasted at the inside of the back cover of the book; the present reviewer is old-fashioned and restricted himself to close reading of the printed pages!

The basis of the authors' exercise consists of ceramic finds in the area concerned. Field-walking produced these finds. Each walker is held to have seen a 2 m wide strip, with 15 m intervals between them. The number of sherds observed on the strip has been extrapolated over the remaining 13 m (4). Now on the whole I have always liked students; nevertheless, I am pragmatic enough to be skeptical about the degree of accuracy of the walkers; some may have seen more than others and all may have suffered from an occasional lack of concentration while walking under the burning sun in the Thespian fields. Our skepticism grows when we hear that a more intensive and time-consuming counting process on a specific site 'increases the field-walking figures by an average factor of 2.5 (23)'. Worse, not all walkers may have been equally competent in recognizing different ceramic types. On 13, in the context of a section on prehistoric and other periods, the authors are aware of this 'lack of recognition'; are they sure that for the classical/early Hellenistic periods this lack is negligible? Anyhow, the extrapolation of potentially inaccurate observations and findings over long stretches outside the strip controlled by the walker, merely increases the risk of such observations. At all costs, and for reasons to be analyzed further down, the authors want to have an area with as dense a carpet of ceramics as possible. In order to achieve this they introduce three factors. First, the visibility-factor: vegetation obscures the soil surface; the authors present a visibility estimate on a scale from 1 to 10; visibility 1 turns a count of twenty artefacts into 200 artefacts etc. etc. In my view this is just pseudo-precision; visibility can be designed behind a comfortable desk but I doubt whether such an estimate can be applied to actual vegetation while walking through fields; second, a so-called enhancement factor: more intensive study leads to 2.5 times more ceramics being found than field walkers noticed in a locality; finally, the 'plough soil' factor: only one-sixth of the plough-soil artefacts are detectable by field walking. This exercise in the end yields ca twenty million sherds for 5.2 km². Assumptions and extrapolations reign supreme here. Other survey-archaeologists should give their verdict on this point. I am left with a feeling of uneasiness, possibly due to lack of competence in such matters. Whatever the quantitative truth, the authors are probably right in pointing out that there was 'a dense carpet of ceramics' in the area concerned. They distinguish ca 18 so-called sites in an ocean of off-site scatters. As to the latter they understandably wonder how to explain the over-all ceramic density in the area. They come up once more with their 'manure-hypothesis'. Urban-based landowners were in the habit of 'exporting' urban refuse (cf. 'the wastes of the human population', 105) to their rural estates. Intense manuring allowed a system of annual cropping rather than the system of alternating crop and fallow; annual

cropping was necessary to feed Thespiat's growing population. I suppose that the manure consisted predominantly of the excrements of human beings (and perhaps an occasional domestic animal (cf. the reference to 'night-soil' on 105)). However, Xenophon's dungheap seems to have been a compost heap of vegetable refuse, not of animal (or human) dung (*Oeconomicus* 20.10; cf. S. Isager/J.E. Skydsgaard, *Ancient Greek Agriculture. An introduction* (1992), 111). Does Xenophon's dung have enough fertilizing power and is there evidence that the ancients systematically mixed dung (of whatever kind) with ceramic waste? The manure-hypothesis needs support from historians of Greek agriculture but the authors do not invoke their help. Isager/Skydsgaard, *op.cit.*, *ibidem*, write that possibly sherds may have been distributed along with manure from stables; but Bintliff *cum suis* do not believe that in the city of Thespiat (or on its territory, for that matter) animals were kept in stables! The otherwise informative chapter by R. Shiel and A. Stewart on the soils and agricultural potential of the area (ch. 7; 95-109, especially 107/108) does not really help the reader for this problem.

More important is the discovery of ca 18 sites, some of them with 'haloes' around them, characterized by a significant larger density of sherds than in the off-site areas. In their 6th chapter on the analysis of the individual sites they present several options for the function of those sites: estate centre (in one case even the estate of a 'moderately wealthy Thespian family' (45); cf. also 132: 'a suburban estate'), medium farm, hamlet of independent farmers. At the same time the authors candidly admit that Thespiat was an agro-town, whose inhabitants in majority were commuting farmers (24). All the sites were located on walking-distance from the city, certainly not 'beyond the threshold at which the distance from Thespiat reached the point where urban farmers were largely replaced by those living in rural nucleations and farms' (136). What the authors write about two specific sites (LSE 1 and 3) is in fact applicable to the whole area surveyed by them: 'we had not expected to find classical farm sites in this zone' (135; cf. also 73 on site THS 12: 'unexpected, so close to the city'). I would go one step further and argue that to postulate 18 rural sites in an area, at most 1-3 km. from the city, is at variance with the theory of agro-towns inhabited by farmers, who in such an area are not likely to have built farms: in addition to being unexpected such farms would have to be characterized as 'highly improbable, perhaps even unacceptable'. The authors, however, are hypnotized by the idea that their sites, characterized by a significant density of sherds, must have been inhabited permanently by people. But why not follow the above-mentioned principle and seek another explanation for the density of sherds on a given location? Semi-permanent shelters or barns *vel sim*. And why did the authors not organize a couple of quick trial-excavations on a couple of sites?

This is the more remarkable, because in the case of site THS 11 the authors, on the basis of the presence of funerary ware, had concluded that it was a cemetery; a conclusion subsequently confirmed by excavations, conducted in 1981 by Andreiomenou and reported in *AD* 36 (1981) [1988] B 1 186.187 (70 and 266-271). A.'s report was unknown to the authors when they sug-

gested identifying the site as a small cemetery. Was it impossible to organize such trial-digs or is it a certain aversion to excavating archaeologists, which led the authors to base their history on ceramic finds only? In a recent newspaper-interview (*NRC*, Dec. 2, 2008) Bintliff was far from kind to such colleagues: they were narrow-minded, (i.e., they do not look beyond their own excavations), competitive and hardly prone to collaborate with colleagues from elsewhere. In two years B. had clarified two thousand years of the history of both the territory and the city of Koroneia, whereas Americans needed a century to shed light on the history of a small part of the city of Corinth. B. fails to realize that the Corinthian excavations enabled us to study many more aspects of the history and *society* of a major city in much more details than B.'s 'skeletal' reconstruction of Koroneia's history, which amounts to no more than an account on the lay-out of the city, the position of houses, the size and cultivation of the territory of the city, and hypotheses about demographic developments. The *society* of Koroneia is hardly illuminated by this sort of archaeology.

