Reviews


Michael Donderer’s (henceforth M.D.) first monograph on ancient mosaicists and their ‘signatures’, Die Mosaizisten der Antike und ihre Wirtschaftliche und soziale Stellung: eine Quellenstudie, was published in 1989. Since then, new inscribed mosaics have been found within the workshop traditions of the Mediterranean and elsewhere. The present work is the result of a further period of research and has been restored or made available for closer inspection; in a few cases, recent studies have seriously questioned the current reading and interpretation. This new book has been conceived essentially as a supplement to the former, dealing with material then unknown and updating the old catalogue. Under these premises, M.D. embarked on a praiseworthy enterprise, aimed at stimulating debate on the widest number of ‘signed’ mosaics. Both books, of course, share the same perspectives and method, as well as the choice of problems according to which the material is presented. A short introduction deals with the main theoretical issues at stake: the professional and social standing of the persons named by the inscriptions (pp. 15-17). Firstly, we have to distinguish between the artisan who actually made the mosaic, those who drew its preliminary sketch or wrote the text, the owner of the workshop (who did not need to be a craftsman himself), and the purchaser/donor. Sometimes, a single person could have played more than one role, i.e. the workshop could have been owned by the very same artisan who conceived the pattern and/or arranged the tesserae. The question is if each role may be defined by precise word choices, and up to which point does our knowledge of ancient workshop practices allow us to search for coherent categories. The first obstacle is the wide chronological, geographical (and consequently lexical) variety of the inscriptions. Then, a major difficulty arises from their contexts: the relationship between place, customer and mosaicist, of course, changes considerably between a private dwelling and a public building. Similarly to what he has done with his former book, M.D. introduces the catalogue with a short discussion of the terms defining the relationship between persons and mosaics (pp. 19-30). Being most new texts in Greek, the summary on Latin terminology is little improved (the listed words are: compone, facere, ex officina, opus, tessellare). On the other hand, the analysis on Greek vocabulary has been sensibly broadened and several new terms or expression added to the list (διὰ τῶν, ὁ κάματος, κάμην, ὁ κεντητής, μουσῆσις, τεχνία, ὁ τεχνίτης, ἡ τεχνία, ἡ ψηφίζω, ὁ ψηφίζως, ἡ ψηφίσθηκα, ψηφίσθηκαν). Others (γράφειν, ἔγραψα, ἔγραψον, ὁ ψηφιθητής) are discussed under the light of new evidence. However briefly sketched, this repertoire clarifies a few key semantic problems and helps assessing the methodological approach. New discoveries that either question the supposed chronology and the geographic distribution of a certain word, or challenge our understanding of workshop practices are carefully taken into account. For instance, a 7th century AD inscription from Bostra, in Jordan (catalogue A.22), shows how the verb γράφειν was not necessarily used by an artisan to sign his piece, but could also identify the author of the text (p. 19).

This opening dictionary is clearly conceived as a general guide to read the texts. Therefore, one could not wonder at its concision and apparent lack of interest for a deeper insight into the meaning of each word. Bearing this in mind, we can well understand why the following paragraphs, too, are exceedingly brief when addressing long-debated issues about the social status of artists/artisans in Graeco-Roman antiquity (pp. 32-33) or about workshops’ organisation (pp. 34-38).

According to the author, during Late Antiquity a perceivable shift in the social recognition of mosaicists took place at least in the Greek-speaking Eastern Mediterranean (mirrored by a parallel evolution of sculptors’ signatures). There, an increased number of inscriptions shows that the mosaicists were sometimes allowed by their clients a remarkable liberty to describe themselves and their work on signed pieces. In a few instances, they even acted as donors in prominent public contexts (e.g. during the late 5th century AD, Dorotheos and Euthychos made and donated a mosaic in a basilica in Kos; see catalogue A.7 at pp. 46-47).

The inner organization of workshops, too, can hardly be described according to a standard, generalized hierarchy. When inscriptions mention more than one name, for instance, it remains difficult to determine whether these persons may belong to the same family, or enjoyed the same rank within their workshop, or performed different tasks (drawing the pattern, writing the text, making the mosaic). In most cases, it is impossible to decide whether a name refers to an artisan or to his master, who held the workshop’s capital, hired the workmanship and assigned the tasks. On the other hand, a rather vague label such as ex officina does not tell us much about the technical competence of the workshop’s owner, who could have had little to do with the everyday life of his atelier and with the actual creation of ‘his’ mosaics.

Understandably, the strength of this book lies in its catalogue. Over 50 new texts are listed within 4 categories: 1) Greek and Latin inscriptions mentioning mosaicists, 2) similar inscriptions in other ancient scripts (Armenian, Palmyrenean-Aramaic, Georgian, Syriac-Aramaic, Iberian), 3) inscriptions perhaps referring to mosaicists, 4) presumably false inscriptions. According to the editorial choices of M.D.’s earlier account of mosaicists’ signatures, each catalogue entry provides the text, its translation, information about place and chronology, a short description and a full bibliography. Chronology ranges throughout an impres-
sive span of time - between the late Hellenistic period and the 8th century AD. Provenance, too, could not be less homogeneous, with inscriptions found in the whole territory that can be roughly defined as 'the Roman Empire'. A last section updates almost every entry of the older catalogue. In several cases, M.D. lingers on a few topics emerged in recent research, mentioning a key discovery or discussing in some length an interpretive problem (see catalogue entries nr. A.9, A.12, A.30-32, A.47-49, A.63, A.69, A.71-72, A.75-78, A.83, A.85-86, A.88, B.1, C.1, C.5, C.7-8, C.11, C.17, C.34-35, C.37, C.41). Sometimes, texts (A.19 and A.59) or translations (A.38) are corrected according to new philological research.

As said before, the book remains concise - not to say elusive - on a quantity of themes, merely referred to without further discussion. However disappointing for the reader, we must not overlook M.D.'s obvious purpose: providing the scientific community with clear, comprehensive and user-friendly standard reference works, rather than with a full account of the mosaicists' role in ancient societies. Therefore, the texts are mostly left to speak for themselves, with the aid of an excellent bibliography. The plates, too, are generally of a high quality and well chosen.

This book, exactly like its predecessor, won't probably be much of a help to those who wish to read a discursive introduction to the broad topic of artists' signatures in the Ancient World and their social standing. The scholarly public and all those who need detailed and illustrated information and a reliable bibliography on inscribed mosaics and their contexts, on the other hand, will surely find both M.D.'s books an invaluable help and a precious reference.

Anna Anguissola


The book under review is an excellent piece of scholarly work: knowledgeable, accurate, well documented and illustrated, it challenges a number of core issues about the state of research on Hellenistic and Roman housing. Notwithstanding the detailed presentation of buildings, architectural elements, floors, and pottery, the real strength of the volume lies in the broader context that it reconstructs, and in the many theoretical issues it raises.

Its topic is the so-called In n-2 insula in Paestum and its houses, all of which show a striking variety in typology, layout, and in the forms of social communication they implied. No reliable records of the excavations led in the southern area of the block (houses A to E) soon after World War 2 exist. Stratigraphic records and recovered pottery are available for the northern part (houses F and G), unearthed between the late 1970s and the early 1980s. Given this profound gap, it is well understandable why the Authors decided to divide the book into two virtually independent sections, each of them following its own methods and answering to a different set of questions. When lacking reliable stratigraphy and finds, of course, a relative chronology can only be conjectured through comparative indicators such as building techniques and layout. The corpus of concrete floors finds a dense network of parallels from Central and Southern Italy, and plays a central role in assessing chronology.

The book aims at providing a whole picture of the area and its role within the urban texture of the Roman town, as well as at reconstructing the micro-history of each house. A key problem is that of identifying the models behind each architectural solution, and explaining why and how indigenous traditions were retained or combined with emerging 'Roman' patterns, affecting their shape and arrangement. To this purpose, the choice of concentrating on a whole block instead of a single house provides a privileged viewpoint: the expansion and amalgamation (or, to the other side, the reduction and sale) of neighbouring houses bespeak directly the social capital and expectations of each family. As a real work-in-progress, at every moment of its life a building expresses the living standard of its inhabitants, the social conditioning of the community and the individual taste of its members. These remarks are even more true when considering the strategic location of the block: alongside the decumanus, nearby the Forum and at a short distance from the religious centre of the town. Sometimes, of course, it remains unclear whether a larger building, organized around several nuclei, disguises once independent houses. The only viable approach to get over such impasse is to adopt a much wider frame, comparing layouts and arrangements with what attested elsewhere in the same geographical area (particularly in Pompeii and Herculaneum).

The attention with which the Authors constantly compare their context with others, keeping an eye on the larger picture, is what turns this book into much more than just another case-study. Typologies and interpretations developed by scholarly literature (with particular regard, of course, to the reference works by J.-A. Dickmann, A. Wallace-Hadrill, and P. Zanker) are challenged under the light of the Paestan evidence, that often suggests a much more complex reality than our consolidated assumptions allow for. These houses, lacking any wall and ceiling decoration, are preserved, so to say, in a 'purely architectural form': a situation that, however undesirable from an archaeologist's perspective, provides a perfect test-bed to try the ideal schema of a 'prototypical Roman house'. Moreover, further interest arises when considering the history of Paestum, where a Latin colony was founded as early as 273 BC. There, Romanization had an early impact on an ancient civic community, that had already witnessed major social and cultural changes.

As mentioned above, the book is divided into two parts, respectively dealing with the southern and northern areas of the In n-2 insula. Their structure and methods vary considerably, owing to the profound divide between the archaeological records. For the first section, where no reliable excavation reports exist, the matter and features of floors play a substantial role. Because of their importance for establishing a chronol-
ology, floors have been catalogued and discussed separately, following the presentation of each house. If, broadly speaking, it is certainly preferable to find all information on each room in a single paragraph, the choice of addressing floors in individual sections is somewhat inescapable here - and much more appropriate.

The first part, dedicated to the houses A to E and to a few non-residential areas (S I-V), is opened by a brief discussion of building techniques and their chronology. A whole paragraph (pp. 24-27, with a plate at p. 25) deals with thresholds. The interest in these artefacts and in frames is a leitmotiv of the publication: thresholds and frames are direct evidence for the type of shutters they supported and, consequently, for the degree of accessibility between different areas. From this point of view, their value for our understanding of the functional and social dimension of a house is everything but marginal. However obvious these remarks may seem, it has to be mentioned that, to date, the analysis of thresholds and fastenings still remains confined to a handful of commendably detailed case-studies (e.g. the Häuser in Pompeji series or the volumes on the insula of the Menander at Pompeii, edited by R. Ling) and, as far as my knowledge goes, to a single comprehensive account of Pompeian domestic architecture (J.-A. Dickmann’s fundamental book).

The shape and history of houses in this Paestan insula is the starting point for a discussion on several long-debated themes. The case of Paestum, compared to an impressive set of parallels drawn from other geographical environments, provides a new reading for topics such as: the emergence and functional structure of Doppellatriumhäuser (pp. 72-90), the meaning of terraced porticoes (pp. 138-145), the types of Dreiraumgruppen (pp. 144-145), the use of cenacula and independent apartments (pp. 145-148), the feature of fences and frames around the peristyle (pp. 193-194), the role of concurring traditions in shaping inner courtyards (pp. 178-188).

As a matter of fact, almost all houses of the block show a striking variety and unconventionality in their inner organization, especially with regards to the layout of the atrium and its relationship with adjoining spaces. The Domus A-B was created as Doppellatriumhaus around the 1st century BC, through the merging of two neighbouring houses. A large set of parallels from Pompeii attests that a precise content of prestige, luxury and social eminence was attached to the possession of a house with two atria. As argued convincingly by Renaud Robert and Anca Lemaire, Dickmann’s theory, according to which the emergence of Doppellatriumhäuser was tightly connected to the need of building or enlarging a peristyle, should be nuanced and relativized outside Pompeii. The same applies to the view of those who insist on the hierarchy between the two front courtyards, one of which is supposed to have served for reception, the other to host household tasks and the everyday life of the familia. When refashioning the houses along the decumans into an impressive palace, a larger space for a rear quarter behind the atrium of B was created at the expenses of a third parcel to the north (the so-called Domus C), while the layout of A remained more or less intact. Therefore, rather than fulfill the demand for a peristyle, the choice of a double atrium seems to have depended on the wish to imitate the taste for ‘multi-polar’ homes of a wealthy Roman elite, with a superabundance of residential areas and the repetition of certain clusters. A wish for social prominence and visibility lies at the core of another peculiar arrangement attested in this insula: the terraced portico at the eastern end of Domus C, most likely built during the 2nd century BC.

Throughout the book, due attention is devoted to the issues of family structure, social interaction and rank. If there is no possibility to identify the proprietors of these houses, sometimes their standing and mutual relation can be conjectured with a certain degree of confidence. The houses A and B, after their merging, were probably inhabited by the same family, who came to own C too. However included into a larger estate, this latter remained virtually independent, likely to have lodged a different familiar group, perhaps related or subject to the former. Again, the north-eastern area of C, with its own entrance from the street and independent water supply, was suited for rent or the use of guests. While the complex formed by the houses A, B, and C provided its inhabitants with a multitude of residential spaces, with a high degree of ‘privacy’, Domus E consisted almost entirely of reception rooms, several of which fully opened towards the courtyards. There, not only two atria flank each other on both sides of the block, but each of them is served by its own kitchen, thus enabling the owner to entertain different guests at the same time (or to give frequent banquets without disturbing the everyday life of his family). Therefore, it is likely that a person with particular public duties lived here, who needed to stage the ceremony of hospitality at a larger scale than his neighbours - in relation, of course, to the size of his house. The issue of cultural identity and concurring traditions is better addressed when looking at Domus D, built between the late 3rd and the early 2nd centuries BC. The retention of a centripetal organizing pattern of Hellenistic origin is in remarkable contrast with the rest of the insula. Well after Paestum had fallen into Rome’s orbit, then, the local elite still had a broad variety of patterns among which they could choose for shaping their lavish residences. Notwithstanding subsequent restorations, the overall layout remained roughly the same throughout the life of the building, thus attesting a conscious and explicit reference to the ‘old days’ and the venerable tradition of the town.

Summarizing the many merits of this book is certainly a difficult task. In Poseidonia – Paestum V, the catalogue of spaces, pavements, and finds is clear and accurate: the readers will meet with no difficulty in finding all required information. The choice of presenting and discussing an area after the other within the same house helps focusing on the general questions that each nucleus puts. Regrettably, the Authors could not include a full survey of water supplies, unavailable for inspection and deeply compromised (see p. 17). A clearer idea of how the piping system worked throughout the block would probably bring a decisive contribution to some of the problems raised by layout and architecture.

Inferences about chronology and architectural pat-
terns are constantly drawn from a wide and fitting choice of parallels. When required, all reasonable assumptions are presented and weighed against each other, confronted with the available evidence from other geographical areas. This volume advances substantially our knowledge of Roman housing, both through the impeccable publication of a relevant context and discussing a broad set of general issues within a comparative perspective. All in all, the book is thoroughly recommended to scholars interested in Hellenistic and Roman housing and urban development - a title that can hardly be missing from the shelves of any department’s library.

Anna Anguissola


In her discussion of Meter Theon, Xagorari-Gleißner’s goal is to outline the profile of this goddess by the Greeks in historical times and to examine her in the context of Greek religion and culture. The author takes into account her connections with Minoan and Mycenaean mother deities, which just like later influences from Anatolia, played a formative role in the iconography and cult of the goddess. The main focus lies on the never investigated context in places of worship, which generally deviates from the typical form of the peripteros temple.

