intriguing possibility that this most impressive and monumental phase of the Pnyx may not have been completed, an idea supported by the unfinished nature of the bema itself and the two large "unfinished stoas" on the terrace above.

D. Romano reconsiders both the form and function of Pnyx III and responds to criticism of his earlier theory (*AJA* 89 [1985] 441–54) that the Pnyx was the site of the "Panathenaic Theater and Stadium" constructed by Lycurgus. Despite admonitions that there are very few stadia for which we know the precise length between starting lines, and no accurately measured stadia in Athens from any period, Romano's proposed foot length of 0.2157 m for his hypothetical stadium on the terrace above the bema is still far shorter than any attested elsewhere in the Greek world. His restoration of double-sided spectator embankments on the foundations usually identified as the "unfinished stoas" is also unconvincing. The most controversial aspect of this paper, however, is its new suggestion that the Great Altar of Athena Polias is to be located on the Pnyx instead of on the Acropolis. Romano's argument is based upon his interpretation of a fourth-century B.C. inscription (*IG* II², 339), which is the only preserved text to mention the "Great Altar" by name. Although Romano correctly points out that the inscription does not refer to the "Great Altar" as being on the Acropolis specifically, there is also nothing in the text itself to suggest that any of the sacrifices or shrines mentioned are to be located anywhere else. Romano produces no archaeological evidence to support his theory apart from a rock-cut bedding for a large altar on the terrace behind the speaker's platform, tentatively identified by previous scholars as the so-called "Altar of Zeus Agoraios."

The cult of Zeus Hypsistos on the Pnyx in the Roman period is reviewed briefly by B. Forsén, who proposes that the height of the rock-cut niches in the shrine suggests a slightly sloping ground level, possibly a feature of Pnyx III. The religious aspect of the Pnyx is further explored by A. Domínguez, who discusses the establishment of the cult as part of the transformation of Greek assembly places into religious precincts during the Roman period. Seen in this larger context, the reuse of the older political center for either popular or state cults provides insight into the evolution of the Greek city and its institutions in the Roman empire. Domínguez distinguishes four different types of reuse, ranging from full or partial reuse or renovation to the destruction or burial of the earlier political structure and the establishment of a new cult on the same location. The discussions and comparisons are informative, but sometimes unclear (e.g., the theater at Syracuse [61], where twice "1st century A.D." should be substituted for "1st century B.C.") or seem forced (e.g., the Old Bouleuterion at Athens as an example of a building destroyed or buried).

This volume presents an important collection of current research on the Pnyx and will be most useful to scholars who are already familiar with the history and topography of Athens. Each paper is thoroughly documented and there is an extensive unified bibliography at the end, along with an index of literary and epigraphical sources and an annotated list of illustrations. The numerous illustrations are well chosen and generally of very high quality. The editors have missed only a few typographical errors and minor inconsistencies, and several passages of Greek are not translated.

KEVIN T. GLOWACKI

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL STUDIES
INDIANA UNIVERSITY
BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA 47405
KGLOWACK@INDIANA.EDU

THE HILL-FORTS OF THE SAMNITES, by *S.P. Oakley.* (Archaeological Monographs of the British School at Rome 10.) Pp. xi + 164, pls. 88, figs. 57, map 1. British School at Rome, London 1995. £35. ISBN 0-904152-28-6.

THE SAMNITES OF THE FOURTH CENTURY BC AS DEPICTED ON CAMPANIAN VASES AND IN OTHER SOURCES, by *G. Schneider-Herrmann* (edited by *Edward Herring*, with a foreword by *A.D. Trendall*). (*BICS* Suppl. 61; Accordia Specialist Studies on Italy 2.) Pp. xxxiii + 143, pls. 166, figs. 75. Institute of Classical Studies, University of London; Accordia Research Centre, London 1996. £45. ISBN 0-900587-64-4.

I SANNITI: CAUDINI, IRPINI, PENTRI, CARRICINI, FRENTANI, by *Gianluca Tagliamonte.* (Biblioteca di archeologia 25.) Pp. 322, pls. 92, figs. 53. Longanesi, Milan 1996. Lit. 56,000. ISBN 88-304-1372-0.

The height of the revolution in Samnite studies was in the 1970s and early 1980s. The excitement of these times is best represented in the catalogue of the exhibition held in Isernia, *Sannio: Pentri e Frentani dal VI al I sec. a.C.* (Rome 1980), and a companion volume of conference proceedings with the same title, published in Campobasso in 1984. Both the availability of new material evidence and methodological advances in the study of it hinted at a brave new world within which the cultural, social, and political history of the Samnites would no longer be centered on Livy's account of the Samnite Wars with material evidence used more or less as "illustrations" of that story. In short, by the early 1980s, the Samnites were beginning to look a good deal more complex than the harsh-living heroes of E.T. Salmon's book, *Samnium and the Samnites* (Cambridge 1967): the concepts of "urbanism" and "Hellenism" now seemed more applicable than images of cultural isolation and "backwardness." Perhaps inevitably, the excitement of those years has not continued with the same intensity, although no one would want to deny that a good deal of necessary and

highly valuable work has been done both to reinforce and to modify the predominant, but sometimes impressionistic, models of the 1970s and early 1980s.