Whatever the reason, the authors preferred to stand by their interpretation of the sites as 'residential foci' (146). Various sites previously held to be estates are gradually and very hypothetically transformed into hamlets inhabited by poor peasants well under hoplite-status and owning initially 3.6, but in the final analysis, a mere and very hypothetical 2.3 ha, not enough to survive on with a family of 4/5 persons. As a result these peasants were forced to earn some supplementary income by working as dependent labourers on the estates of the richer, urban-based and commuting citizens. But again, why should sub-hoplite peasants, in contrast with their somewhat more well-to-do fellow-citizens, have felt the necessity to build a 'residential focus' on a site on walking distance from the city, thereby demolishing the authors' own thesis about commuting farmers living in the city and walking (or riding on a donkey) to their fields in close proximity to the city? The decision to shift from 'estate-centres' (cf. the above-mentioned moderately wealthy Thespian family) to 'hamlets' finds in my view no justification in the quantity and quality of the ceramic findings but is simply a function of the thesis concerning the poor peasants/labourers. Strangely enough, on their tabular survey on 172 the authors also posit the existence of two medium-farms; are their inhabitants also sub-hoplite peasants or are they more well-to-do? And if the latter were true, why on earth did they decide to build a farm instead of commuting from the city?

In short: I am not at all sure that the inspiring reconstruction of the history of part of Thespiai's territory is really based on reliable foundations. I do hope (and even wish) that rapid trial-excavations à la Andreiomenou will soon show that I am too sceptical about the authors' ultimate interpretation of most of the sites as the homes of a small number of poor peasants/labourers. Even so, *mutatis mutandis*, the salutary warning of a British archaeologist deserves to be mentioned: 'you can dig up a villa but you cannot dig up its land-tenure' (quoted in *JRA* 2008, 482).

H.W. Pleket

WINFRIED HELD, *Gergakome. Ein 'alteswürdiges' Heiligtum im kaiserzeitlichen Karien*. Tübingen: Ernst Wasmuth Verlag GmbH & Co., 2008. 220 pp., 250 figs, 1 map; 30 cm (*Istanbuler Forschungen* 49). – ISBN 978-3-8030-1770-3/ISSN 0723-4333.

Gergakome is an isolated site in northwest Caria, off the main roads, in a mountainous region covered with gneiss-rocks and, at least in antiquity, pines and cedars. The place has been visited at the end of the 19th century by the Frenchman Cousin and in the 20th century by Alfred Laumonier and George Bean. Held presents the results of his visits to the site in September 1989 and 1994 (cf. already a brief report by H. summarized in *SEG XLV* 1511). Gergakome in fact is a precinct, ca 1 km² large, surrounded by a long terrace-wall and containing remains of several buildings, three large statues, a couple of chambers built in the terrace-wall, and a series of stelai which originally stood on the wall. The state of the ruins is rather depressing. Gneiss is not an attractive stone in appearance; the ruins have suffered from the, alas, usual illegal activities of the Turkish peasants (cf. H.'s reference to 'Raubgrabungen' on 18, 33 and 101!). What are we to make of this site?

The dominant building is Held's 'Bau I', well preserved but small in size: ca 7½ m long and 4.85 m wide; on a sort of pediment above the entrance there is a Greek inscription in huge letters (50 cm high): Gergas. Incidentally, there are on the site altogether 43 inscriptions with the words Gerga(s), Gergakom(e) or Gergaskome. 'Bau I' has been interpreted by earlier scholars as a tomb, a temple-tomb or a temple. H. convincingly argues that it is a small temple, probably of the mother-goddess Kybele. The other buildings (nos II-XIV) are fountain-houses (four certain; four probable), a (farm)-house, a building with an oil- or wine-press, and chambers cut into the terrace-wall; all described in great detail and illustrated with magnificent photos and maps. Careful analysis of the architecture and building-techniques shows that the entire precinct has been constructed in the Roman Imperial period in a deliberately archaizing style. Analysis of the lettering of the inscriptions is H.'s main prop for a date in the 2nd/3rd century AD (145/146). I am, however, not so sure that H.'s criteria are sound. Cursive letters (sigma, omega) already occurred in Hellenistic texts. In the photos presented by H. there are hardly apices; alpha has either a broken or a straight cross-bar, and thus hardly provides a chronological clue; photo and drawing of inscription no 11 (110/111), with small hanging omicrons, definitely do not recall the 2nd/3rd century AD. At best the inscriptions perhaps justify a general and rather vague date in the Roman period (ca 1st-3rd century AD). The temple (and all other buildings, for that matter) has been made exclusively from stone; traces of timber are absent. This testifies to what H. nicely terms a certain 'lithomania' on the site; the many unscrubbed stone stelai erected in and around the precinct underline this mania, which befits the goddess of the 'rocky' mountains. Three huge statues, ca 4.5 m high, have been found in the precinct: one of Kybele, quite close to the temple, one of Apollo (with the inscription Gergakome) and the third of Dionysos (with Gerga).

Remarkable is the large number of 'fountain-houses' ('Quellenhäuser'); one of them is adorned with lions' heads possibly to be connected with the main deity of the precinct; in addition to fountains there are near the temple two water basins. H. suggests that some fountains, located near the entrance of the precinct (no IV, XI (c) and XII), may have been used for ritual cleansing; the water basins fulfilled the same function for those entering the temple. But some fountains are neither at the entrance of the temple nor are they likely to have fed the basins; perhaps some fountains served secular purposes like agriculture.