In chapter 1 Xagorari-Gleißner examines the gender and common status of the priests of Meter Theon. The second part of this chapter should examine whether the feasts in honour of the goddess depend on local traditions, but here Xagorari makes an error by giving a history of literature about Kybele and Rhea. It is in chapter 5 only that the priest class, feasts and participants are examined. Furthermore she mentions, Welcker who called Zeus a spring god, but the argumentation is lacking (p. 9). However, Welcker himself gave no explanation for his statement about Zeus. Therefore the author takes a risk in copying an argument without argumentation.

In chapter 2 Xagorari reviews the literary sources, with attention for mythology and historiography. She sketches the mythology about the birth of Zeus and the role of Rhea as his protectress. Rhea places a stone before Kronos, so that he does not get a chance to eat Zeus out of fear of overthrowing him. Here she makes a comparison between Greek mythology and that of the Hittite Kumarbi, Tamisu and Teshub. Then, suddenly, Kubaba appears, although Xagorari states that Kubaba plays no role in Hittite mythology. She is only mentioned because one of her sacred animals is the lion, just like Kybele’s. Furthermore Kubaba was first a city goddess, but later took the role as a sun goddess from Arinna. The author also argues that Kybele is to be assimilated with Demeter, Aphrodite, Artemis, Hekate, Dea Syria, Gaia and Isis, but a plausible argumentation is lacking. Strangely enough Agdistis, who is a hermaphrodite, is an epithet of Kybele and Rhea, which is odd because Agdistis is born out of Zeus and Kubaba. The purpose of this assimilation remains unclear.

In chapter 3 the historical context of the mother goddesses is discussed. This overview ranges from the Venus of Willendorf to Greek goddesses like Gaia and Kybele. The author states that a cult continuity should be assumed, although there is no proof to corroborate this thesis. The better word here would be ‘plausible’, given the descriptions of the cult and its development. Furthermore, the author speaks about pre-Greek goddesses such as Diktynnna, Britomartis, Aphaia and Ariadne. Here Xagorari forgets the myth according to which Britomartis was a maiden pursued by the Minoan King Minos for nine months, until she threw herself into the sea and was saved in the nets of some fishermen. Afterwards she was called Diktynnna - a name whose resemblance to Mount Dikte on which Zeus was born cannot be coincidental. Diktynnna was the goddess of the nets, since diktyon means net. Concerning Ariadne there could be discussion about her pre-Greek status, since she is viewed as a Greek goddess of vegetation, possibly derived from an unnamed Minoan goddess on Crete. According to Homer and Hesiod she was the daughter of Minos and consort of Dionysos (M. Jordan, Encyclopedia of gods. Over 2,500 deities of the world, London 1992, 22). In answer to the question whether multiple gods or one goddess in multiple appearances is being honoured, A. Baring and J. Cashford (The Myth of the Goddess. Evolution of an image, London 1991, 40, 73, 105, 118-120, 497-501, 522-525, 576-578) state that civilisations in Europe and Southwest Asia during the 7th millennium BC needed new mythological aspects, which made it possible that the Great Goddess appeared in as many forms as Goddess of Fertility, Goddess of Grain, Snake Goddess, Fish Goddess, and as Butterfly or Bee Goddess. This did not threaten her ancient maternal power including her functions.

In respect to the question whether the Mother Goddess and fertility goddesses are accompanied and suppressed by male gods, Baring and Cashford (ibidem, 660-661) give a clearer answer, stating that the Great Mother Goddess alone gives birth to the world out of herself, so that all creatures, including the gods, are her children, and part of her divine substance. Therefore, the Mother Goddess unites with the god - once her son, now her consort - to give birth to the world. Here a distinction is made between the eternal womb and its temporary phases, and the focus of the myth is on the relationship between the Mother Goddess and the god, her ‘son-lover’. In the next stage the Mother Goddess is killed by the god, her great-great grandson, who then creates the world out of her dead body, and the human race from the blood of her dismembered son-lover. This was the late Bronze and early Iron Age Babylonian myth of Tiamat, the mother goddess whose corpse was torn apart and spread into earth and heaven by the superior wind- and fire-power of the sky- and sun-god Marduk.

Chapter 4 treats the iconography of the mother goddess, from the sitting position to the panthers and reverence of goddesses in other regions. The first Kybele
naiskoi appear around 600 BC, whereas there were images of the goddess as early as the Mycenaean age.

Chapter 5 focuses on the cult of the mother goddess of the Greeks. First, the author examines the priests. Men and women could take the role of priest; the men were often castrated. The significance of this part escapes me when reading the goal of this chapter: first feasts in other regions and second the followers of the mother goddess. I would say that the followers are the most important persons, so that this part of the research could show where these followers were coming from. Then it is possible to give a geographic frame within which the cult of the mother goddess could exist.

Chapter 6 discusses the places of worship. This sublime overview speaks for itself and is probably the best part of the book. The main places of worship are listed, and the structure of the metra is another important part of this chapter.

In Chapter 7 the results are presented. Xagorari concludes that the cult of the mother was not as popular as those of other Greek mother goddesses. This conclusion is to be contested. My main objection in this respect is that throughout this book the author states that the mother goddess appeared in many different forms like Rhea, etc. (see above). These were not unimportant goddesses in the ancient Greek world. Therefore, Xagorari’s conclusion should be adjusted in a way that there is more interest in other Greek mother goddesses.

Chapter 8 is a summary of the book, while Chapter 9 contains the catalogue of metra.

As a contribution to our conceptions of ancient Greek religion, and even the centrality of the role of mother goddesses by the ancient Greeks, Meter Theon promises more than it delivers. But that does not detract from the immense value of the contribution as a whole, or from the simple pleasure of reading it: Xagorari’s is a seductive book.

Mark Beumer


I have always felt that: to explain a joke, is to kill it. But the appearance of this book on humour is very welcome; its subject is delightful and has so far not been treated in a solid discussion. I have always wondered how that could be, for Greek literature and painting abound in witty fancies.

The book under review is a very serious and extensive study both of the material and of the countless theories that have been proposed from the early Greek period down to modern times. It deals with all kind of aspects, and ventures even on the subtle relationship between humour and democracy. Its main aim is to penetrate one step further into the Greek psyche’ (p. xviii-xix). The material discussed is vast as can be judged by leafing through the indexes. Astonishingly extensive is the general index in which the subjects are enumerated: it occupies no less than 14 pages of two columns. To give an example: the entries for satyrs alone contain 64 different themes! Besides, there are thirteen Tables in which the comical scenes are arranged under various headings. Table 1, p. 8, lists different kinds of laughter (e.g., non-euphoric, euphorigic), Table 2, p. 9, lists the various theories and the anthropological approach of humour and laughter. Tables 3-4, p. 281, list the shapes of the vases with comic scenes. Table 5, p. 282, gives the various types of humour and the number of vases on which they appear. Tables 6a-c, pp. 283-295, contain the painters of the comic vases and the scenes in question, with the number of vases cited. Many times mentioned are, for example, the return of Hephaestus and scenes of Heracles frightening Eurystheus into the pithos. On Tables 7-10, pp. 307-309, we find satyrs in parodies of everyday life and myths: e.g. gluttony, caricature, scatology, satyrs as wine makers, as warriors, in mock-heroism and the like. We must be grateful for the completeness with which Greek (mainly Attic) humouristic vases have been collected and discussed.

Greek humour is mainly explained as referring to to gelion (it is one of the flaws of the book that Greek expressions are quoted in nearly impossible Latin transcriptions, e.g., p. 67). However, humour is so vague a word that it cannot be summed up in a definition: obviously this word or concept lacks a clear-cut meaning: it simply denotes all situations in which we are amused, or pleasantly tickled to smiling, to chuckling, or even to outright laughter. The urge to analyse these psychological reactions and proffer definitions may be philosophically interesting but makes most books on humour much duller than expected; fortunately, this is not the case with the present book: it contains a wealth of information and is rich in interest.

The illustrations, however, which should have been a joy for the eye, are downright shocking, both the photographs and the drawings (vectorised, see p. xviii). The illustrations, however, which should have been a joy for the eye, are downright shocking, both the photographs and the drawings (vectorised, see p. xviii). It is to be regretted that in our time such abominable illustrations are printed in a fine study - after the perfect publications of Greek vases since the great plates of Furtwängler-Reichhold more than a century ago and the impeccable plates of such volumes as published by Arias-Hirmer, and in spite of the technical perfection that can be achieved nowadays.

Apart from this surprising defect, one or two other slight criticisms may here perhaps be proffered. More emphasis might have been laid on the light-hearted playfulness of some painters, their whim to add tiny details to arouse a faint smile on our face, for example when the Euergides Painter depicts a dog that scratches its neck energetically while clearly enjoying its effect (ARV 96, 136, coll. Beazley: there is a distinct smile on its face). Or the way in which the Andokides Painter makes light of the deeds of Heracles when he shows him courting to approach Cerberus with a big chain and with soothing sounds and a smiling face so as to put the monster at ease (Cerberus looks baffled, clearly not knowing what to think: ARV 4.11), or when Heracles hoists the Nemean lion over his head in what is known as the ‘flying mare’, a trick of the wrestling school that is perfectly harmless for the opponent (ARV 4.8). Such obvious details, which are truly innumerable on Greek vases, do not, I believe, belong to the realm of to gelion, but to something more subtle, less easily caught in a single term.
In this connection it is surprising that there is no mention of the Caeretan hydriae with their countless witty details and scenes; only one hydria is shown, Fig. 61, p. 136, but its interpretation is defective: the three figures shown are, from left to right, Apollo, Maia and her legitimate husband Atlas, while baby Hermes in swaddling-clothes is pretending to sleep (but with eyes wide open), stretched out on top of what seems a faithful picture of a modern tea-trolley on wheels.

There are, of course, more points on which the reader may disagree. Sometimes the dating seems questionable (figs 36, 42, 61, 79, 92, 99). It is a mistake to tell the reader that the inscription Nikosthenes epoiesen in fig. 81 is (a comic) part of the scene of two dancing men, in which it is written: the painter has the habit to place these inscriptions ruthlessly in very unlikely spots: see Tosto pls 85-89: the comment under fig. 81 is, therefore, misleading.

It should also be added that, in places, the style of writing is cumbersome. For example it is said that satyrs often ‘despoil the usual iconography and become a translation agent between different categories of representation’ (p. 165-166); this refers to details such as the satyr who holds on to the eyebrow of an ornamental eye of an eye-cup (fig. 80).

But in spite of such objections the book is an important standard work that will surely be much consulted in future.

[Incidentally, the author refers to the Museum Scheur leer in the Hague (p. 120, n. 83), but that museum closed in future.]


This book is a collection of papers which were presented in March 2002 in Tunisia. It does not cover the whole region of North Africa, but rather gives a rich overview of specific areas and presents case studies in Libya, Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco. The articles consider the periods from the (pre) Roman to the medieval time and refer to both archaeological remains and textual sources. They discuss issues related to the collecting and transporting of water and the applications of water for industrial installations and pleasure devices. These papers open the discussion on water organisation in the Maghreb in North Africa and address some general problems of water facilities, the dating of archaeological evidence and the continuous reuse of water facilities through time.

It is interesting that all articles in this volume share a number of common ideas. One would think that most parts of North Africa are desert and extremely harsh to live in, but from reading all articles together it becomes clear that the region had plenty of water. The people who lived in these arid regions learned how to deal with water management problems and used their local knowledge of such things as soil types and groundwater to exploit the environment where they lived and to develop their own techniques to collect water for their survival and use.

By building weirs, low dams, the runoff water from the hills and valleys was collected. A technique for preventing water loss through evaporation and absorption was to build underground tunnels, known locally as foggaras. Foggaras are found all-over North Africa, with the largest concentration in the Libyan Sahara. Different authors discuss how these techniques were introduced and spread into North Africa, either by diffusion from adjacent areas of use or by immigrants. Some articles focus on the role of the local people.

Some authors deal with a large area (i.e. North Morocco), while others refer to one specific location in more detail. In North Morocco sites were surveyed and water management, entrapment and use are described. Such studies shed new light on water management methods because water was not always used for agriculture but in some places water served industrial purposes such as to salt fish.

Three detailed studies relate to the city of Carthage in Tunisia. The first refers to specific studies on water tanks with details and analysis in order to position the layers of the archaeological remains. The second refers to a study on a large number of public and private baths which depended for their water supply on an extensive network of aqueducts, cisterns and other hydraulic devices. The third study describes the Zaghouan nymphaeum by researching the architectural material, decorated pieces and excavated pottery. This gives more information about the characteristics of the construction and give a realistic date of the nymphaeum in Carthage to be the beginning of the 3rd century A.D.

An interesting discussion regarding a site called Rusaas (modern Azeffoun) in Algeria describes a special system where a number of different techniques was used to convey water from a spring to the city. These techniques included an aqueduct, a canal, a siphon and a filter station before the water was delivered to storage tanks and baths.

A number of studies discuss textual sources; these concern the constructing of aqueducts and baths, Arabic documentation of hydraulic work in the Middle Ages and many poems dealing with bathing in Tunisia. Together, these studies illustrate that there was a great awareness about bathing, health and water management in the Maghreb, as can also be seen from the liveness of the archaeological, epigraphic and literary evidence. One of the interesting parts of the textual studies is the discussion that the authors initiate by analysing and (re)interpreting texts, and their attempt to compare this with archaeological evidence.

This book provides not only a scholarly analysis of hydraulic issues, rather it gives a new insight in and easy access to the archaeology and ancient societies of North Africa, with photos and drawings in each case study. It provides a well-documented archaeological work, even for those who are only interested in Arabic language, or even for readers who are not archaeologists or specialists in the topics but interested in legendary stories from local people concerning water. A general introduction is unfortunately lacking, and so is
an illustrated map of North Africa, but the summaries at the end of the book give a clear overview.

Almost all of the papers address the problem of dating the water facilities. Since these water facilities were used for long periods of time and were often maintained, repaired and reused, it is difficult to clearly define the building dates. Such studies considered in one book give us an excellent set of observations on the organization, distribution, and historical development of water management in North Africa. It also offers us a view of sites and the relationship between the local people, its environment and water usage. Overall this book gives the reader a comprehensive insight into the archaeological aspects of North African techniques of water technology, control and distribution.

*Sufyan Al Karameh*


In the past half century, the pre-Roman archaeology of Central Italy has been enriched in a remarkable manner. Following the unprecedented growth of the capital and fighting an uncompromising battle against art crime, the archaeological knowledge of the Roman campagna, here broadly understood as the entire central-western portion of the peninsula, has increased manifold. Evidence of both domestic and religious architecture in an astonishing variety of terracotta roof fragments has come to light in scores of sites ranging from Siena in the North to Latina in the South. Yet the many rescue dig accounts, regular excavation reports, international congress proceedings (‘Archeologia Laziale’, ‘Delieae Fic-tiles’), and both themed and general exhibition catalogues available since the 1960s cannot obliterate the absence of a unifying discourse making sense of the myriad of observations, local histories and scientific idiosyncrasies so characteristic of this field of studies. With the publication of this book, Nancy Winter has filled in that gap.

The book’s lofty title alludes to iconography, politics and historical contexts which is the one thing that it leaves aside. Instead it deals in a quite factual manner with the remains of about one hundred terracotta roofs from some twenty-five sites, arranged chronologically in seven major roof types. These cover the period between 640 and 510 BC, i.e. from the introduction of terracotta roofing, with a clearly regional Central Italian imprint, up until the adoption of a more general, less localized koine known as the ‘Second Phase’, as proposed in the 1918 Villa Giulia Museum catalogue by A. Della Seta and still valid to many.

The main roof types presented in the book are described in each chapter, first, as underlying concrete roofs found in particular sites, which are then taken apart in their constituent members, such as simas (raking and lateral), antefixes, revetment plaques, acrotelia and tiles (pan, cover, ridge). Of all roof types full graphical reconstructions are given, and all members are illustrated by scale drawings and, whenever needed and possible, small photographs. The evidence is backed up by full bibliographical references - more than a thousand sources are quoted. Each chapter closes with a short conclusion. After a brief excursion on technique and manufacturing, a very handy topographical synthesis is offered where the previous, detailed observations on roofs and buildings are brought together in more comprehensive accounts, arranged per city. The concluding chapter deals with analytical observations on architecture, the positioning of the various decorative members, the evolution of motives and mouldings, and, finally, some historical remarks. After a choice of indices, of museums (including all and full inventory numbers), ancient authors, proper names, place names and subjects, the volume closes with groundplans, wherever available, of all the buildings the hundred or so roofs can be attributed to, as well as colour reconstructions of pediments and eaves of some of the roofs.

To help readers appreciate the ramifications of the enterprise: among the roofs treated in this volume are the famous, late 7th/early 6th-century decorated roofs from Murlo and Acquarossa (that were all published, not so much haphazardly as rather in a less than coordinated fashion); the quixotic Minotaure-frieze roof from the Roman Forum; the Veii-Rome-Velletri roofs that so elegantly illustrate the concept of itinerant workshops (to which now a variant Rome-Capriccio can be added); the roofs from the Roman Mater Matuta temples at the church of Sant’ Omobono; and the Ionicizing-Etruscan roof at Latium Satricum, of which now a full-fledged, provenance unkown ‘predecessor from Caere has been ascertained in the storerooms of the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek at Copenhagen. Thanks to Winter’s exemplary work, all these buildings are now set in contexts which, sadly perhaps, contradict their uniqueness but, happily, makes them infinitely more understandable. Perhaps the most enriching aspect of this publication is the fact that architectural terracottas are no longer considered and presented in isolation but as parts of comprehensive endeavours, of ‘roof systems’ - to my knowledge here done for the first time in a consistent manner.

The author entered archaeology 35 years ago with a PhD on terracotta representations of human heads in Italic Archaic architectural decoration (reworked as an article in *RM* 85, 1978, 27-58). Precisely halfway, she published a seminal handbook on *Greek architectural terracottas* up until the Classical period (*Oxford* 1993). Students of Italic pre-Roman history can now reap the fruits of her having combined the position of librarian of the American Institute at Athens with that of a terracotta specialist visiting nearly all the world’s museums’ storerooms to find solutions to the many riddles ancient roofs pose. The result is a meticulously curated presentation of the stunning richness of pre-Roman terracotta roofs, nearly the only evidence of an exciting period of experiment in a budding society - out of which one city would arise that by its sheer dominance seems to have stifled an almost ‘baroque’ diversity that previously existed. These experiments, it now appears,
were both technical and formal, both in design and in execution. It is the great merit of Ms. Winter’s effort that practically all and everything in this field has been brought together in a rational, clear, uniform and precise manner. In addition, many minor but anything but superfluous questions are being settled in the over 1,500 footnotes. I was not able to find any printing or reference mistake, which for the sheer repertorium this book is, is no less than astonishing. For its encyclopaedic character it will no doubt have a future on a par with Arvid Andrén’s Architectural Terracottas from Etrusco-Italic Temples (1940). The fact that the author refrained from entering the slippery area of iconography and social interpretation makes this work even more valuable, since however these interpretations may waver, which they did especially in the sometimes overly political Italian archaeological arena, at the same time they kept lacking sufficiently accessible facts some of us still deem indispensable to base them on.

This said, there are some critical remarks to be made. Some of them are mere details, such as several instances of less than happy nomenclature (the “depth” of a cover-tile may be correct but is less clear than ‘length’, passim; ‘two painted black triangles’ is perhaps better expressed as ‘a painted hourglass motif’ on p. 214); some awkward details in the drawings (missing elements in reconstructions rendered in solid lines in ch. 6; wrongly positioned cover-tiles on p. 402; lack of evidence for the revetment plate 6.D.1.a. on p. 446); and a constructional less likely solution (the overhang of raking simas over raking revetment plaques should be minimal to prevent breaking or flipping, pp. 399, 401). Others, however, give rise to major doubts. Besides the lack of an explicit theoretical framework, which would have made Winter’s enterprise both more accessible and discussable, I hesitate to accept the proposed phasing in its entirety. Given the need to organise the material along chronological lines, and given the likelihood that real-life workshops (in various forms) consecutively carried out commissions in a sequence of places, it is logical to assume some distinct (here: seven) types of roofs (‘systems’) that were produced over two generations in an area 240 km of length. Yet to define such systems entirely in chronological terms perhaps does historical events less than full justice. Contemporaneity should then be avoided, leading to the need of assuming ‘precursors’ in one system (or stage) for events in another (p. 227), or of hybrids (p. 224). Most disquieting it was to find Winter assign the typical eaves-tile lotus/palmette motif (‘painted half-lotus flowers flanking a palmette’) to roofs dated 580-540 BC (4.F.4.c., p. 303), but also on Veii-Rome-Velletri lateral simas (5.B.2.A, p. 339) from c. 530, and finally on later eaves-tile soffits from, i.a., Satricum and Caere (6.F.2.A., p. 483). Exterior stylistic comparison should have warned the author that the motif is closely bound up with Pontic, Caeretan hydriæ and North-Ionian cups all dating to the third quarter. A further chronological subdivision is not possible.

A similar haziness characterizes the end of the ‘First Phase’. I have suggested elsewhere that in Central Italy, the architectural experiences in the Campanian area may well have led to adopting the different protective decoration modes known as the Second Phase. Trying to explain that technical and stylistic break purely from within the First Phase-tradition leads to awkward positions. The widely debated Palestrina raking sima (5.A.3.b, p. 336) with First Phase relief scene in a Second Phase format is an archaism, not a transitional piece from ca 510-500. The morphology of the piece is fully-fledged 5th-century. The author wavers somewhat since she admits as much in the conclusive paragraph (p. 393). The same goes for the one instance of an anthemion plaque (6.D.5, p. 463); it is attributed to a Roof 6 system on the hypothetical association with an antefix and a sima (note 174), but its format is vintage Second Phase, deriving its logic from Campanian forerunners, and its occurrence here is anachronistic to say the least. The unique column/mutulus plaques (6.D.6, p. 463f) are likewise suspect in a pre-Second Phase system. The author admits as much (note 176: ‘suggesting, perhaps correctly, that these were later additions to the roof at the end of the 6th century BC.’), but further on does not retain this nuance (p. 493).

To end on a positive note: the importance of this study on the wealth of roof evidence of Archaic Central Italy cannot be overestimated. A true treasure trove for many generations to come.

Riener R. Knop


This issue of Acta Hyperborea publishes papers associated with a conference on Artemis held in Copenhagen in 2005; indices of literary and epigraphic sources, names and sites make them even more useful. The journal’s regular ‘Forum’ section records Danish fieldwork, reviews and an intriguing article by A.-F. Alexandridou (pp. 497-522) examining early funerary offering rituals in Vari and the Athenian Kerameikos.

The Artemis papers, intended to build upon Martin Nilsson’s 1925 History of Greek Religion, present authors’ excavations (especially Danish projects) and research on topics of current interest (see editors’ introduction pp. 11-17). So we find specific sites and objects, from Italy to the Black Sea, treated in fine detail, although this is not intended as an all-encompassing reference. On the question of ‘origins’, Marie Louise Nosch examines Linear B evidence for Artemis and/or the Potnia Theron, ‘mistress of wild beasts’, in Late Bronze Age Greece. Only at Delos and Kalapodi is there evidence of votive goods or sacrifices (including bears, lions, turtles). Two, possibly three, Pylos tablets name a-le-mi-to (and her slave); others name different po-ti-ni-ja, but none are ‘theron’, and only at Iliad 21.470 is Artemis herself so named. Bodil Hjerrild presents Near Eastern equivalents: Anatolian Kybele and Iranian/Zoroastrian Anahita, the ‘glorified virgin’ patron of the wild and war, popular well into the Roman Empire.

Minna Skafte Jensen surveys Artemis in Homeric literature, noting allusions to choral music and dance in...
addition to the usual hunt, death, protection, etc. Jørgen Mejer’s review of the many Athenian shrines of Artemis makes use of tragedy and other literature in estimating the appearance of Classical cults. Using vase paintings and archaeological evidence at Brauron, Inge Nielsen reconstructs rituals from late 6th century on: banqueting, races, dances, burnt sacrifices and priests wearing bull masks. She suggests that many activities, such as girls racing nude, represent private rituals rather than public holidays. Birte Lundgreen revisits a marble head (Arktos or Eros?) acquired from Brauron by Furtwängler and now in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek.

In the Greek sphere, another sanctuary was Artemis Lauria at Kalydon, revisited in Danish fieldwork (S. Dietz, pp. 523-531). J. Mejer presents an altar dedicated there by a Thrason of possible Hellenistic date. Ditte Zink Kaasgaard Falb surveys offerings in the Spartan Orthia sanctuary (lead miniatures, grotesque masks) to demonstrate that Artemis had been syncretized with Orthia by the 6th century BC (rather than the Roman Imperial period). Synnøve des Bouville turns to Levantine sources for the more bizarre facets of Orthia cult, noting their frequent post-Archaic re-invention and modern ethnographic analogies.

In other Mediterranean cultures, Artemis cults tend to diverge from what we might predict. In Cyprus, few sites are identified from inscriptions or votive sculpture (Lone Wriedt Sørensen). Greek colonial regions show varied identities. Pia Guldager Bilde advocates the approach of quantifying literary and epigraphic evidence (epithets), maintaining that the cult spread to Black Sea colonies from Miletus and Megara Nisia, and increased dramatically in the Mithridatic period. Luis Ballestros-Pastor, analyzing the sanctuary at Themiscyra, suggests that the ‘palace of the Amazons’ and even later defenders’ use of wild beasts against Lucullus may derive from the temple and cult of Artemis there (cf. Adrienne Mayor, Greek Fire, Poison Arrows & Scorpion Bombs: Biological and Chemical Warfare in the Ancient World, New York, 2009, chapter 6).

Tobias Fisher-Hansen sees strong cultic links between the colonies of the Black Sea, South Italy and Sicily, where Artemis worship became a hallmark of the proud hellenization of native centers.

Marjatta Nielsen and Annette Rathje survey the un-Greek identity of ‘Artemis’ in Etruria and offer several speculative interpretations, seeing an Iron Age Artemis cult in antler slices deposited at the Tarquinian Pian di Civita site, and possible terracotta deer in the Ara della Regina’s pediment. They likewise consider the Etruscan cult of Tuir/Moon as Artemis.

The most striking Roman center was the shrine at Lake Nemi, to which Mette Moltenes restores a terracotta Late Republican temple pediment excavated in 1885 and dispersed to Boston and Nottingham. (See Erika B. Harnett in K.J. Hartwick/M.C. Sturgeon, eds, ΣΤΕΦΑΝΟΣ: Studies in Honor of Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway, Philadelphia, 1998, 101-104, note 19, for a contemporary terracotta pediment from Minturnae.) For stone sculpture from Nemi, see also Irene Bald Romano, Classical Sculpture. Catalogue of the Cypriot, Greek, and Roman Stone Sculpture in the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (Philadelphia, 2006) 72-161.

Jesper Carlsen surveys the sparse evidence for Late Republican Romans (occasionally the Domitii Ahenos-barbi) in Artemis sanctuaries at Samos, Ephesus and Delos. Rubina Raja presents the splendid Antonine temple at Gerasa and a Flavian-era predecessor (also Artemis Tyche on Hadrianic coinage).

Birte Poulsen restores to late Roman hunt images their underlying associations with Artemis cult; mosaics, frescoes, and textiles depict shrines of Diana, and many sanctuaries were anchored to hunting preserves. In late antiquity, Diana retained her healing aspect, identified by Niels Hønnestad within the indigenous Bad Bertrich spa cult on the evidence of a statuette from a workshop of Christian sarcophagi.

Marjatta Nielsen, in a wonderfully illustrated analysis, explains the misunderstanding, beginning with Rafael, of the pectoral ornament of Ephesian Diana as ‘Multimammia’ (replicas do not predate the Trajanic period.) She agrees with Seiterle’s identification of the bulges as bulls’ scrota; for other explanations, see L.R. DiDonato, Harvard Theological Review 85.4 (1992) 398-415; A. Bammer, Anatolian Studies 40 (1990) 137-160 (8th-century amber pendants). The projection of different values and meanings onto Renaissance and Neo-Classical portrayals of the statue should, in Nielsen’s words (p. 487), ‘give a hint of how ancient gods and myths were able to transform themselves when still “alive”, by being given shifting competences, while spreading from one area to another, through numerous channels of contact.’ These papers offer fresh examples of just such processes.

Jean MacIntosh Turfa


Though there are several monographs on childhood in the Greek and Roman world, many aspects have not yet been dealt with. Books on Minoan, Mycenaean, Etruscan, and Italic children are still lacking. The impressive collection of impeccably edited and illustrated papers of a childhood conference at Dartmouth College in 2003, organized in the context of the exhibition ‘Coming of Age in Ancient Greece’ in the local museum, certainly fills some gaps in this immense and difficult field of research. The sequence of twenty very readable papers of high quality is thematic, placed under seven headings: families, socialisation and enculturation, rituals and life transitions, gender and representation, burial, commemoration, and childhood and the classical tradition.

Cohen’s introduction does not summarize the papers but presents an essay on childhood between past and present, paying attention to former scholarship. She rejects Philippe Aries’s idea, presented in his Centuries of childhood (1962), that childhood in antiquity was not conceived as a separate stage of life. Further she adds interesting observations on Greek and Roman children and their birds in figurative art.
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The other archaeological contributions focus on children in classical Attic votive reliefs (C.L. Lawton), parenthood in official Roman art (J. Diddle Uzzi), immature gestures in Attic vase painting (T.J. McNiven), education on late antique mosaics (C.A. Marinescu et al.), votive terracottas and the welfare of infants at Paestum (R. Miller Ammerman), the personification of Komos growing up among satyrs and children (A.C. Smith), art and maturation in early Greece (S. Langdon), girls as acolytes in Aegean ritual and cult (P. Rehak), youth and gender identity in the frescoes of Thera (A.P. Chapin), boys, girls, and abduction in ancient Greek art (A. Cohen), mortuary programs at Tarquinia as indicators of the transition to adult status (M. Becker), the bioarchaeological record in the classical polis (A. Lagia), children on classical Attic funerary moments (J. Burnett Grossman), childhood on Roman funerary memorials (J. Huskinson), Roman circus sarcophagi and the commemoration of children (E. d’Ambra), and Eros and the lizard: children, animals, and Roman funerary sculpture (J. Sorabella).