As said before, H. interprets one building as a farm-house, whereas in another one an oilpress had been installed; moreover, a threshing floor, found just outside the temenos-wall, points to cereiculture, for which some irrigation may have been useful. H. (130/131) suggests that grain-growing was practiced on 'flacheren Hanglager' just outside the precinct.

As to the inscriptions H. favors the suggestion made by predecessors to connect Gerga with Kar, the archetypical deity of the Carians. He combines this with Masson's idea that in various near-eastern languages Carians are denoted with variations on the root *kark*. Gerga is a variant of the indigenous deity Kar(k) and may have served as an epithet of Kybele, just as Zeus occasionally carried the epithet Karios. One inscription is atypical: 'Gerga embolo', interpreted by H. as 'Gerga embolo(s)'; *embolos* denotes a 'keilförmige(r) Felsvorsprung' or the 'Spitze des Tal-Keils'. Such an interpretation fits the location of Gergakomē.

The status of Gergakomē is mysterious. It is, of course, a village, possibly in my view a sort of sacred village centered around the sanctuary of Kybele Gergas; but whether it is an independent entity or part of the territory of a neighboring city remains obscure. The place does not occur in Chr. Schuler's monograph on *Siedlungen und Gemeinden in Kleinasien* (Munich 1998). In one very fragmentary inscription, now lost (F 23), the word [*stepha*]nephoro[n] can be discerned: a magistrate typical of a city, not of villages. To which city does it refer? And, if we knew, would it imply that G. belonged to that city? In the next line of the same fragment the Greek letters [*genil*] occur, followed by what earlier scholars read as an upsilon plus lambda, with a horizontal stroke above it. Here speculation sets in: first *sug*[*genila*] is restored which is possible but far from certain. *Sungeniai*, in origin clan-like entities, are known to have administered rural sanctuaries in Caria; UL has been interpreted as abbreviation of (H)yllarima, a city ca 15/20 km east of G.; H. prefers a correction AL, implying a reference to Alabanda, a somewhat bigger city about the same distance from G. westward. This is intriguing but speculative to the extreme. H. goes even one speculative step further. He believes that the construction of the site of Gergakomē was the work of a *syngeneia* of sophists who wanted to promote a specifically Carian variant of the revival of the worship of ancient Greek gods and myths, so typical of the 'renaissance' of the Second Sophistic: a sort of German 'Verein für Heimatkunde' avant-la-lettre! A Carian variant is attractive, given the ubiquity of 'Gerga'-inscriptions but a group of archaizing sophists, at home in one of the neighboring cities and wanting to boost the local iden-

tity of the population, is definitely a step too far. But H. surely has a point in locating the archaizing cult of Gergakomē in the context of an increasing focus on the worship of age-old deities in the Roman Imperial period in general and in the Second Sophistic in particular with its increasing interests in the historical roots of contemporary Hellenism. Recently J. Nollé in his *Kleinasiatische Losorakel* (Munich 2007) 288, pointed out that 'Die Zweite Sophistik - - - stärkte die Popularität der alten Götterbilder und Mythen und wurde - - - zu einem Jungbrunnen für die überkommene Religiosität'. H.'s study corroborates this view.

In a final chapter H. reports on the examination of archaeological remains, partly already visited by earlier travellers, in the environs of Gergakomē: a number of ancient farmsteads, remains of a spectacular aqueduct provisioning Alabanda with water in the Roman Imperial period and a couple of fortification-towers built in the late classical-Hellenistic period to protect road-traffic. An intensive survey needs still to be executed, as H. himself candidly concedes.

As said before, H. firmly dates buildings and inscriptions of Gergakomē to the Roman Imperial period; nowhere, if I do not err, does he refer to earlier vestiges. I suppose that it is only some form of excavation which can clarify the 'pre-history' of Gergakomē, if there is any. Whereas on 157-175 he collects interesting evidence on the *revitalization* (italics are mine, HWP) of age-old cults in Asia Minor in the Imperial period, Gergakomē remains the exception where apparently, so to speak, *ex nihilo* a sanctuary was created. This sounds too exceptional to be really acceptable. More work needs to be done on the site.

H.W. Pleket

NORA M. DIMITROVA, *Theoroi and Initiates in Samothrace. The epigraphical evidence*. Princeton, N.J., American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 2008. 280 pp., 133 figs; 28 cm (Hesperia Supplement 37). – ISBN 978-0-87661-537-9

Samothrace was a popular place for pilgrims in antiquity. The mystery-cult in the precinct of the Great Gods was the attraction par excellence. On the one hand cities were in the habit of sending sacred ambassadors (*theoroi*) to the island, on the other initiates (*mystai* (first grade) and *epoptai* (second grade)) both individually and in groups flocked to the island. Excavations have yielded dozens of inscriptions recording members of both groups. Some have been published in *IG XII 8* (Berlin 1909); others, found during the American excavations in the precinct, can be found in P.M. Fraser's *The inscriptions on stone* (New York 1960; vol. 2.1 of *Samothrace. Excavations conducted by the Institute of Fine Arts of New York University*). Together with 32 new texts (twenty-two Greek; six Latin; four bilingual) D. now presents the entire dossier of 171 inscriptions. Twenty-seven texts concern the so-called *theoroi* sent by a variety of cities to Samothrace; 138 are lists of initiates and four are miscellaneous: two are brief prohibition texts ('the uninitiated is not allowed to enter the sanctuary') and the other two are a decree of Samothrace for a Ptolemaic official

who had himself initiated in the mysteries during a stay on the island and a fragmentary decree of Odessos concerning the Odessitans' participation in the same mysteries.