The chapters based on historical sources cast light upon the parental ethos of the Iliad, i.e. their care for children (L. Pratt), a curriculum for raising a 4th-century Christian infant (Ph.B. Katz), female transitions to adulthood in late antiquity (A. Alberici and M. Harlows), and romantic constructions of childhood and Hellenistic poetry (A. Ambühl).

I summarize some of the results of the archaeological research, in the shortest possible way. Lawton shows that, though inscriptions on Attic votive reliefs do not mention children, the latter nevertheless play an important role in the religious rituals of a family. At least four stages of childhood (babies, toddlers, pre- and pubescent juveniles) are visible. In a similar way McNiven distinguishes different age groups by analyzing non-adult gestures. Girls keep them, boys gradually imitate adult ones. Diddle Uzzi shows that, generally, in Roman elite art children appear with their fathers, and non-Roman children with their mothers. Marinescu cum suis deals with 15 colourful, inscribed, 5th-century AD floor mosaic panels of unknown origin which show life stages of a certain Kimbros: the infancy, the time at the ‘basic’ school and the time at the ‘high’ school. Ammerman analyzes votive terracottas, especially kourotrophoi, found in four sanctuaries in and just outside Poseidonia, and in the Heraion of Poseidonia in the Sele. She carefully analyzes the transition from the Greek to the Lucanian period. Smith pays attention to Komos on 18 Attic vases; first Komos is a satyr, later a boy on ritual choes, during the Peloponnesian war, maybe symbolizing the promise of life and citizenship. Langdon holds that Greek geometric art associates boys with heroic fighting, and girls with marriage. Rehak stresses the importance of girls’ dress in Aegean cults. Chapin shows successive life stages of nude boys on Theran frescoes: first they are boxing, later on they are fishing. Cohen concludes that abducted girls are rendered as mature women in Greek art in order to obscure the real age difference between men and women in marriages. Grossman studies the idealized appearance of children on Attic grave monuments. Here, they are mentioned in inscriptions. Boys are rendered nude, girls are dressed. Children’s portraits on Roman tombs, funerary altars, and sarcophagi are sometimes idealized too, as Huskinson shows. D’Ambra interprets Erotes in circus scenes as a kind of consolation: a triumph over death. Defixiones with children’s names were supposed to influence real races. Sorabella proves that sleeping Erotes, symbols of innocence, keep, like Roman children, lizards as protective, domestic animals. This succinct survey shows that the topics hardly overlap. They give an interesting but rather kaleidoscopic view of many aspects of childhood in the Mediterranean, from ca 2000 BC until ca 500 AD. The title of the collection suggests constructions of childhood. Agency or agents in these processes, however, can hardly be found or defined. Probably due to the absence of central research questions (cf. J.B. Rutter’s preface on foici, pp. xxi-xxii), there is no general evaluation. The reader will note that phenomena like the age of transition from child to adult, ritual roles of children, education, the experience of child loss are time-, culture-, status- or even place bound. In addition, the archaeological, literary and epigraphic data are not always compatible as is often the case in classical archaeology. Some chapters generate new questions. Becker’s study, for example, shows that also after ca 700 BC neonates and children up to the age of 5.5 years at Tarquinia must have been buried in separate areas outside cemeteries for older children and adults as happened later, elsewhere in southern Etruria. Does this ‘mortuary program’ really show the transition to adult status as the title of Becker’s paper suggests or should we rather conclude that an infant younger than 5.5 years was not considered to be a persona, member of a community? Maybe, the age limit is rather related to weaning (cf. S. Crawford-Brown, Votive Children in Cyprus and Italy, Etruscan News 12, 2010, 5 and 31; also online). Lagia’s bioarchaeological research in Greek polis proves that generalisations cannot easily be made. This holds good for the whole book.

All references, combined in one bibliography, and a rather good index, make consultation easy. In my opinion, a chronological order of chapters would have been better as several contributions deal with more than one theme. Those who are interested in childhood can also use the very recent books: A. Backe-Dahmen, Die Welt der Kinder in der Antike (2008) and M.C. Crelier, Kinder im Athen des 5. Jhs v. Chr. Aspekte der gesellschaftlichen Wahrnehmung des kleinen Kindes im athenischen Polis des 5. Jhs. v. Chr. im Spiegel archäologischer Quellen (2008).


This lavishly illustrated book is dedicated to one of the most famous and most problematic bronze vessels, the 90.5 cm high volute krater with a sieve-lid, topped by a gold wreath, and wrapped or covered in a shroud and used as an urn for the burnt bones of a man and a
woman, found in the untouched, large cist grave B (with paintings) at Derveni, 12 km to the north of Thessaloniki, in 1962. The bones had been wrapped in purple cloth. Some details partly suggest a Homer, heroic tradition of cremation (cf. pp. 28, 30, 46, 182), also known from Vergina tomb II.

The nine chapters deal with metal vessels in Macedonian history, the seven Derveni tombs, the krater itself, its precursors, elaborate volute kraters of ca 400 BC, relief friezes, ornaments and workshops, the major repoussé frieze, animal friezes, volute masks and cast shoulder figures, and the uses and workshop of the Derveni krater. From this content it is clear that the author (henceforth B-Sh.) places her very detailed research in a historical, and above all a broad art historical, stylistic and technical perspective.

B-Sh. dates the vessel to the second quarter of the 4th century BC, more precisely around 370 BC (p. 8). As the tomb contained a posthumous gold quarter-stater of Philip II, the grave goods probably date to ca 320-300 BC (p. 25) and the krater may have been an heirloom. The inscription on the lip of the mouth of the vessel, silver letters in the eggs of the Ionic kymation, possibly inlaid after production, reads: Astiounios Anaxagorai ek Larisis, generally translated as: ‘of Astioun, son of Anaxagoras from Larissa’. So Astioun was probably owner of the krater, and may have inherited it from his father. B-Sh. presumes that Anaxagoras was member of the Aleuadae, a Thessalian family on good terms with Macedonian kings. Astioun, his son or grandson, may have been a cavalry soldier in the army of Alexander the Great and have died around 320 BC (pp. 44-45). This reconstruction is of course very speculative. What is certain is that the soldier died at the age of ca 35/40. The Thessalian inscription is problematical. Astiounenos may be a patronymic meaning ‘son of Astioun’. For other interpretations see SEG XLI, 1991, no 568 (with bibl.; with thanks to dr. R. Tybout).

Antecedents of the volute krater’s shape can be found in ceramics from Athens around 480-470 BC. The form continued in South Italian red-figure and even in Neo-Attic marble items. B-Sh. holds that the krater was a special commission, probably executed in Athens as indicated by many technical, stylistic, and iconographic details, for example the existence of clay impressions of relief figures found on the Agora, dated to ca 410-380 BC (pp. 84, 106-107, 180), and the continuity of maenad motifs on Neo-Attic vases (pp. 70, 89, 93-94, 106-114, 126-127, 132-135, 141-146, 157, 179). The major frieze in a sensual, fluid, ‘rich’ style shows a dominant, large, nude Dionysos and a dressed Ariadne, sitting together in a rather erotic union, further dancing maenads, some ecstatic and some cruel, satyrs, almost nude, ithyphallic Silenos, and an armed hunter with one footed boot, maybe Pentheus, opponent of the wine god (or Lykourgos according to G. Mihailov, REA 93, 1991, 39-54). Animal friezes are located under the frieze, above the foot, and on the neck. The masks in the eyes of four handle volutes probably represent Herakles, Acheolos, Hades and Dionysos (pp. 39-42, 166-168). They are Underworld gods (p. 175). Four cast figures on the shoulder show Dionysos, Silenos and maenads. The collective imagery looks coherent. Therefore, it may have had a message: opposition to Dionysos leads to madness and death, the god himself brings luck (also in afterlife, pp. 180-181, 183). B-Sh. excludes that the vessel was made for a burial (p. 183), although she associates the volute masks with the other world. In my opinion, the owner or successive owners may have used the krater during symposia. This does not exclude that the brilliant bronze worker or his commissioner realized that its final destination would be funerary, as often symposium sets ended up in tombs (cf. the grave sets in some tombs at Vergina).

The extremely rich content, the mass of endnotes (per chapter and page), perfect references and index make this beautiful book a _kitem ais aket_. It is a pity that drawings of the ‘unrolled’ friezes are missing. The book is probably not the last word on the masterwork. Questions remain, e.g.: why would a Thessalian man have commissioned a krater at Athens (or in the north-eastern Peloponnese), and not in nearby Macedonia where so many metal vases have been found which can hardly all have been imported? No metal _comparanda_ of the krater have been found at Athens. As Euripides worked in his last years at Pella until 406 BC, other Athenian artists may have migrated to Macedonia too.

The references to the secret marriage ceremony of Dionysos’s substitute with the _basilinna_ and a hypothetical monument with prototypical figures, both at Athens (pp. 178-180), do not prove anything. Could a style of ca 370 BC be reproduced at the end of the 4th century? The Neo-Attic reliefs prove that styles can be reproduced centuries later. The ongoing discussion on the ‘Philippos’-tomb at Vergina which has a silver calyx cup similar to that in Derveni tomb B (p. 26, fig. 22), shows that dating proposals, especially for metal vessels, still vary. Anyhow, science makes progress: Gisela Richter’s dating of the krater to the first or second century BC (made in 1969) can now definitely be dismissed.

L.B. van der Meer


This interesting booklet contains the _curriculum vitae_ of Sybbie Haynes written by the grand old lady herself, her bibliography and fourteen contributions of close colleagues, all dedicated to aspects of Etruscan culture and all written in English.

D. Ridgway deals with James Byres’ visits to and admiration of Etruria, his intention to write a _History of the Etrurians_ which unfortunately never appeared, his positive view on Etruscan art and his negative one on Roman imperialism.

Under the heading _Etruscan Production and Interpretation_ D. Williams sheds light on two pots from unknown find spots: the Hamilton Gray Vase, an Etruscan geometric bichrome urn (720-700 BC) and the Ridgway Ram vase, a (ritual?) hybrid, geometric jug with an animal head as mouth, possibly inspired by a Phoenician, metal predecessor (ca 700-680 BC). L. Ambrosini pays attention to the distribution of Attic re-
figure vases of the Zalamea Group in Etruria and Spain in the second half of the 5th century BC. J. Swaddling now dates an authentic ivory sistrum in the British Museum, formerly dated to the 7th century BC and incorrectly held to be Etruscan, to the 2nd/1st centuries BC. It belonged to an Isis cult in Campania. G. Bagnasco Gianni tries to explain scenes with Umaele on Etruscan mirrors, suggesting that Etruscan Umaele is Greek Eumalos, a legendary, mantic singer. On some mirrors, however, he is about to write on a diptych (p. 54, figs 1-4). He looks more like a scribe in an oracular context than a singer (cf. Artile on the famous Cacu mirror). A. Romualdi attributes three bronze griffin-head protomes (ca 600 BC) from the Brolio deposit (now in Florence) to a workshop at Chiusi.

Under the title Houses, Tombs and Temples F. Prayon’s article focuses on the atrium as an Italo-Etruscan architectural concept and as societal form. The etymology of the word atrium seems unresolved. I do not exclude the possibility that the root derives from *atr (plural of atr (‘mother’)) as funerary stone house cippiti and house-like stone beds in tombs clearly illustrate the strong relationship between house and woman. St. Steingräber’s essay deals with the origins, characteristics, indigenous and exogenous elements of rock-cut tombs. He does not exclude the possibility that the phenomenon had its roots in Asia Minor as it appears suddenly, around 575-550 BC. N.A. Winter holds that archaic terracotta sphinx akroteria have different origins (East Greece, Corinth) and that, by consequence, they say something about the cultural identity of the donor or patron. In the next section, Funerary Practice, St. Bruni presents a breath-taking article on the 7th century BC tumulus tomb in via San Jacopo at Pisa. He suggests that many elements refer to Homeric funerary rituals. That is correct but the sequence of rites is different from those in the funerals described in the Iliad and Odyssey. J.-R. Jannot presents hypotheses about the use of the lotus, poppy and other plants in funerary contexts. Much remains unclear: e.g. did aryballoi contain an opium-scented perfume or was it an ointment?

Under the title Defining the Etruscans: Language and DNA J. Penney makes clear that the extent of mutual influence between (non I.E.) Etruscan and (I.E.) Italic languages is not yet clear. The reason for the absence of high numbers of loans in both directions may have been the language barrier. In that case the Etruscan language would be an ethnic marker. Penney, however, does not pay attention to the existence of many proper names of Italic origin (e.g. Mamarce) in Etruscan inscriptions. Most important is a long contribution on DNA and Etruscan identity by Ph. Perkins. He criticizes the recent conclusion of C. Vernesi et al. (2004) and of M. Pellecchia et al. (2007) that DNA research might point to some migration of people (mostly women) and cattle from Anatolia to Etruria (see Etruscan Studies, Etruscan News and the many websites, all s.v. DNA, Etruscan). Perkins believes that ‘Etruscan ethnicity cannot be determined by genetic studies alone’. That is correct but it would be worthwhile to compare the DNA of contemporary bones from tombs both in Etruria and on Lemnos (ca 800-500 BC), as the Etruscan and Lemnian languages are akin. Perkins advocates a collaboration between molecular biologists and Etruscologists. But which Etruscologists? The main stream, often biased archaeologists or the more critical, and open minded ones who use all available data? Of course, competitive linguists should also be involved in such an interdisciplinary research.

L.B. van der Meer


Given the title one would expect contributions on the relations between Etruria and Umbria before they were conquered by Rome. If we analyse the introduction written by the editor, however, the aim of the colloquium in 2004 seems to have been to enlighten the process of urbanisation in the two adjacent areas. The hypothesis that at the beginning of the Villanova/Iron age (ca 1000/900 BC) Etruscans migrated from small settlements on hillslopes to large clusters of settlements which became the later cities, is now partly abandoned in view of recent research. In Tarquinia there were already settlements in the Final Bronze Age in and outside the plateau of the later city. So when did Etruscan proto-cities come into being? It appears that the births of Veii, Caere, Tarquinia, Vulci, Populonia developed differently. A definition of city or city-state is lacking, but monumentalisation (organized by priests/rulers) might be a good indicator as e.g. is visible in the Civita sanctuary at Tarquinia around 700 BC. On archaeological grounds cities in Umbria, less rich than Etruria, probably have developed only after the Roman conquest but Fontaine realizes that more research under the Roman cities is necessary. I only list the other thirteen contributions, written in four languages. M. Paciarelli gives indications of social complexity in the proto-urban communities of southern Etruria, Tarquinia and Veii, in the Iron Age. A. Maggiani casts light on the formation of the city and territory of Volterra and by comparison upon that of Chiusi and Vetulonia. L. Cappuccini deals with the dynamics of settlements at Chiusi in the 7th and 6th centuries BC. L. Donatelli deals with Poggio Civitella on the border of Chiusi’s territory. P. Perkins sheds light on the cultural and political landscape of the Ager Calatranus, north-west of Chiusi. F. Prayon analyses orthogonal settlement patterns and temple orientations taking the excavation site Castellina di Marangone as starting point. A. Naso deals with the Etruscans in the Tolfa Mountains from the 7th to the 5th centuries BC. G. Bradley offers a survey of cities and communities in pre-Roman Umbria. L. Bonomi Ponzi presents three emblematic case studies of ancient Umbia: Terni, Colfiorito and Gualdo Tadino. D. Manconi writes about Spello and Spoleto as outposts of Valle Umbra. Her observations are based on finds from emergency excavations. S. Stoddart presents the changing views of the Gubbio landscape, based upon research until 2005. M. Torelli analyses the relationship between Etruscans and Umbrians, the interferences,
conflicts and material loans. D. Briquel examines the grandeur of the Umbrians in the eyes of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the image of the Umbrians in the Greek ad Latin literature. *Mirabile dictu*, no attention is paid to epigraphic documents like the bronze *Tabulae Iguvinae*. All articles are well illustrated with many maps, and even with colour photos. The proceedings, though published six years after the colloquium, are important as they present many new data about the Etruscan and Umbrian landscape, cities and settlements. Most articles have useful, separate bibliographies. In some cases, unfortunately, the references are in the footnotes.

L.B. van der Meer


Valentina Vincenti’s book deals with the less known Etruscan Tomba Bruschi. It was discovered in a private area belonging to the Counts Bruschi, at the periphery of the necropolis of Calvario, just outside the walls of Tarquinia, in 1864. Fortunately, in the same year drawings of the wall-paintings were made by Gregorio Mariani. Two paintings were removed and stored in the local museum. Then the tomb was closed to prevent further damage by vandals. In 1963 the tomb was re-discovered and documented after an attempt of *tombaroli* to rob its grave goods was prevented. All extant, rather fragmentary paintings and remains of sarcophagi were removed and used for the reconstruction of the tomb in the museum. No skeletons were found. The hypogeum, 3 meters under the surface (closed again after 1963), has a square form (6.70 x 6.20 m) with two niches and two painted pillars (showing Charun and a woman). At least fourteen sarcophagi stood against and in front of the walls. The paintings show converging processions of men dressed in white linen togas guided by musicians, *litiaces* and *corniciones*. The main persons, two men riding horses, one of whom died at 23 years, are guided by demons. They must have been magistrates as some *lictores* or *apparitores* held *fasces* (p. 30). On the left wall the procession is curiously interrupted by a lady with a head wreath (now lost) holding a pomegranate in her left hand, whose name is *larthi ursmnai*, member of an elite family (see p. 114). She sees herself reflected in a hand-mirror held up by a female assistant. According to V. the woman might be a Dionysian *mystes* (pp. 65-66). The *krateriskos* (not a *kantharos*) of an anepigraphic, female sarcophagus lid figure also refers to the Dionysian cult (p. 76). The mirror was probably a female status symbol, comparable with male political attributes (p. 69). Inscriptions on the walls (most of them lost now, pp. 101-118) show that the tomb belonged to the *gens Ap(u)nas*. This clan, already powerful in the 6th century BC Southern Etruria, was later also present at Cerveteri, Volterra, Bolsena, Perugia and Cortona (pp. 107-125), showing the strong social mobility of elite families in the last four centuries BC. The inscriptions may mention members of four generations. This, like many scenes on south Etruscan sarcophagi and Volterran urns, demonstrates the belief that the deceased would see their family again in the underworld (cf. the reviewers’ *Myth and more on Etruscan stone sarcophagi*. Louvain 2004, 81-83, 92-100 and e.g. M. Cristofani (ed.), *Corpus delle urne etrusche 2. Urne Volterranze 2*, 1, no 183). The hardly or unpublished stone sarcophagi, 2 complete ones, 4 chests (one showing a procession in relief) and 8 lids (some of which are lost) date from ca 340/310 until 225/175 BC. As is well-known, dates of late Etruscan tomb-paintings vary, sometimes from the 4th until the 1st century BC. Based on contextual evidence (e.g. the position and dates of the sarcophagi, some Etrusco-Campanian vases), alphabetic, antiquarian and stylistic indications, V. dates the paintings at the end of the 4th and the beginning of the 3rd centuries BC, before Tarquinia was conquered by Rome, probably before 281 BC. The walls were painted after the introduction of the oldest sarcophagi. One indication is that some painted inscriptions mention the lexeme *mutuntathi* (*in the sarcophagus*). Appendix 1 presents the archival documents from 1864 to 1979, and Appendix 2 describes the technical aspects of the removal of the paintings. The bibliography is almost completely up to date. Several abbreviated references in footnotes, however, are not present in the bibliography. There are spelling errors in the main text: e.g. *skiphos* instead of *skyphos* and the Italianised Latin adjective *magistrualis* (passim). V. defines a parade, clearly a procession in the underworld, as a *funus triumphalis* (p. 46). One should read: *funus triumphale*. As nothing, however, refers to a triumph, it is just a procession with elements of this world (musicians, *litiaces*) and the neither-world (demons) (cf. p. 72). The translation of *vel apnas larthal clan* (*Vel Apnas son of Larth*, p. 105) is incorrect as he is the son of a woman, Larthi or Larthia, possibly of Larthi Ursmnai mentioned before. The comment on the inscriptions is too short. Translations are missing. The photographs, also those in colour, are of good quality. Let us hope that other late classical and Hellenistic painted tombs also will be published in monographs, if possible with indices and without the many, usual spelling errors in non-Italian names and publication titles. But all in all Vincenti’s book is worthwhile, written with much care. Her chronological proposals are convincing.

L.B. van der Meer


This book is the sixteenth monograph on archaeological materials in the splendid National Archaeological Museum at Tarquinia. F. Colivicchi (C.) presents, dates and comments on 554 artifacts. Most objects are preserved in the magazines, unfortunately many without an inventory number. In Part 1 of the book vases, most-
ly alabastra (of calcareous alabaster, gypsum or another material) and objects of stone, in Part 2 vases and objects of glass (on a fusible core, stamped, or blown), in Part 3 objects of ivory of bone, and in Part 4 ostrich-eggs are studied in a meticuous way, well organized under headings such as groups, form, types and variants. Every chapter has a long, thorough, up to date introduction. Unfortunately, precise contexts are rarely known. Probably because of this, many items are not dated individually. Not all the artifacts are Etruscan. Many calcareous alabastra are of Egyptian origin, transported by Phoenicians to Etruria, after ca 600 BC. The production place of alabastra of gypsum is still a problem (p. 42). It may have been Tarquinia, as local gypsum was already used in prehistory. An east-west transmission of technical know how is also shown by glass and ivory. The glass production started in Mesopotamia, later it spread to Rhodes, Carthage, Crete and Etruria. Some types of glass were probably produced in Etruria itself, after ca 650 BC (pp. 74, 77). Blown glass was probably invented in the Syro-Palestine region before ca 50 BC. Although the technique was imitated in Italy, Tarquinia did not play a role in the production. As for several kinds of ivory artifacts, 5th century BC Vulci seem to have been a production centre (p. 150). Tarquinia’s museum has 45 mirror handles of bone, presumably used from ca 350 until ca 200 BC, or even much later (p. 179). It appears that most bone artifacts are related to the mundus muliebris. Even parallels of bone remain. The five half ostrich-egg shells used as cups from the 7th and 6th centuries BC were imported from Carthage or from another Phoenician region, and may be partly local products.

Though the book has no central research questions, it ends with Conclusions which summarize the use of all materials mentioned from the Iron Age until the Julio-Claudian period. Indices are missing but this is compensated by a worthwhile bibliography (with few spelling errors). The many profile drawings are excellent and the black and white plates are reasonable. The book is for consultation rather than for reading. It is highly specialized. Hopefully, a catalogue of mirrors, e.g. a fascicle of the Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum, will follow soon. For a very detailed criticism of V.’s catalogue raisonné one should read the online review of Jean MacIntosh Turfa (http://bmrc.brynmawr.edu/2009/2009-08-53.html).

L.B. van der Meer


Perkins’s book is an outstanding catalogue raisonné of all bucchero vases in the British Museum (BM). These completely black or less black vessels, markers of Etruscan culture, usually substitutes for more precious metal vessels or Greek fine ware, were used in settlements, tombs and sanctuaries. Chapter 1 deals with the formation of the large collection, which grew from more than thirty other collections or collectors between 1756 until 1980.

Chapter 2 evaluates former studies of bucchero. The author uses, in addition to many CVA volumes, specialized studies and recent excavation reports, the classification and typology of T. Rasmussen whose seminal book of 1979 recently has been republished as paperback (Bucchero Pottery from Southern Etruria. Cambridge 2006). A nice feature is the attention paid to the most recent attempts to reconstruct the production process (pp. 8-10) and the treatment of the vases after they arrived in collections. According to most recent research the black colour was created by ‘the firing within sealed containers (saggars) filled with organic material such as sawdust’ (pp. 8-9). As might be expected, the exact archaeological context of the items is unknown, apart from four pieces from graves at Tharros on Sardinia (nos 11, 17, 45 and 46).

Chapter 3, the catalogue, lists in the alphabetical sequence of 37 vase names, from ‘alabasta’ to ‘tripod vases’, 309 items, 11 of which are sherds. Many items come from Campania. For each vase the register number, catalogue number, measurements, find spot, production place, acquisition, date and colour (described in detail) are mentioned. There follows a very detailed explanation of how each vase was made (potting, turning on a wheel, joining of parts, burning, the inclusion of silver mica, firing, finish, decoration, firing). Finally matches or comparanda are mentioned, which may shed light on the production centre. Most vases are illustrated by a small but sharp black and white photo and some by drawings of profiles and cylinder stamps. The oldest items are dated to ca 670 (e.g. no 5), the most recent ones maybe to ca 400 BC (nos 45-46 from Tharros). The proposed dates are rather global: the chronological upper and under limits range from 20 to 120 years. All types of classes, bucchero leggero, pesante, and a cilindro are represented, though in varying quantities.

The concordances list register numbers, CVA plates, BM catalogue numbers, Perkins’s catalogue numbers, figures, and the source (the former owners) of the items, followed by indices of the (presumed) places of production, find spots, 24 vessels with graffiti, and a bibliography. As many museums have buccheri, often insufficiently published and of unknown origin, Perkins’s study may be an exemplum and a goldmine for authors of future modern bucchero catalogues.

Some problems are unresolved. How can false items be detected (cf. no 297)? What are the differences between bucchero pesante from Orvieto and that from Chiusi (cf. no 42)? Was Campanian bucchero exported (cf. no 200)? How can ‘Ionian’ bucchero (cf. no 1) be recognized? What is its relation with Etruscan bucchero? Chemical research may be helpful to answer these questions. In addition, we might ask whether Campanian bucchero may be called Etruscan, as places like Capua were multiethnic.

L.B. van der Meer


Each region of ancient Asia Minor had its own styles and forms of funerary monuments, from urns to large
tomb buildings. Therefore, it has been a good initiative of the Marburg centre of studies of sarcophagi to publish corpora of material from the different regions. In a re-elaboration of her German PhD-diss. Korkut presents a modest class of ostothecae (small chests used to contain ashes and bones of the cremated deceased) made of local limestone in the south-eastern part of modern Turkey. The shapes and decorations of the 251 pieces are mostly similar to those on the much larger sarcophagi in marble from the same region. They are seldom round, and the rectangular ones have the form of a house, including a door or doors on the sides and gabled roofs as lids, whereas the reliefs show garlands held up by Cupids or Victories. More specific elements are the portrait busts or heads placed within the garlands or in-between. The author has made classifications of ‘Gruppen’ in typologies based on different criteria. Since the amount is considerable these groups often work well. After a treatment of typologies, Korkut passes over to iconography, discussing the plant species of the garlands (laurel etc.), the garland bearers (Érotes etc.), and the portraits. Some motifs (vases, wreaths, door depictions) and figures (Dionysos, Hermes) can clearly be associated with the realm of the dead. The notion of a consecratio in formam deorum, so familiar in the west, lacks. The portrait busts or heads are intentional rather than realistic, but seem indeed to symbolize the deceased, which implies that more than one individual were ‘buried’ within the chests. Since there are more busts or heads than one, they can constitute a couple or a small family. Hair fashion gives clues as to chronology: they follow the fashions of the emperors and empresses (see also extensively chapter 7, in which other factors are treated as well). The inscriptions may refer to the persons entombed and if they lack we must imagine other indications in the tomb chambers.

An interesting chapter is dedicated to the production of the chests. The limestone stems from quarries as near as possible to the cemeteries. These ostothecae, therefore were not destined for exportation and were found in the neighbourhood. Finally, there is a brief chapter on the display and function of the chests, which is not very thorough because of the lack of find data for most of the chests.

I have little to comment upon the results of this impeccabe study. It is not a very thrilling class of material and the discussion does not stimulate the author to draw revolutionary conclusions, but its utility will be long-lasting. The catalogue and most of the conclusion can play a role in the future debate on local styles and customs.

Eric M. Moormann


The title betrays the long history of German research in the biggest and in many respects grandest house of ancient Pompeii, the Casa del Fauno (here CdF). Hoffmann was to publish a monograph in the prestigious series Häuser in Pompeji, edited by Volker Michael Strocka, but now clearly opts for another strategy. He presents a brief architectural history of the CdF based on the results of the excavations carried out by Arnold Tschira and Friedrich Rakob, which are presented by his colleague Andrea Faber. Visitors of the house finally get insight into the investigations carried out almost 50 years ago that left as only proof a set of walls under the actual layer in the large room 42 in the second peristyle. This does not mean, however, that the reader gets a full comprehension of the complex that apparently will follow in a sequel to this well edited book.

The results are presented dryly, without making connections to other research in Pompeii on the layers previous to the eruption of AD 79. The CdF, therefore, seems to remain an isolated monument, but let us hope that the following publications will give more insight. The publications quoted are all rather old (there is no bibliography which gives a good overview of the works used) and only focus on the house itself. That implies that no intense comparison is made with the increasing number of stratigraphic investigations all over Pompeii in the last decades, often well published and object of discussion, among others of monographs in the outstanding series *Studi della Soprintendenza Archeologica di Pompei* founded by superintendent Pietro Giovanni Guzzo. What was a revolution in Pompeian archaeology in the early 1960s, has almost become a fossil in nowadays *Pompeianistica*. The authors seem to realise this and give a clear series of conclusions that partly match similar investigations (pp. 103-109).

Therefore it is difficult to assess the conclusions in full. Hoffmann and Faber distinguish various phases. The terrain contained structures before the erection of ‘Casa del Fauno 1’, but their nature remains obscure, all traces having been demolished in antiquity. CdF 1 occupies the entire insula, albeit with a large garden or hortus where CdF 2 would get the second peristyle. Partial reconstructions lead to CdF 3, the monument that we see nowadays. As a matter of fact the articulation as a whole, with two atria, did not change very much. From the first moment there was a peristyle and rooms demanding attention next to it, so that one can consider this house as a mix of Italic and Greek elements. Regarding chronology, without saying the authors assume that all depends from the finds in the old digs. This leads to the following time scheme:

1) Traces of buildings 5th-3rd centuries BC
2) CdF 1: second quarter 2nd century BC; some interventions in the next 25 years
3) CdF 2: first decades of 1st century BC; some interventions in the next decades
4) CdF 3: first quarter of 1st century AD; subsequent interventions, i.a. as a result of the AD 62 earthquake.