In addition D. draws some conclusions concerning 'the religious functions of the sanctuary and the people who came to experience the religion of Samothrace' (1). Two maps on 2/3 visualize the provenance of *theoroi* and initiates alike: most of them came from Asia Minor and the Aegean islands, some from cities in Moesia and northwestern Greece and very few from the southern part of the Greek continent. Brief sections deal with the function of the *theoroi*, the social status of the initiates, the stages of initiation ('*myesis* = initiation of the blinded ones', and '*epopteia* = initiation of the viewers') and the annual festival to which the *theoroi* were sent.

D. has an interesting section on the function of *theoroi*. In the Samothracian texts they clearly are sacred envoys sent by their home-cities to attend religious celebrations and to bring sacrifices. In other inscriptions *theoroi* are attested as eponymous officials ('overseers') or as special envoys sent by their cities to announce festivals organized by those same cities and to invite the host-cities to send their representatives.

A small detail: on 16 D. discusses Ephesian inscriptions recording *theoroi* at the Olympic Games. Although D. appropriately quotes L. Robert, *OMS* V 669-674, the reader is left with the impression that we have Ephesian envoys sent to the Olympic Games (in Elis) as representatives of their city. Most of these envoys, however, as D. correctly observes, are women. Robert has shown that they were allowed to be present and to 'watch' the Olympic Games in Ephesus itself. The Ephesian Olympia were a copy of the original Peloponnesian Games; the Ephesian *theoroi* were the equivalent of the priestess of Demeter who in Olympia was officially allowed to 'watch the Olympic Games'. This sort of '*theoria*' has nothing to do with the two above-mentioned categories of *theoroi*.

In which festival the *theoroi* were supposed to participate in Samothrace? Since some *theoroi* are also called *mystai/epoptai*, one would like to believe that they attended a festival called 'ta Mysteria'. Curiously enough, the lists of *theoroi* or initiates tell us nothing about this problem. One funerary epigram (no 29 apud D.) mentions the initiation in the mysteries of Kabiros or rather of the two Kabiros, who are identical with the 'Great Gods' of Samothrace, often mentioned in inscriptions and literary sources; and there is one Koan inscription (no 2 in D.'s Appendix I; *SEG* LIII 848) which tells us that a Koan *theoros* had been sent to Samothrace to be present at the [- -]ia: an exasperating irony of history that it is precisely at a crucial place on the stone that a few letters are missing. D. convincingly defends the view that [ta Dionus]ia is to be restored and points out that relations between Dionysos and mysteries (Eleusinian and Samothracian) are close. The theatre in which the performances of the Dionysia took place was located in the precinct of the Great Gods. During their mission at the Dionysia some *theoroi* used the opportunity to have themselves initiated in the mysteries; initiation was possible throughout the sailing season and not exclusively during the day(s) of the Dionysia.

Some *theoroi* were honored by the Samothracians with

the *proxenia*. Their lists were inscribed on the wall of a building in the city rather than in the sanctuary. D. concludes (72) that their visits 'had a primarily political purpose'. I prefer to stick to the meaning of 'sacred envoy'. There are inscriptions from other cities in which '*presbeutai kai theoroi*' are mentioned (15/16), which means that in those cities a political mission (*presbeutai*) had been added to the sacred one (*theoroi*). The *theoroi* fulfilled a sacred mission and could be rewarded with a political function (*proxenia*).

D.'s corpus is on the whole excellent: very precise, based on autopsy of the stones and squeezes if possible, and illustrated with very good photos. In her commentaries she gives detailed and relevant information, especially about the many names in the lists and possible connections between *theoroi*/initiates and other, homonymous persons on record in the epigraphy of the city from which the *theoroi*/initiates came. Her views about the two stages of initiation and about the chronology of the mysteries (cf. above: 'throughout the sailing season') are on the whole convincing. Initiation was big business on the island and therefore it was not limited to just one period during the official festival of the Dionysia.

The dispatch of *theoroi* (or *hieropoioi* in the case of Rhodes and Kyzikos) stopped in the Late Hellenistic period; the registration of groups of *theoroi* was replaced by the inscription of lists of initiates, individuals or members of a household or the crew of a ship. Quite a few slaves and freedmen are among the initiates. Incidentally, some lists provide interesting evidence for the size of the retinue of rich slave-owners. Why did the lists of *theoroi* stop? There is no reason to suppose that it is merely the 'epigraphic habit' which changed. D. does not provide an answer to the question. A possible answer could be that from the Late Roman republican period the Samothracian festival (the Dionysia) to which *theoroi* used to be sent, lost the battle with the steadily increasing number of internationally renowned festivals-cum-contests (musical; athletic), to which cities preferred to send their sacred envoys in order to participate in the religious ceremonies (*synthusia vel sim.*). Samothrace played no role in the extensive calendar of athletic and musical contests in the Roman period; incidentally, the same is true for Samothracian athletes and artists. The mysteries themselves remained popular and private people continued to flock to the island, as the lists of initiates show; for initiation the celebration of and participation in the Dionysia were not indispensable.

The following texts elicit some comment. In the list of *theoroi* in no 8 I notice an entry Apollō Archepolidos. With that accentuation Apollo is a female name; *theoroi*, however, are invariably men in the Samothracian lists. Apollō as a male name does occur but only in the Late Imperial period as equivalent of Apollōs (cf. H. Youtie, *AJPh* 1941, 502-504; *BE* 1987 no 721). I take it that Apollō is either a misprint or an abbreviation of Apollō(nios); an alternative is Apollō[n] or Apollō[s] (for the latter see now M. Arslan, *Gephyra* 2, 2005, 173/174). No 35 is a fragmentary list of initiates. In the left column one reads in the first line: 'from Azorion [a Macedonian city], *strategos* of the Tripolitai and *hoplophoros* Parmeniskos, the attendant (*akolouthos*) Menandros'. D. does not comment on *hoplophoros*. I suggest that the name of the *strategos*

stood in the missing line above L. 1: 'so-and-so --- strategos---, and his "arms-bearer" Parmeniskos and his attendant Menandros'. Our Thessalian grandseigneur had at his disposal both a private 'body-guard' and a personal attendant taking care of things other than safety. *Akolouthoi* are frequently on record in the lists of initiates. In **no 39** we find an initiate Asklepiodotos from Perinthos (L. 6), together with 'Myron, son of Proklos, trophimos of Asklepiodotos'. In her commentary D. writes about A.'s 'household-slave'; however, *trophimos* denotes a foster-son, not a slave (cf. *SEG XXXIX 1240*). For **no 54** see now *SEG LIV 813*. In **no 56** a more serious problem deserves our attention. This text records an initiate (both *mystēs* and *epoptēs*) from Kyzikos. The man was an architect and had been sent to Samothrace on the island's request ('according to the embassy of the *dēmos* of the Samothracians'; so F. on 246) 'on account of the [---] | poia and the hierai eikones'. From **nos 50** and **58** it appears that Rhodes and Kyzikos were in the habit of sending *hieropoioi* to Samothrace instead of *theoroi*. Although D. in her commentary on **no 56** rejects P.M. Fraser's *heneka tēs h[ī]ero | poias*, she writes in her commentary on **no 50** that the office of *hieropoioi* is recorded in **no 56**; in her commentary on **no 56** she refers for the office of *hieropoios* to **no 50**. In my view in **no 56** there is no question at all of a Kyzikene *hieropoios / theoros*. We have a case of a technical expert sent to Samothrace for construction and/or repair activities in the temple in general and concerning the 'sacred images' (sc. of the Kabiroi) in particular (cf. *IG I³ 81 LL. 5-14*: carrying of images in the secret part of the Eleusinian mysteries: see K. Clinton, 'Epiphany in the Eleusinian mysteries', *Yale Classical Studies* 29, 2004, 85-109). *IG's* restoration *tēs n[eo] | poias* looks attractive from my point of view; after *tēs* there is a vertical hasta on the stone. On 246 D. calls our architect 'head of a delegation from Kyzikos'. In LL. 15-24 there are remnants of names. Those people may have been members of his building-team. Our architect's job probably necessitated a long stay on the island, so that he could participate in two separate initiation ceremonies: one for the *mystēs*, the other and later one for the *epoptēs*. The architect was neither a *theoros* nor a *hieropoios*. **No 107** (Latin) contains a list of Roman initiates, all of them slaves of a prosperous household. Their master(s) were mentioned in the missing lines. One of the slaves is a *linteis* ('in charge of the linen materials'; so D. on 195). The best parallel is the Greek *lintearios*, known from inscriptions pertaining to gymnasia, baths and visiting epehebes (cf. *BE 1976 no 749*): slaves responsible for linen goods (towels etc.) in those institutions; the Samothracian slave was responsible for the 'linen-cupboard' of a Roman household.

H.W. Pleket

STEFAN SCHMIDT, *Rhetorische Bilder auf attischen Vasen, Visuelle Kommunikation im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 2005. 329 pp., 137 figs; 25 cm. – ISBN 3-496-02776-2.

Schmidt's study attempts to apply rhetoric concepts to examples of Attic vase-painting. S. starts his foray into visual communication of Attic images with a method-

ological account. With feeling and depth he sketches the intellectual climate in later 5th-century Athens, illustrating it with the Socratic discussions in the shop of shoemaker Simon. There, people from several layers of Athenian society met to discuss all matters of importance. This open and discussion-rich atmosphere led to a systematic exploration of *rhetoric* - always of importance in Greek culture and politics, only now the prime subject of learning for the Athenian citizen.

In antiquity, the visual never attracted the systematic attention devoted to the spoken word. The rare instances in literature need thorough interpretation before revealing the development towards a conscious manipulation of visual means of communication. It shows a shift from formal appreciation (Homer, Hesiod) towards a judgment based on (moral) content (Gorgias, Plato, Aristotle).

S. gives good arguments to limit his survey to a small number of Attic shapes (lekythos, pyxis, chous, louthorhos and hydria). The sculptures of the Parthenon, to name but one obvious candidate for rhetorical analysis of Greek art, are hardly representative in their complexity. The field of Attic vase-painting provides a cornucopia of images, and makes it possible to follow the development of shapes and themes over hundreds of years. In contrast to Webster and Hoffman, S. finds it impossible to make generalized statements about the functions of vessels. For each shape, the evidence from actual use has to be evaluated, and the function of most vessels does not appear to be constant over time.

The central point of the study is the problematization of the relation of decoration and function from the rhetorical point of view. S. mentions the studies of Scheibler (*JdI* 102, 1987, 57-118; *AntK* 43, 2000, 17-43), Shapiro (in J. Oakley/W. Coulson/O. Pelagia (eds), *Athenian Potters and Painters*, Oxford, 1997, 63-70) and Bentz (*Panathenäische Preisamphoren*, Basel, 1998), but he does not analyze their methodology. And that is a shame, because his own approach is superior to the earlier attempts. A thorough analysis would surely bring to light some of the risks involved in this approach. The same applies to the general methodological background. S. mentions and defends Barthes' *rhétorique de l'image* (11-12), 'allerdings ohne dass wir dessen semiotischer Vokabular im einzelnen übernehmen' but fails to mention what valuable insights he derives from Barthes and what part of his vocabulary he adopts. Besides, semiotics is not just a vocabulary one can partly adapt, but a distinctive way of looking at the objects. Other theories of communication remain virtually untouched. S.'s framework is thus limited to a canonically Classical interpretation of rhetoric.

Apart from these drawbacks, his basic approach seems sound. The question to be answered is whether one can trace the mechanics of and the changes in rhetoric in the actual images.