Phase 2 includes the embellishment of the house with the splendid mosaics (Battle of Alexander and Darius, Fight of fishes, erotic couple, Nilotic frieze, etc.) and greater part of the first-style wall decorations. I think that, if the authors are right, this is of great consequence for the study of mosaics and murals in the late Hellenistic...
period. By sticking to ca 100-80 BC, Hoffmann and Faber see, like all scholars up to now, the house as a Samnite urban palace, but all without saying. The famous Latin inscription in front of the western entrance would have had a Samnite counterpart. The only reference to Pompeian urbanistics is the explanation of the construction of a second floor in phase 3 as the result of ‘gesellschaftliche Veränderungen’ (p. 52), which are not explained or assessed whatsoever but in note 222 on p. 109.

It is clear, this reader closed the book with mixed feelings: happy that finally some results of old work have been made public, unhappy because of the fragmentary state of the book within the study of the house and its place in Pompeian history. Let us hope that the second volume will not come with a delay as long as this work has suffered from.

Eric M. Moormann


This volume is the last of an impressive series of single editions of Vitruvius’ ten books De architecutre in the Budé series, started with the publication of book 9 in 1969 by Jean Soubriran. Mme Saliou obtained her habilitation with this edition in 2006 and delivered an excellent piece of work. Saliou places herself in the relatively short, but already impressive tradition of the Budé series of the last decades by editing the text with her own amendments to the critical edition, a thorough introduction almost as lengthy as the text itself, a new translation and an extensive commentary in which all modern literature pertaining the topics treated by Vitruvius is discussed. This commentary almost becomes a manual on public building in its own. Reading these three hundred pages is a great pleasure and renders the reader extremely well instructed. This volume is dedicated to the profane public edifices, to start with the agora/forum. Since the topic contains complicated issues such as the acoustics of theatres, Vitruvius deservedly observes that he has to explain the matter as clearly as possible. A nice look into the process of conception of De Architectura is that he explains, in this respect, the modest dimensions of each of the ten books: the reader can pick up more easily the information contained in a slim volume than when he has to peruse a lengthy and ponderous book. That book 5 is the last in the series, is mere coincidence, but without suggesting so, Saliou makes clear that it forms the centre of Vitruvius’ work in all senses. The master himself used the image of the Pythagorean tetraktys of ten numbers in which five forms the pit (p. 100, ad Preface 5, note 2). The centrality of the book might also be explained by the fact that Vitruvius comes to the fore as a practising architect himself: he presents the basilica built after his design on the forum of Fanum (modern Fano) as an example of a well designed and ‘correctly’ executed building that belongs to a complicated class of necessary commodities in the public central space of every Roman town. Unfortunately, excavations in a Roman colony on the Adriatic coast have not brought to light remains of this monument, so that its reconstruction is limited to paper work and a sound assessment of Vitruvius is impossible.

Book 5 contains a learned essay on acoustics and the harmony of sound, connected with the description of the outlay of theatres in both the Greek and Roman world. While it seems a rather unbalanced chapter, with a relatively brief explanation of the theatres’ features and the lengthy excursus on sound, one may also argue that the importance of the theatre is dictated by the demands of human ears. Vitruvius’ ongoing interest in human health gets a great monument in these pages. Moreover, it is his distinction between Greek and Roman theatres that is still the canonical one found in textbooks for students and learned monographs alike. One may wonder why Vitruvius does not pay attention to amphitheatres, a category of buildings not yet fully developed at Rome in his time, while the south of Italy already had some examples, e.g. at Pompeii. Possibly it is, indeed, the shortage of concrete examples in the urbs, but also the short scope of Vitruvius’ panorama of what was Italia (see Saliou’s interesting remarks about a possible definition: neither Etruria nor Campania, let alone the more northern and southern areas of the peninsula). His more times expressed conservatism can be another reason for this lacuna as well.

Rather a notice than a review, this brief presentation cannot but praise Saliou’s Vitruvius. In the last years I have used with great profit the other volumes of the Budé Vitruvius and this will not change. The series can be recommended to all sorts of scholars who work with this unique source: classicists, archaeologists, architectural historians and art historians. As to the latter category, those who study Vitruvius’ Nachleben will find many important explanations of terminology and forms of buildings as well as rules described by the architect who enriched Fano with a basilica.

Eric M. Moormann


In the study of Antiquity, Johannes Wiedewelt (1731-1802) has a certain prestige as one of Winckelmann’s friends in Rome. There he made a thorough study of ancient and modern architecture and collected a bulk of documents to be taken home. This multi-faceted figure gets a worthy monument in this new volume of a high-quality series dedicated to reception studies. Marjatta Nielsen introduces him (pp. 11-61), sketches his life, present his achievements, and explains the other papers. His contribution to Danish culture is the introduction of neoclassical architecture of an almost timeless simple grandeur. Wiedewelt has remained in the shadow of Thorvaldsen and studies about him are almost uniquely in Danish. After almost six years in Paris, at Rome he shared a room with Winckelmann, of modest social status like him, in 1756-1757, and had to
return in 1758 to get a number of projects from the court and other important institutions in Copenhagen. Here he lived the rest of his life. Other sources of inspiration were found during a trip to England in 1768.

As to Antiquity, the book contains a few contributions that are relevant. Nielsen (pp. 85-111) has written an essay on Wiedewelt’s drawings of antique objects in Rome. These documentary sketches would serve as sources for various monuments, e.g. the sarcophagus of King Christian VI in Roskilde Cathedral. The simplicity of drawings matched Wiedewelt’s neoclassical taste, as reflected in a Danish treatise of 1762 on that matter. Jan Zahle discusses the plaster casts (pp. 127-173) that were collected by Wiedewelt, since the acquisition of marble originals in Rome was out of (financial) order. These acquisitions were partly private, partly for the Royal Academy of Arts: students should draw after real statues or three-dimensional reproductions. These documentary sketches would serve as a smooth transition of formats from private collection Høegh-Guldbergh (now mostly in the National Museum of Denmark) was described according to principles developed by Caylus and Winckelmann, viz. starting from chronology, iconography, and the importance of the object for its artistic value. Wiedewelt wrote this book as a proof of his quality as antiquarian scholar, which was great and up-to-date. The objects themselves are small and belong to the Egyptian, Greek and Roman realm. The genuineness of some pieces is still to be assessed. I do not discuss the other contributions that have little or nothing to do with antiquity, but they are worth reading and portray this fascinating artist and theorician Wiedewelt was.

An article out of order, but not less interesting is an addendum about 2004-2010 would have been merely concurring position and the different payment

Eric M. Moormann


This volume presents a wide array of studies about aspects narrowly connected with the architecture of grand sanctuaries in - mainly - the classical and Hellenistic Greek World. Some papers delivered in 2004 have been published in larger publications as well. The editors subdivided the (numbered) sixteen contributions into four sections. The first section on ‘Structure and Ornament’ focuses on the way sculpture functions within its architectural space. Robin Osborne evidences the advantages and weaknesses of decorating pediments, metopes and Ionic friezes. He concentrates on frontal representations, urging the spectator to take part with the scene, which is particularly true for chariots. An extra point is his explanation of the absence of satyrs in temple sculpture: they stand for disorder, have no narrative of their own and these two faults are not resolved in myth. Peter Higgs takes up the complicated discussion about the date of the reliefs of the coffered ceiling of the Athena Temple at Priene. The fragmentary pieces of high quality are mostly dated to the first building phase, the third quarter of the fourth century, but would have been installed only after the completion of the building in the second century. In my view, Higgs’ analysis is convincing: the pieces do not betray a stylistic similarity with the sculptures of the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus and are rather comparable to monuments from the second century. The frequent occurrence of the Giants’ Battle in that century might be a secondary, albeit less conclusive reason. Patricia Butz’s brief, but elegant essay on the ornamental character of Greek inscriptions concludes with the observation that the monoline letters are of a Doric character, whereas letters with serifs rather belong to the Ionic order. The absence of images complicates an immediate assessment of this paper, without consulting corpora of inscriptions. David Schahill retraces the roots of the Corinthian capital in funerary art in an iconographic way, and in the mix of stone or marble kalathos-like capitals with bronze adornments. A striking case is a smooth kalathos-like capital from Corinth. Tonio Hölscher finishes the section in a way Osborne started it, viz. by examining sculpture decoration as mere messages or decorative elements of buildings. The difficulty of contemplating these decorations (for the viewer in a high and slanting position) on architecturally subordinate elements make friezes, metopes and pediments adornments rather than messengers, for messages cannot be understood in one glance. The consequence is the introduction of reliefs on the viewer’s level (Altar of Pergamon, Ara Pacis Augustae) in oblong format that form a solution of this struggle between ornament and meaning.

In ‘II, Technique and Agency’ editor Peter Schultz focuses on the Temple of Asklepios of Epidaurus and the ‘agency’ of its artists. That the artists Timotheos and Theolo earned much more with their acroterial figures than Hekordas and [?] with the pediments should not be explained by Timotheos’ later fame but by the merely concuring position and the different payment
of each artist’s skill. Style and skill were much more important as discriminating factors than we usually think. Katherine Schwab, who already did much work on reconstructing other east metopes of the Parthenon, concentrates on the badly preserved metope 14 with two horses. Including the study of drill holes serving for the application of bronze additions, she reconstructs Helius driving a quadriga to the left. András Patay-Horvath also studies metal attachments to architectural sculptures, esp. hair locks in the late archaic and classical period. His suggestion of bronze hair locks to the head of one of Olympia’s centaurs (p. 90, figs 8.6-8.10) is not picked up by Westervelt (see below, pp. 137, 147). Here I would have inserted Schibli’s essay (see above).

Section III on ‘Myth and Narrative’ focuses on mythological history as displayed by Athens. Editor Ralf von den Hoff ‘rearranges’ the metopes on the Treasury of Athens at Delphi in such a way that the balance between the pan-Hellenic hero Herakles and the Athenian Theseus becomes clear, which happens within the decade 510-500 after Kleisthenes’ reform and first military successes of Athenian hoplites. Judith Barringer highlights the Athenian Hephaisteion as a monument to celebrate the male power of Athens by honouring Theseus and Herakles. They are symbols of man-made democracy, guided by the two gods worshipped in the temple. She suggests that the never well explained eastern frieze might represent an early fight, as described by Plato, of Athens against Atlantis (see now her Art, Myth and Ritual in Classical Greece, Cambridge 2008). Iphigeniea Leventi studies the badly preserved and barely readable blocks of the Ionic frieze of the Poseidon Temple at Sounion from the 440s (see now Antike Plastik 30, 2008, 1-54) that would represent scenes connected with Athens’s mythic history. Again, Theseus (in the Centauromachy) and Herakles (in the Gigantomachy) are the most important heroes. There is a clear connection with Poseidon who has a place of pride in the Gigantomachy. Formally, the frieze resembles that of the Parthenon, where in other ways the symbolic language is identical. Moreover, both monuments stand upon remains of temples destroyed in 480 by the Persians. Hilda Westervelt’s essay tries to read the sculptural programme of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia in respect to Herakles, mainly eternized on the metopes. Herakles features in the Elea Centauromachy of the west pediment (probably the head of fig. 12.9, see p. 147) - so not, as is said by Pausanias, in the Centauromachy with Peirithoos and Theseus - and stands on the same level as Pelops in the east pediment. Both were considered founders of the Olympic Games. Westervelt illustrates her thesis about the specific Gigantomachy with vase images of Herakles slaying Centaurs in the same battle (one detail: the vase of fig. 12.13 is not in The Hague, but in the Allard Pierson Museum at Amsterdam). Westervelt explains Pausanias’ errors in his interpretation of the Centauromachy in a way that endorses her arguments very well.

The last section, on ‘Diffusion and Influence’ opens with an analysis of the metopes from Selinus by Erik Østby, who could not include in his discussion a recent monograph by C. Marconi (Temple Decoration and Cultural Identity in the Archaic Greek World: The Metopes of Selinus, Cambridge 2007). He sketches the development of narrative in metopes from mid 6th to mid 5th century and characterises the iconographic programmes as expressions of oppositions between good and bad, man and woman and the like. In the case of the youngest example (Temple E, 460-450, dedicated to Hera), Østby suggests the influence of local intellectuals like the Pythagoreans or Empedokles. Justin Walsh adapts a theoretical approach, that of hybridity originating in mixed societies, to gate reliefs on Thasos: they show mixed styles, iconographies, and messages reflecting the various influences the island underwent in the run of the late archaic and classical periods. In this way he fully tallies with the theme of section 4. Martin Bentz and Lorenz Winkler-Horaček close with papers on somewhat different monuments, viz. a funerary pillar from Chios (now in Berlin) and the much disputed ‘Parthian’ monument from Ephesos on which after this contribution was written a pile of new publications has come out (see p. 212).

This brief overview shows the wide array of topics and the thrilling proposals made by these excellent scholars. The subdivision of the papers into the four sections mentioned is nowhere explained and not clear to me in all cases. As to the editorial matters, I must say that the quality of several illustrations is not very high (e.g. Olympia and Thasos). There are a few misspellings. But this does not detract from the book’s quality. The editors have to be congratulated with this fine series of papers.

Eric M. Moormann


The main title of Sabine Fourrier’s monograph may create the misleading impression of a study in ‘art history’. The secondary title, however, is successful in correcting immediately this impression, by alluding to the primary aim of the study to deal with Cypriot Iron Age cultural and political identities.

The main body of the monograph consists of two parts, prefaced by a methodological introduction and followed by an annex where the data-set, i.e. the terracottas (of both large and small scale) on which the discussion is based, are listed according to site and style. As this material and its typology are relatively known from previous publications, and as the author’s primary goal is to establish regional groups of production, object information in the annex is reasonably confined to deposits and inventory number. Acknowledgements, a chronological table, a list of bibliographic abbreviations, a bibliography, an index, a list of illustrations and 24 plates complete the book.

In her introduction Fourrier puts the Cypro-Archaic period in context, laying out the scope of her study and her methodology, and relating her project to the existing scholarship. The political segmentation of Cyprus in many city-kingdoms, clearly evident in the Cypro-Archaic period, coincides with the multiplication of Cypriot sanctuaries and the abundance of various coroplast, sculptural and ceramic artistic styles. Building
In the first - and most extensive - part the author analyses the regional styles of the island in nine chapters. Each chapter refers to a production centre: Salamis, Idalion, Kiton, Amathous, Kourion, Paphos, Marion, Soloi, and the northern part of the island, in which Fourrier includes Lapithos and Kazaphani. In the first section of each chapter she reviews the existing evidence and the problems that arise from its discovery, in an effort to define the various styles. She regards a particular ‘regional style’ as a shared element of a community, which can be defined following a consideration of morphological characteristics, manufacturing techniques and sources of influence. In the second section of each chapter the author proceeds to a discussion of the diffusion of the various styles in the sanctuaries attempting, where possible, a distribution based on the distance from the production centre: sanctuaries very close to the centre (le cercle proche), territorial sanctuaries (les sanctuaires de territoire), and frontier sanctuaries (les sanctuaires de frontière). Fourrier allocates - most often justifiably in my opinion - many extra-urban sanctuaries in the territories of specific city-kingdoms, or in frontier zones between two city-kingdoms. In the Cypro-Archaic period, these sanctuaries should have belonged to secondary centres, villages and/or farmsteads within the sphere of influence of specific city-kingdoms. She, therefore, successfully manages to identify liminal zones between the various city-kingdoms. I selectively mention her pioneer assignment of Arsos to Salamis ‘sphere of interest’ (I would cautiously use the term ‘territory’ in these instances), or of Agía Irini to Soloi.