For the shapes, I will focus on lekythoi. Above all, S. stresses the change in function from a general oil-container to a ritual grave-vessel and even a monument. In black-figure it was a oil-container for daily use, as the finds from the Agora show, and their iconography was general (31, 37-40). This analysis, however, does not take into account that the iconography of black-figure lekythoi start to show a specific

iconography quite early on. The important and numerous Phanyllis Class (dating around 530-510 BC) is subdivided in 'arming' and 'hoplite leaving home' groups, after their predominant imagery. Hardly suitable subjects for an everyday oil-container, but quite apt if understood in a funerary context, not just as 'Lebensbild', but also as farewell-image. The dominant presence of Dionysos and Dionysiac themes (more frequent on lekythoi than on cups) demands an explanation (my suggestion points to a funerary sense, see Van de Put 2009 in E.M. Moormann/V.V. Stissi (eds), *Shapes and Images*, Louvain 2009, 37-43). A more precise categorization of motifs and statistical analysis would have helped S.'s argument. Now it seems that S. denies the possibility of a funerary iconography for black-figure lekythoi. His analysis of white-ground lekythoi, on the other hand, makes exemplary use of contextual information in a convincing sketch of the change in meaning and use in the course of the 5th century BC. Here, he makes a clear point for his central thesis: the change from rather unspecified images to pictures aimed at conveying lasting remembrance, social continuity and faithful adherence to cultic duties of those left behind. Stressing the programmatic coherence of sets of lekythoi belonging to one grave, S. seems to underestimate the ambiguity of certain images. He interprets Athens 19353, where a chlamys-clad, spear-carrying youth confronts a sitting woman, as a courting scene (68), because he reconstructs a deceased newly-wed in the iconographic program. The parting of a warrior however is a much more common interpretation in scenes like these (see J. Oakley, *Picturing Death in Classical Athens*, 2004, 61-62). It seems obvious that ambiguity enlarged the applicability of the imagery, so that the painters served a larger market. It is an interesting possibility that the customers made use of this ambiguity to assemble an appropriate set.

The other shapes (pyxides, louthrophoroi, choes and hydriae) show above all the need for contextual analysis for each shape. All the examples show different developments, even though they have a 'bewussten Reflexion der kommunikativen Mittel' and a tendency towards symbolic use in common, noticeable in a heightened attention to the images, concentration on a smaller range of themes and experimentation with new visual strategies (279-282).

S. has written a very valuable, thought-provoking and enlightening study, which would have gained from a greater attention to the theoretical framework and a more precise quantitative analysis of the iconographic data.

Winfred van de Put

FEDERICA WIEL-MARIN, *La ceramica attica a figure rosse di Adria, La famiglia Bocchi e l'archeologia*. Padova: Coop. Libreria Editrice Università di Padova (CLEUP), 2005. 648 pp., figs, drawings; 25 cm. – ISBN 88-7178-575-4.

Wiel-Marin took on the gargantuan task of presenting and commenting on all the red-figure fragments from the early collecting efforts of the Bocchi family of Adria. She has done so admirably, but she did more than present-

ing the fragments. The first 80 pages are devoted to the history of the extraordinary Bocchi family, starting in the late 17th century and continuing into the last. This family not only made pioneering efforts in archaeology, but also formed an early collection with unique focus for the time: instead of hunting for ceramic treasures or at least limiting their collection to complete vases of some quality, the collection comprised fragments from the living quarters of the ancient town of Adria. Unfortunately, no records remain of the exact find spots of the objects. Another important contribution of the Bocchi family was the foundation of the local historical museum, 'il patrio-Domestico Museo', as early as 1770 (24). It remained very much a family matter, and in 1787 a guest-book is initiated for the Museo Bocchi, a good guide through the history of the museum (26). In 1902, the Bocchi collection was sold to the municipality, allowing the institution of the Museo Civico. W.-M. also devotes attention to the excavations conducted by family members and the administration of both digs and collection.

This story of the Bocchi family is timely, as the interest in the history of collections is on the rise, witness the Lasimos project (most recently, <http://www.cvaonline.org/cva/authors/lasimos.pdf>). W.-M. makes no effort to place the family in a wider context of antiquarian interest and history of collecting, and the immense effort of the publishing of the collection is a good excuse for that. The present work is an excellent starting point for further exploration.

The catalogue, fully illustrated, contains almost 2500 numbers. Among these are numerous undistinguished fragments (e.g. nos 1948-2457 are kylix fragments with only tondo meanders for preserved decoration). The inclusion of these (in contrast to the earlier CVA fascicule) is laudible, as they give a more complete picture of the collecting activities of the Bocchis, and there is enough of interest in the remainder of the material.

Another interesting aspect is the range of shapes and painters and their frequency. W.-M. analyzes these thoroughly (58-68, 72-73, 88-89). Almost three-quarters of the shapes preserved belong to drinking vessels, and this dominance is maintained from the last quarter of the 6th century BC to the first half of the 4th - a late classical continuation, albeit on a lower quantitative and qualitative level, which in the past was denied. The larger shapes are supposed to have been bronze, of Etruscan shape (72). W.-M. makes the comparison with nearby Spina, first with painters represented (62-68), in appendix 6 in general (88-89). Comparison is difficult as the material from Adria hails from the living quarters, while in Spina the necropolis is the source. This difference has influence on the state of preservation, the types of vases (lekythoi are naturally more numerous in Spina), and the iconography. In Spina, oinochoai, containers, kraters and plates make up a large part of the repertoire, but drinking vessels are also present. Notable is the absence in Spina of important earlier cup painters like Douris, Makron and the Brygos and Tripolemos Painters, who are abundantly present in Adria. The case would have been clearer if the analysis of painters had been combined with this more general discussion.

The primary order of the catalogue is shape (variety).