In the second part the author brings together in three chapters the evidence from the previous chapters exploring the relations between workshops, sanctuaries, and polities in the wider context of the island’s entity. Fourrier attempts an interpretation that addresses the diffusion of regional styles in relation to segmented cultural and political identities. This is the less extensive part, but the author raises fundamental - and indeed very complex and complicated - questions arising from the material.

In chapter one, taking on Gjerstad’s proposed chronology based on the finds from Agía Irini and on comparisons between Cypriot material found on the island and in the Aegean (mainly Samos), she discusses the problem of chronology proposing new and convincing revisions of stylistic successions and stratigraphy. In the second section of this chapter, Fourrier attempts to encapsulate in three pages (107-109) the complexity of the formation of the Cypro-kingdoms in relation to the birth of regional styles. The development of secondary urban centres, the multiplication of the extra-urban sanctuaries and the evolution of coroplastic styles in the early Cypro-Archaic period represent the climax of a process that began well in the Early Iron Age. These phenomena might well relate to the consolida-

tion of the city-kingdoms and their territories and the island’s entry under the Assyrian sphere of influence and ‘rule’. While I agree with the main lines of Fourrier’s thought, I would wonder about the meaning of her proposed reorganisation of the Cypro-kingdoms from ‘un regime royal à un regime monarchique’ during the course of the 8th/7th centuries BC (p. 109). A more detailed explanation of her view in this context would have been particularly welcome.

In the second chapter of the second part, Fourrier draws conclusions about the distribution of terracotta styles on the island, as an indicator for the territorial formation of the various Cypro-Archaic city-kingdoms proposing a theoretical, as she herself emphasises (p. 112), map of the various regions of influence assumed for each kingdom (fig. 9). The artistic styles allow her to see nine regions, which she regards as corresponding to the territories of nine polities (Salamis, Idalion, Kiton, Amathous, Kourion, Paphos, Marion, Soloi and Lapithos) that functioned as distinct city-kingdoms between the second half of the 7th and the beginning of the 5th century BC. As she herself admits, this distribution of styles on the territories does not supply an account of the dynamic, more or less slow, processes of the formation or abolition of some polities. At this point a central issue should be made clear: Fourrier is right not to seek for borders between the various city-kingdoms, but instead for ‘frontier zones’, that is, liminal (or even meeting) zones among the various communities. Therefore, different types of terracotta figurines correspond to different production zones, which she assigns to the landscapes of the various city-kingdoms considering the epigraphic and numismatic evidence. She further acknowledges that the number of the Cypro-kingdoms was diminishing from Cypro-Archaic to the Cypro-Classical period, because polities were fighting over each other’s territories (see M. Lacovou, From Ten to Naught. Formation, Consolidation and Abolition of the Cyprus’ Iron Age Polities, Cahier du Centre d’Études Chypriotes 32 [2002] 73-87). We should, therefore, stress the difficulties and dangers inherent in supposing that these zones coincide with political borders, something which Fourrier herself emphasised (probably more clearly) in the past (‘Le territoires des royaumes chypriotes archaïques: une esquisse de géographie historique’, Cahier du Centre d’Études Chypriotes 32 [2002] 139-140). Here comes my only real reservation about the conclusions drawn by the author: based on the lack of a regional style for Támasos and the homogeneity of its terracottas with Idalion, she reaches the conclusion that, most probably, the former was dependent on the latter city-kingdom during the Cypro-Archaic period (pp. 115, 119), something that is not supported by any further evidence. Conclusions relating the subordination, or not, of one polity to another, should not always be dependent on stylistic analysis.

In the last chapter, Fourrier, states clearly her influence by de Polignac’s model, according to which the act of founding Greek - mostly extra-urban - sanctuaries expressed notions and intentions of territorial domination and sovereignty. She discusses the setting and function of the Cypro-Iron Age sanctuaries, which she divides in four main categories: urban, peri-urban, territorial and frontier. While, in what the author calls
urban, peri-urban and territorial sanctuaries, the material is mostly of local production, i.e. identical to those of a production centre, in the frontier sanctuaries the material is of a mixed variety, i.e. it combines styles from more than one city-kingdom. Extra-urban sanctuaries were directly linked to the political power of the Cypriot basileis (kings) and, consequently, with the territorial formation of the city-kingdoms; lying either along long-distance communication routes, or along ‘frontier zones’, sanctuaries were in any case linked to the evolving socio-political and socio-economic dynamics. Moving beyond the Cypro-Archaic period, the study of Cypriot sacred landscapes within the lenses of their *longue durée* (from the Late Bronze Age to the Roman period), their transformations and their possible change of meanings, can successfully reinforce Fourier’s interpretation that the extra-urban sanctuaries played an important role in the political setting of the city-kingdoms: my views on this issue are further discussed in my article ‘Cypriot Sacred Landscapes from *Basileis to Strategos*: Methodological and Interpretative Approaches’ (in *POCA* 2005, edited by G. Papantonio, Oxford, 37-45), an extensive and more developed version of which will appear as a separate chapter in a forthcoming monograph. Nonetheless, I should state here that the formation of the Cypriot sacred landscapes cannot be reduced to a passive reflection of political and economic events. We should consider the possibility that the territorial significance of extra-urban sanctuaries in ‘frontier zones’, such as those of Arsos or Vavla-Kapsales, for instance, may be the result of social (including political) developments and human feelings which follow their foundation.

At this end, it has to be acknowledged that, as regards to the spatial setting of the Cypriot sanctuaries, Fouquier, throughout her research, was the first ‘Cypriot scholar’ to methodically observe and advocate the clear interconnection of the political and religious lives in Iron Age Cyprus. Venues for high-calibre and cutting-edge research have been inspired by Fouquier’s success in offering the most meticulous and meaningful study of Cypro-Archaic terracottas in terms of understanding the island’s convoluted Iron Age history by opening the door for new and innovative approaches to a difficult and poorly studied domain of ancient Cyprus. *La coroplastie chypriote archaïque* is an important volume that successfully addresses the political state model of Iron Age Cyprus. While it will enhance the collections of the libraries of institutions where ancient Cypriot history and archaeology are studied, it is bound to be of interest to scholars of eastern Mediterranean, particularly those working in the eastern Aegean.

*Georgos Papantonio*


For a long time modern scholars have been interested in the study of local elites in the Roman Empire, although we still have not come to a full understanding. The many contributions on individual members of the elites by for instance Werner Eck and Geza Alföldy in the past decades have shown us that regional, local, and individual differences should be taken into account when attempting to draw general conclusions about local elites. Both new epigraphical and archaeological findings and new methodological approaches offer inspiring additional avenues of interpretation. An international workshop, held in Athens (2005), focused on the functioning of civic elites, particularly in the cities of the eastern half of the Roman Empire. The volume under review offers the results of the papers presented at this workshop.

Cébeillac-Gervasoni opens the volume by outlining a research program of the CNRS since 1994, entitled ‘Elites municipals italiennes de la République et de l’Empire’. This project has demonstrated that only with a team of scholars from different disciplines who all concentrate on different regions and issues one might be able to obtain an overall understanding of elites. The other contributions in the volume show how a regional focus in the eastern part of the empire (for instance on Achaia, or on cities such as Ephesos, Corinth and Aphrodisias) is similarly fruitful. These contributions can be arranged according to two themes: the role of elites within religious practices, especially the imperial cult, and the local representation of elites.

As to the first theme, since religion was a major part of civic life for all social classes, the role of elites within those religious practices is instructive for an understanding of their position within their community. As is well known, the leading families within local communities mostly dominated the priesthoods, because socially, politically and financially they were in best position to fulfill priesthoods. In the course of the first century the imperial cult became an important part of local religious life. It offered local elites not only an opportunity by which they could communicate exclusively with the imperial family, but also a way to improve their position of status and influence locally. Several contributions are exemplary for this process. Kantiréa analyzes the leading local family of Tiberius Claudius Polycrates in the second century in Sicyon that was involved in local and imperial priesthoods whereby her epigraphical reconstruction leads to a better embedding of the family within their local context. In his examination of Asiiarchs and high priests in Ephesos, Kirbhler not only discusses the debate in modern scholarship about the terminology for *asiiarch* and *archiereus*, but also focuses on their activities. They were of course part of processions during religious celebrations, but were also involved in the meetings of the provincial *koinon* and were expected to act as benefactors. Whereas we often assume that imperial priesthoods played a pivotal role in the careers of local elites, Camia argues that in Greece family and personal connections to Roman authorities functioned as the real springboards to higher positions.

Both Lo Monaco and Galli focus on individual emperors and their role within the imperial cult at local level. Lo Monaco examines the tension between the...
mostly negative literary image of Nero and his role within the imperial cult and its festivities in Greece which offers a much more positive image. Galli’s contribution describes how local cults incorporated worship of an emperor within their own practices, such as that in Athens for Hadrian who ended up ‘sharing’ the Olympieion with Zeus. Huploßer shows similar merging traditions in his analysis of Corinth’s pantheon with its diversity and mingling of old traditions and new phenomena. Incorporation of the imperial cult into existing local traditions suggests that local authorities continued to have a say in their religious practices. The analysis of deification and damnatio memoriae by Hoët-Couwenbergh shows a similar sentiment as she demonstrates how cities not always seem to have strictly followed official instructions from the imperial government, especially in the case of damnatio.

The second theme, (re)presentation of elites, concentrates on the ways in which local elites were embedded in local social structures. Pont’s contribution on Aphrodisias in the High-Empire is a prime example of how modern study of elites has to take into account unique local features. Evidence from Aphrodisias shows an unusual weak connection between benefactions and magistracies contrary to evidence from other cities in Asia Minor. Similarly, Farrington’s analysis of so-called themides - a particular type of games run by and competed in almost exclusively by the local elites - demonstrates how these games particularly in Lycia, Pamphylia and Pisidia offered an important status marker for local elites. Again, such evidence is lacking for other areas in Asia Minor.

Voutiras discusses the securely identified portrait of the famous sophist Herodes Atticus, which contrary to expectations perhaps is not the portrait of a typical philosopher, but one of a citizen, actively involved in public life. Furthermore, a second type of portrait supposedly of Herodes Atticus would make him unique as other private people in Athens are not known to have more than one type of portrait.

Finally, the volume also offers two contributions with a strong linguistic component. Zoumbaki examines protos and proteuon (defining leading members of society), their context and the way in which they relate to other terms equally applied to local leadership. Giannakopoulos investigates the honorary titles hypios boules, hypios demous and hypios poleis and demonstrates how these titles are connected to political activities and ideological representations of local elites.

Because the contributions are all linked to one of the themes, the editors Rizakis and Camia should be commended for having managed to present a coherent volume (always a difficult task with conference proceedings) which should be of interest for all of those who are interested in the functioning of local elites in the Roman Empire.

Danielle Sloatjes


The statue type commonly referred to as the Tyche of Antioch was created during the early Hellenistic era for the Seleucid city of Antioch-on-the-Orontes, and was popular from that period onwards until late Antiquity. The original statue itself, which is said to have been created by a Lyssipp sculptor called Eutychides, has not been preserved, but we have comments on its nature and meaning in (much later) texts of Pausanias and Malalas; and the type itself is widely distributed by means of all kind of media, especially on coins. A statue from the period of Hadrian, now in the Vatican (Galleria dei Candelabri), is commonly used to illustrate the original. It shows a female figure wearing a mural crown, who is seated with crossed legs on a rock and who is touching a swimming male below her with her right foot. In scholarly literature she is commonly referred to as City Tyche (‘Stadttyche’ in German) and the type as such (a woman wearing a mural crown) has been understood to represent a City Tyche par excellence from the early Hellenistic period onwards.

The impressive study by Marion Meyer deals with almost all aspects of the Tyche of Antioch in an exemplary way, and will undoubtedly become the standard reference and point of departure for all further research on the subject. Only religious aspects seem to be somewhat underplayed in the study, as M. herself also acknowledges. The voluminous book (541 pages with more than 2100 footnotes followed by almost 40 pages of illustrations, maps and tables) is part of the author’s 1996 Habilitation. The manuscript was finished in 2002; other parts of the research (see below) will be published elsewhere. One of the author’s novel conclusions is that the original statue was a personification of the city of Antioch, probably commissioned by one of the Seleucid kings, but that there are no indications that the type as such was perceived as Tyche until the Hadrianic period. But there is much more to be found and explored in this rich and dense study.

Chapter I (‘Die frühhellenistischen Bilderfindung’) deals extensively with all aspects of the original. A combination of close reading of the argumentation from earlier research with a re-evaluation of the evidence leads M. to several new conclusions. The interpretation of the statue as a Tyche, for instance, rests on the Pausanias and Malalas passages alone and can, for the Hellenistic period, not be substantiated by any other evidence. Also regarding the supposed format of the (bronze) statue, the communis opinio looks debatable: most scholars assume that the original statue was colossal, but without much argument. Following this are discussions on date, style, iconography and meaning. The Tyche of Antioch is an exciting and original statue in many respects. Statues of seated figures often give a somewhat static impression, but here the crossed legs in particular provide an enormous dynamic that is enhanced by the composition as a whole. Original in the iconography are references to Antioch’s topography by means of the mountain behind (the Silpios) and the personification of the river below (the Orontes), as well as the inclusion of a crown in the form of a city wall with towers for the figure itself. The city wall-crown has evoked much discussion, in particular because it is an element that is alien to the Greek world, but well known from the cultural milieux of Anatolia, Cyprus.
and Asia Minor. M. extensively discusses possible reasons for the coming together of different cultural elements within a new ‘Bild’, and her book therefore is important for scholars dealing with the Seleucids or, more in general, processes of cultural interaction in the Hellenistic world. M. interprets the inclusion of the ‘Eastern’ city wall-crown in the iconography as a process of ‘Aneignung’, one of the (possible) results of acculturation processes taking place in the early Hellenistic period. By taking this approach to the problem M. distances herself from an earlier interpretation by B. Fehr (Visible Religion 7, 1990, 83-97), who argued for the possibility of a (simultaneous) ‘Eastern’ and ‘Greek’ reading of the iconography, depending on the background of the viewer. M., however, sees the iconography as ‘kompromißlos einsprachig’ (151): the Seleucid king responsible for the statue wanted to communicate to all people from his (extremely multi-ethnic) Empire and he choose the ‘Greek’ visual language to do so.

Chapter II (‘Die Verwendung des Typus von spät-hellenistischer bis späantiker Zeit’) discusses, in about 150 pages, the distribution of the type, first in Antioch itself and next throughout the Mediterranean and the Near East at large. Throughout Antiquity the Tyche of Antiochia remained most popular in Antioch itself and in the surrounding Anatolian and Near Eastern regions, especially Cilicia and Syria. In her interpretation of the type in its many local contexts, M. makes a sensible distinction between ‘Abbildungen’, ‘Nachbildungen’ and ‘Zitate’. The catalogue at the basis of this Chapter is printed at the end of the book and consists of the categories ‘Rundplastik’, ‘Nachbildungen aus Bronze und Silber’, ‘Werke aus Ton’, ‘Werke aus Glas’, ‘Reliefplastik’, ‘Mosaik und Malerei’, ‘Gemmen und Schmuck’, ‘Siegelabdrücke’, one ‘Nachantikes Werk’, and three pieces sometimes ascribed to the type, but without reason. The largest part of the catalogue in quantitative terms, however, are the coins: 396 coin types show the Tyche of Antioch, and on top of that 54 coin types from cities in the Decapolis and Arabia display persons wearing a city-walk-crown in combination with other figures. Mints using the Tyche of Antioch (around 90) can mainly be found in Asia Minor, but also in Europe. In her analysis of the application of the type, M. makes an important distinction between the late Hellenistic/early Imperial period (in which it would have been used to convey specific, local messages) and the later Imperial period (in which it would have been commemorative in a very general sense): a shift in meaning from a personification of the city of Antioch in particular, to a Tyche of a city.