My main criticism of the catalogue is that W.-M. chose iconography as the secondary criterion. It may have been the choice of Francesco Antonio Bocchi (93); the scholar interested in red-figure vases is really best served in catalogues by a chronological/stylistic presentation. The focus of the study is not iconography, and the fragmentary state of the collection does not even allow for a thorough iconographic analysis. What results is a somewhat jumbled catalogue, which is a shame as the work done on it, as well as the accompanying drawings, are exemplary in their thoroughness.

The illustrations are not limited to modern photographs but also comprise the earlier drawings. No 691, for instance, an unassuming skyphos with athletic youths by the Painter of Todi 474 (204), gives the fragment in four varieties, illustrating adjustments according to the taste of the time. The photographs are small, sometimes rendering the style of painting illegible – the more complete fragments are better illustrated in the *Adria CVA* fascicule. Descriptions are concise and clear, dating precise, attributions reliable; where possible, W.-M. has added comparanda, where she also cites the numbers from the Beazley Archive database, greatly enhancing accessibility. The new attributions seem sound; the drawings (523-562) are excellent.

In sum, the author may be congratulated with this successful and interesting study.

Winfred van de Put

CELIA E. SCHULTZ, PAUL B. HARVEY JR. (eds), *Religion in Republican Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006, reprinted with corrections in 2008. pp. xiv, 299; 15 b/w ill.; 23 cm (Yale Classical Studies 33). – ISBN 978-0-521-86366-7.

The role of religion in the processes set in motion by the Roman expansion in Italy is currently gaining much academic interest. The apparent success of this collection of papers on the Roman impact on religious observance in Italy (rather than on religion in Italy in general as the title might perhaps seem to suggest), first published in 2006 and reprinted with corrections in 2008, may attest to this recent development. It has been the editors' explicit aim to explore new insights into religious aspects of the 'Romanisation' of the Italian peninsula by bringing together specialists working in different scholarly fields. As a result, the collection displays a rich variety in methodological approaches as well as in geographical scope (although Latium and Etruria predominate). This has the important strength that it gives due attention to particular local developments and manifestations of Roman-Italic religious practice, without forcing the arguments of the separate papers into one general interpretative framework. It also means that the reader must not expect overarching interpretations or theories of religious change in Italy, but rather different possible approaches to the subject, as well as some fine debunking of traditional conceptions of religious change in the Republican period.

An example of the latter is the important paper 'Reconsidering "religious Romanization"', in which Fay Glinister questions the direct relationship between

anatomical terracottas and Roman influence that usually has been assumed. She argues that the correlation between the appearance of terracottas of this type and Roman colonisation is both geographically and temporally problematic, since anatomicals have been found outside colonial territories as well and sometimes predate the Roman conquest (cf. for the argument also the almost simultaneously published article by M.D. Gentili, *Riflessioni sul fenomeno storico dei depositi votivi di tipo etrusco-laziale-campano*, in A.M. Comella/S. Mele (eds), *Depositum votivi e culti dell'Italia antica dall'età arcaica a quella tardo-repubblicana*, Bari 2005, 367-378). Although a correlation with Roman colonisation cannot be entirely effaced (the issue in any case awaits an in-depth study taking into account all available archaeological evidence), Glinister's main - and convincing - point is that the spread of anatomicals does not represent (p. 25) 'a conscious Roman policy, nor the spread of a distinctively Roman religious form', but was rather part of a more general Hellenistic trend that was adopted by Romans and Italians alike.

Turning to Etruria, in the paper 'In search of the Etruscan priestess: a re-examination of the *hatrencu*', Lesley E. Lundeen takes a critical approach to the traditional interpretation of the *hatrencu*, a term which appears in twelve brief funerary inscriptions from Vulci, as indicating a specific priestly college of women. Lundeen argues that this interpretation is biased by amongst other things (false) assumptions on the role of women in Roman religion and hypotheses, inspired by recent developments in research on women in Roman religion, that the term *hatrencu* was perhaps rather related to a civic title or a public magistracy.

In 'Etruscan religion at the watershed: before and after the fourth century BCE' Jean MacIntosh Turfa offers a panorama of the Etruscan religious landscape and its crucial changes in the mid-Republican period. Discussing systematically the different sources at our disposal, she notes the remarkable gap between the aspect of early Etruscan religion and the image of Etruscan religious practice formed by later Roman writers. Turfa concludes that both the actual Etruscan religious landscape as it appeared to post-fourth century observers and specific Roman concerns have led to a biased picture of Etruscan religion which favours public over personal aspects.

A local case study is offered in 'Religious locales in the territory of Minturnae: aspects of Romanization' by Valentina Livi. Livi discusses the evidence for both colonial and indigenous cult places in and near the Roman colony and assesses the impact of colonisation on the indigenous Aurunci in this light. In Livi's view, the installation of the colony thoroughly uprooted the local culture and religious practices. The old indigenous cult places continued to be frequented, but new types of religious material culture appeared which according to Livi could point to the adoption of new religious forms by the local population.

A careful and impressive epigraphical approach is presented by Paul B. Harvey Jr., who investigates 'Religion and memory at Pisaurum' by analysing the religious dedications in archaic Latin found there (which he convincingly dates shortly after the installation of the colony in 184 BC, and not before that time

as some earlier commentators have done). He not only points out the specific Latin overtones in the choices for the venerated deities, which he relates to the origin of the first colonists, but also recognises the re-assertion of this origin in a late 2nd-century AD inscription which mentions *cultores Iovis Latii*. Harvey connects this process to the strong antiquarian interest and related religious romanticism in the Antonine period.

In 'Inventing the *sortilegus*: lot divination and cultural identity in Italy, Rome, and the provinces', W.E. Klingshirn discusses the changing role of the practice of lot divination. He discerns a development from shrine-based ritual in archaic times to independent lot diviners in the 1st century BC, which he links to a general shift to diviner-based ritual. These diviners, competing with other religious practitioners, would then literally have invented the term *sortilegi* for themselves in order to enhance their legitimacy and status.

The next paper by Ingrid Edlund-Berry, 'Hot, cold, or smelly: the power of sacred water in Roman religion, 400-100 BCE' offers an overview of the importance of water and its associated qualities in Roman and Italic religion, in particular on the basis of literary sources and some famous cult sites. Especially the Italic goddess Mefitis was associated with (sometimes sulphuric and thus smelly) water (Mefitis' character has been much discussed in recent research, cf. various contributions in D. Caiazza (ed.), *Italica ars. Studi in onore di Giovanni Colonna per il premio I Sanniti*, Piedimonte Matese 2005; F. Calisti, *Mefitis: dalle madri alla madre: un tema religioso italico e la sua interpretazione romana e cristiana*, Rome 2006).

John Muccigrosso argues in 'Religion and politics: did the Romans scruple about the placement of their temples?' that the placement of temples should be primarily understood in terms of their political importance (and not in more religious terms). Elaborating on Ziolkowski's work, he also emphasises the importance of individual initiatives in the process, and discusses the case of Q. Fabius Rullianus in particular.

In 'Juno Sospita and Roman insecurity in the Social War', Celia E. Schultz links the senate's decision to refurbish the temple of Juno Sospita in 90 BC to the contemporaneous and grave conflict with Rome's Italic allies, the Social War. Although originally a pan-Latin goddess, Juno Sospita was in Roman eyes strongly associated with Lanuvium, her prime place of worship. The Lanuvian cult place came to resort under Roman control in 338 BC after the Latin war, and the association of the latter conflict with the Social War would have prompted the senate's decision to refurbish her Roman temple. Importantly, Schultz also corrects previous assumptions on the 'female character' of the cult, and instead points out its primarily civic and political associations.

Even if not intended as a general conclusion, the last chapter 'Beyond Rome and Latium: Roman religion in the age of Augustus' by A.E. Cooley provides an excellent finale for the book as a whole by focusing on the ways Roman religious models were created and exported in the early imperial period, particularly so because the links and differences with Republican practice are carefully traced. She starts with an analysis of the celebrations of the *ludi saeculares* in 17 BC, during

which the incorporation of the Latins was highlighted. Cooley shows that the Latins were evoked here because they, subjugated and incorporated successfully already in the 4th century BC, provided an appropriate role model for the empire as a whole. The late Republican and early imperial periods also witnessed an increasing synchronisation of different local religious calendars, which helped create a new and universal imperial culture. For this new religious culture, also the proliferation of deities with the qualification 'august-(an)' and their consequent spread beyond Rome was of fundamental importance.

In conclusion, this collection of papers offers tantalising new views as well as detailed local or thematic case studies, in which different perspectives and methodologies are employed. This rich, thought-provoking and well-edited work (I found few typos in the reprinted edition) surely is recommended reading for those interested in Roman religion and cultural change in the Republican period, and is likely to stimulate further debate on the religious aspects and effects of early Roman expansion.

Tesse D. Stek

KEVIN ANDREWS, *Castles of the Morea*. Revised edition with a Foreword by Glenn R. Bugh, Princeton NJ: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 2006. XXVII + 274 pp., 231 figures in text, 40 plates; 31 cm (Gennadeion Monographs 4). – ISBN 978-0-87661-406-8.

This publication is a slightly revised reprint of a study that was edited for the first time in 1953 and was reprinted integrally by A. Hakkert, Amsterdam in 1976. The title is somewhat misleading, because not all castles and fortifications in the Peloponnese are discussed. The study is only discussing a number of 17 fortresses, that were in Venetian hands during the Second Venetian-Turkish War of 1685-1715. As a maritime Republic Venice was only interested in harbours and coastal regions; therefore all castles, apart from Mistra, are situated on the sea-shore or nearby.

A portfolio of Venetian drawings and maps of these fortifications was bought by the Gennadius Library in Athens in 1938. The maps were drawn about 1700 by order of Francesco Grimani, the military commander and later governor of the Morea (Peloponnese). Most important fortifications were at Koroni and Methoni, Navarino, Monemvasia, Argos, Nauplion as well as the immense complex of Acrocorinth.

In the late 1940s as a young scholar Andrews undertook the task to prepare a publication of this so-called Grimani portfolio. At that time - the years of the Civil War in Greece and its aftermath - this project was a very dangerous activity. In the first edition all maps and drawings were reproduced in black and white, in this new edition in colour.

The description of every castle follows a fixed pattern: first a site entry, followed by an historical survey and then a detailed description of the architectural remains, richly illustrated with a number of black and white photographs.

The historical sketches of the 17 fortresses are concise and contain a lot of interesting details collected from many different sources (Byzantine - Crusader period - Venetian and Ottoman). The description of the architecture is elaborate and for many details the photographs are very elucidating. The author tries to discern between the different phases of building and rebuilding of the castles, which sometimes were built up in the early Byzantine period, reconstructed by Crusaders or Venetians after 1204, rebuilt again by the Ottomans and reinforced by the Venetians for a second time around 1700.

For all students of Medieval and later military architecture this book provides a lot of interesting details. In 1953 the publication was epoch-making in a field that was nearly unexplored. In the decades after 1953 a lot of detail studies has been published in books and articles, but the fact that in 2006 the American School of Classical Studies at Athens decided to produce a slightly revised second edition is a prove that the study of Kevin Andrews still is of great value in this very specialised field of research.

And yet, this publication is a little bit out-dated, because during the last 50 years in history and archaeology new ideas and new approaches were explored. In 1953 the emphasis was mainly laid on historical facts and field research of the architectural remains. This implies that the author did not include in his study the richness of the Venetian and Ottoman archives.

In modern research social and economic history have got a prominent place and the integration of a castle into broader regional considerations will take a more prominent place. Therefore I think that based on the profound study of Andrews much interesting research on this small part of the history and archaeology of Greece has still to be done.

J.P.A. van der Vin