Chapter III (‘Zu Konzeption und Ikonographie der Stadttyche in hellenistischer Zeit’) deals, more specifically, with the whole discussion on the concept of ‘Stadttyche’ in the Hellenistic period. No text mentioning the Tyche of a city has been preserved, but M. explores relevant historical contexts in combination with archaeological evidence to come to a reconstruction of the development of the concept. Here, logically, the existence of a tradition distinguishing the personified Tyche of individual persons plays an important role; something M. sees happening from the period around 200 BC onwards.

Also part of the research, but not published in this book, were Chapters on (depictions of) the city-wall crown and its meaning in the ancient (pre Hellenistic) Near East and the Hellenistic period itself.


Sohei Bakhoun, who passed away in 2003 at the age of only 56, was a well-known specialist on Alexandrian numismatics and this volume is a fitting in memoriam to her person and work. The beautifully produced book contains nineteen articles (seven in French, four in English, four in Italian and four in German) preceded by three hommages (including Bakhoun’s bibliography on pp. 17-19 and an essay on her own small collection of Alexandrian coins by D. Gerin, plates 1-5) and a foreword by J. Leclant.

The essays are grouped in four categories. The first one (Questions d’identification) has articles by O. Picard (À la recherche du pentadrachme d’Héron d’Alexandrie: on a specific coin type Heron of Alexandria describes as needed for a machine automatically distributing libation water), A. Burnett (The Alexandrian Coinage of Caligula: only one type, from which four rare examples have been preserved, can be attributed to the Alexandrian mint; it shows Caligula with a radiant crown and had no monetary/economic significance whatsoever), and B. Lichocka (Un tétradrachme de Néron, dit “miroir de Néron”, trouvé à Kôm el-Dikka à Alexandrie: on an enigmatic find from 1987 of what turns out to be a tetradrachm originally showing Nero with radiant crown and Sarapis on the reverse side).

The second and largest category (Trésors et fouilles) contains eight articles. M. Amardy (Un dépôt de monnaies alexandriennes au Musée départemental d’Art, ancien et contemporain d’Épinal) provides a list of a group of 33 Alexandrian coins dating from the second part of the 3rd century AD and now in the museum of Épinal (Lorraine, France). Although hoards of Alexandrian coins are known in the Roman world from Italy, Belgium and Denmark, this group has probably been brought from Egypt by a traveller during later periods. R. Martini (Un nuclo di tetradrachmi alessandrini di Probus della collezione Laffranchi, nelle Cinque Raccolte Numismatiche di Milano di “acquisto” Dall’Arca) adds with this article a group of 40 coins from the reign of Probus to his contribution to the catalogue Probus.
Italia, Aegyptus III from 1992. Next, M. Seif el Din M., M. Shahin and T. Faucher (Un trésor de monnaies ptolémaïques en bronze au Musée gréco-romain, d’Alexandrie le trésor de Nag Hammadi 1957) present an unpublicized group of 80 bronze Ptolemaic coins from the region of Nag Hammadi (in upper Egypt), probably a hoard, all showing Zeus Ammon and now in the Graeco-Roman Museum in Alexandria (Coins from Nag Hammadi in the Graeco-Roman Museum in Alexandria) publishes another group from that region, consisting of 264 bronze coins dating from the end of the 3rd century and the beginning of the 4th century AD (GRM P6639). The essay by H.-C. Noeske (Der Münzschatz von Abu al-Gad und einige Überlegungen zum Hortungsortverhalten im kaiserzeitlichen Ägypten) is somewhat more wide ranging (pp. 113-153). Noeske provides a new and corrected list of the Abu al-Gad hoard - found near Luxor in 1968 and consisting of 233 Alexandrian billion tetradrachmas from the Roman imperial period - and investigates on the basis of that evidence questions about chronology and economic functioning. M. Shahin (A Hoard of Alexandrian Billion Tetradrachms found in 1967 in Kom Aushim) publishes a hoard, already found in 1967, from ancient Karanis. The coins date from the 1st century AD, mainly from Nero’s time. A.R. Parente (Monete da Bakchias, Campagne di scavo 2003-2007) provides an overview of the coins found by the Italian mission in Bakchias, in the Fayum, in recent excavations. M.-C. Marcellesi (La série romaine tardive d’Alexandrie aux types de Sarapis et du Nil), lastly, takes up the interesting question on the dating and meaning of a series of late-antique coins showing Sarapis and the Nile god. Six new coins of this type have been found in recent excavations in Alexandria. Similar examples from Antioch and Nicomedium show a tyche in stead of the Nile god. The use of these pagan symbols would be remarkable in the Christian period, and scholars like J. Van Heesch have therefore brought these coins in connection with anti-Christian politics taking place at the beginning of the 4th century AD. Convincingly, however, Marcellesi dates the coins to the period 294-317 AD (for Alexandria) and 310-320 AD (for Antioch) and argues that the depiction of Nile and Tyche are linked with civic identity.

The third category (Iconographie) consists of six more interpretative articles which draw in other categories of evidence apart from coins alone. F. Queyrel (Le Pseudo-Cleopâtre de la Maison du Diadumène à Délòs) continues his investigations of the iconography of Cleopatra VII and convincingly argues here that the portrait of a woman found at Delos does not represent the Ptolemaic queen. He discusses the context in which the statue was found (the house is named after the find of a copy of the Diadumenos of Polyclitus) and sees this as a very rich and large mansion or perhaps even the seat of a collegium. The portrait dates from the period before 69 BC and would thus present a fine example of the ‘image bourgeoise’ of that era. Queyrel suggests that Cleopatra VII draws on that image in her iconography, and thus have would herself displayed as “reine et femmes d’affaires” alike. A contribution by L. Bricault and R. Veymiers (Un portrait de Néron doté du sistre isiaque) conveniently brings together all evidence on the relations between Nero and Egypt based on the publication of a remarkable intaglio which shows a portrait of the emperor holding a sistrum, the Isiac marker par excellence in the Roman world. In their conclusion the authors intelligently distinguish between cultic and cultural interpretations: although they characterise Nero as ‘égypophile’, there (indeed) is no evidence to see him as an Isis devotee and the sistrum on the intaglio could have been applied for various other reasons. A. Geissen (Sabaia-Demeter-Isis. Eine Klarstellung) presents all Alexandrian coins showing Saba, the wife of Emperor Hadrian. G.M. Staffieri and M. Tosi (La barca sacra di Osiris nella monetazione alessandrina) do the same with regard to the Osiris barge and boat processions (unfortunately not taking into account the considerations by P.G.P. Meyboom in their interpretation, The Nile Mosaic of Palestrina (Leiden 1995) pp. 136-146). F. Barakat (Zu Agathos Daimon und seinen Darstellungen in der alexandrinischen Kunst) lists some depictions of Agathos Daimon from Alexandria (for the subject see now extensively M. Malaise, Pour une terminologie et une analyse des cultes isiaques (Bruxelles 2005) 159-176). M. Weber (Aegyptus in Nummis) discusses two separate subjects. He argues that the ram displayed on Ptolemaic coins showing Alexander refers to Amun/Ammon and not, as is sometimes thought, to Chnum; and next discusses a very interesting tetradrachm from the time of Trajan that would display Isis next to the schematically indicated tomb of Osiris (for which see above).

The fourth and final category (Histoire des études alexandrines) contains two articles (E. Christiansen, Dattari, Milne, Currelly and 30-40,000 Alexandrian Coins and A. Savio, Giovanni Dattari ‘égyptologue’). On the Italian collector Giovanni Dattari who, at the beginning of the 20th century, compiled a large and important collection of Greco-Roman coins from Egypt that is now dispersed across several countries and museums.

This is a rich volume in many respects and an important contribution to Alexandrian numismatics.

Miguel John Verslyps


Patricia S. Lulof, one of the leading specialists in the field of architectural terracottas of ancient Italy, has written the definitive catalogue of the collection of architectural terracottas held in the Allard Pierson Museum in Amsterdam. Lulof had previously published a ground-breaking book, The Ridge-Pole Statues from the Late Archaic Temple at Satricum (Amsterdam 1996), in which her careful documentation of every fragment allowed reconstruction drawings of ten life-size statues that decorated the ridge of Temple II at Satricum. Her identification and reconstruction drawings of the fragments of bases for these statues settled once and for all the question of whether such statues were votive dedications that stood on the ground or architectural embellishments on the roof. She is inter-
that makes her unique in the field. She has successfully co-organized and co-edited two of the four pivotal conferences on architectural terracottas in ancient Italy, and has numerous projects in progress, including the final publication of the roofs of Satricum, co-authored with Riemer Knoop. Thus, she is eminently qualified to publish the Amsterdam collection of architectural terracottas.

The collection encompasses roof elements from the Archaic period through Roman times, with various different types of elements represented (revetment plaques, antefixes, spouts, acroteria, pedimental sculpture, and tiles, as well as moulds for producing antefixes). Examples come from Asia Minor, Greece, Southern Italy and Sicily, Etruria, Latium, and Campania, giving the full spectrum of ancient roofing systems, a surprising result since the collection was not formed with this intention in mind, but is rather the result primarily of purchases of private collections and of gifts to the museum. While many of the pieces have duplicate counterparts in other museums and/or from documented excavations, a number are unique and especially important, such as the moulds, which illustrate so well the means of production of multiple examples of decorated elements needed for individual roofs.

The publication is a model for presentations of collections for this category of antiquities. In addition to providing full descriptions and discussions of each item, each piece is well illustrated by clear photographs of front and side views (and in several cases also the back view), and drawings illustrating all details of the moulded decoration, the breaks, and sections, made by the author, an important supplement to the photographic documentation which is rarely available in studies of this kind. Color photographs of special pieces amply demonstrate the remains of painted decoration and even the terracotta fabric of the piece. Comparisons are fully documented for each example and the bibliography is up-to-date and very comprehensive.

Each section of the catalogue is preceded by a general discussion of roofs of the period and geographical area as a whole, as well as of the category of roof element that follows, giving a history of scholarship and forming both an introduction and a framework into which the museum pieces are then integrated and given context, an important feature as many of the objects have no known provenance. Within each entry, further comments on the individual piece go into more explicit detail of the state of our knowledge on the type and the basis for dating.

Of particular importance in this catalogue in comparison with earlier catalogues of this category of antiquities is a persistent focus on technical matters, from careful descriptions of the fabric (both clays and inclusions) and paints, and manufacturing processes (handmade vs. mouldmade, generations of moulds, evidence for use of separate moulds for different parts of the same piece), to discussions of distribution of moulds and types from one center to another. This discussion is well served by the inclusion of side and back views, and drawings that illustrate how the antefixes were attached to the cover tiles, angles at which the roof element sat, slanted edges of revetment plaques that tell the slope of the roof, etc.

Another important feature is inclusion of discussion of what the decoration meant in terms of the building to which it belonged. Again,full control of bibliography concerning these issues over the widely ranging dates and geographical areas encompassed by the collection is apparent, drawing in different hypotheses proposed by other scholars and defending the most credible of them. The changing fates of centers of production apparent in swelling or dwindling amounts of terracotta roofs are explained by historical factors impacting on the life of the city in question.

The author’s expertise and enthusiasm for her field of specialization comes through on every page of the catalogue. In providing us with this publication of the Allard Pierson Museum’s collection of architectural terracottas, she has given us an encapsulated history of terracotta roofing throughout the ancient Mediterranean world.

Nancy A. Winter


The orientation of the Israeli academy was long dominated by the study of the monotheistic sources and context. ‘Foreign cults’ were conceived interesting only in terms of their interaction with monotheism. The study of antiquity in Palestine somehow missed ‘the pagan side of the story’. The few scholars who have a true Classical orientation, succeeded from time to time to shine with the torch of Demeter upon the domination of polytheistic elements in urban centers, but those religions always retained the monolithic status of ‘the foreign’, not to mention ‘the inferior’. Worshipping the Gods is thus an important collection of archaeological remains and literary sources that can serve as a base for a research that moves towards accepting the position of polytheistic cults and shifting the view towards understanding the Hellenisation of those cults in a region that is dominated by Jewish existence.

As the title indicates, Worshipping the Gods focuses upon evidence of polytheistic cults in Roman Palestine. Archeological remains and artistic visual testimonies are most important for identifying religious activity. The combination of these with literary sources forms a unique combination which is essential for creating a full and reliable reconstruction of religious life in antiquity. The book Worshipping the Gods has both components, but still misses the opportunity to create a flowing, coherent narrative.

The introduction defines the main aim of the book as creating a catalogue of the local cults. And this has been executed by Ovadiah and Mucznik meticulously. The book collects and presents material in an alphabetic order of deities, starting with Aphrodite ending with Zeus. Undoubtedly, the two authors invested an immense effort in the collection of the material: the
amount of pagan imagery that was brought to light by archaeological excavations in Israel through the decades is enormous. Most of it was published in various journals and excavation reports, but no systematic collection has hitherto been attempted. The collection of literary sources is even more surprising. Palestine was not a prominent province and references to it in Roman literature are few. The book includes a treasure of references from the Roman literature concerning the various cults, in the context of its presence in Palestine and its cities. As far as I know, this is the only attempt made hitherto to collect such references and to bring them in relation to the archaeological finds. Curiously, the study does not pose any specific question in relation to the collected material. It had the potential to shed light upon the Hellenisation of the polytheistic cults in the East, create a new definition for that element in society and a new insight into the non-Jewish cultural network of large, mostly urban, communities in Palestine. But these expectations apparently surpassed the aim of the authors. On the other hand, the authors clearly struggled with certain methodological questions, such as the definition of criteria that define a cult and indicate its existence (assuming that solely the existence of a sculpture of a certain divinity does not indicate yet the existence of its cult).

Unfortunately, the choice for an alphabetic approach distorts the discussion in the phenomenon of syncretism, so often stressed by the content of the book. It is mentioned more than once that Astarte and Ba’al were identified with Aphrodite and Zeus respectively. But when did this process of Hellenisation of local cults take place? What is this identification based on? And in what way can such identifications deepen our understanding regarding the nature of the cult of a local deity? Especially in those cases where a local deity retained its autochthonous cult deep into the Roman period it seems that the cult fulfilled a religious need that was not satisfied by the Hellenistic alternative. Which aspects are these? And is the cliché identification of Ba’al/Zeus/Jupiter then still valid? A more nuanced approach towards the developments that took place in the local religion would have the potential to shed more light on the Hellenisation of eastern cults and create a fascinating, innovative narrative.

Despite all this, Worshipping the Gods marks a change of attitude in the effort to contribute to the understanding of polytheistic cults in Israel, which is an important statement in itself. The book offers a firm starting-point for future investigation, with an epilogue that summarizes the central issues such as ‘statistics’ of popularity of certain cults, the domination of certain cults in certain cities or regions, and the preference for a certain aspect of a divinity (and its iconography) by the local worshippers. With this rich material, the future scholar can deepen the investigation into the polytheistic existence in Palestine, its development and continuation, at times deep into the Christian era.

Diklah Zohar