Tagliamonte's new synthesis, appearing most of 30 years after the publication of *Samnium and the Samnites*, is essential reading both for those who already have an interest in the history and culture of non-Roman Italy in antiquity, and for those who really ought to develop such an interest now that ancient history, led by archaeology, is moving steadily away from a more or less exclusive concentration on the "center" of Rome. While this book is written for a comparatively broad audience, it remains a very careful and scholarly account of modern views on "pre-Samnite" and "Samnite" cultures down to the second century B.C., with a useful indication of the most important items of bibliography for each section. The book is divided into three major sections. The first deals with ancient traditions on the Samnites, emphasizing social and cultural relations with Magna Graecia. The second includes a detailed area-by-area account of "pre-Samnite" cultures, based largely on evidence from the Archaic necropolises. In the last section, to my mind the most interesting, Tagliamonte discusses Samnite history, culture, and self-definition from the period of the Samnite Wars to the second century B.C. Readers who compare Tagliamonte's account of cult places (179–202) with Salmon's section on "Religion" (143–81) will get a very strong sense of what the revolution in Samnite studies has been all about. Salmon's Samnites are textbook primitives, the picture of their cult practices drawn in large part from Cato, Livy, Vergil, and Strabo, characterized by fetishism, taboos, and purification rituals. Tagliamonte's account is led rather by studies of the architecture, iconography, and epigraphy of cult centers, and of the forms and distributions of votive offerings, with much to be said about benefactions and local elites, and economic and cultural connections with other parts of the Hellenistic world.

There is great virtue in a single-authored work of this nature that judiciously synthesizes scholarship based on a broad range of sometimes difficult material—archaeological, art historical, literary, and epigraphical—that is normally of necessity divided up according to expertise and published in a fragmented way. At the same time, it draws a map of modern preoccupations (to some extent led by contemporary scholarship, but often reflecting broader popular interest) that is itself rather revealing. The devotion of two of the three sections, almost half the length of the text, to "origins" and "pre-Samnite cultures" makes for an account that is slightly "top heavy," particularly in view of the comparative paucity of material evidence for these earlier periods. Occasionally, our picture of "pre-Samnite" society is fleshed out in more detail than is really warranted. Most notably, the "pre-Samnite" warrior is brought to life from the emphasis on arms and armor in funerary ideology (123–24), but he looks like a cardboard-cutout created to fit a landscape that determines human activity (cf. 34–38), controlling the *tratturi* and pillaging goods in an environment within which competition over resources is a keynote. Despite the author's awareness of the problems of explanations based on "environmental determinism" (36), such explanations creep in when there is little else to go on. More generally, a version of Salmon's affection for the Samnites as anti-Roman figures, in cultural as well as political terms, still lingers to some extent in Samnite scholarship: it is interesting that, in Tagliamonte's account, individual Samnite cultures are eliminated from the narrative as they become less obviously "Samnite" in terms of their distinctiveness from Rome. My one serious criticism of this book is that it does not reflect the considerable attention paid in the most recent scholarship on the Samnites to the archaeology of the central Apennines first in areas most directly affected by the Roman conquest (e.g., Latin colonies such as Venusia), and second for the period after the Social War. It would have been good to see the unhelpful disciplinary boundaries between the study of "Italic" and "Roman" cultures broken down in a book aimed at a comparatively broad readership. In sum, however, I hope that we will soon see an English translation of this excellent book, to broaden that readership further.

As we have begun to see, a new synthesis can reveal gaps in the state of knowledge and understanding as surely as it can reveal developments. Plenty of areas of Samnite culture remain impressionistic, and much work remains to be done in terms both of new and extended survey and excavation and of further analysis of different bodies of evidence. The books by Schneider-Herrmann and Oakley both aim to provide detailed analyses of bodies of evidence. Schneider-Herrmann's book is a monument to a lifetime of diligent and careful examination of detail, and readers should focus on the detailed descriptions of articles of clothing and the like, rather than on attempts to read much about "real life" directly from such scenes. Inevitably, this book will be overshadowed by the impressive work of Pontrandolfo and Rouveret—especially their *Le tombe dipinte di Paestum* (Modena 1992), which is concerned primarily with the tomb paintings of Paestum and Campania, but also with connections between tomb painting and vase painting, and which offers a sophisticated reading of scenes as reflections less of "real life" than of the changing ideals, preoccupations, and cultural horizons of these societies. Schneider-Herrmann's readers are also likely to be confused by her use of the term "Samnite": this blanket usage can unfortunately blur distinctions between a number of different cultural contexts.

In his attempt to understand in a systematic way the terrain of the high Apennines by exploring the hill forts, Oakley set himself a Herculean task. As he says himself (1–2), even finding the walls of a fair number of the hill forts is difficult or even impossible, requiring access to local knowledge and fighting through vegetation. There is clearly some virtue in the results of this labor, primarily for those who do not read Italian: Oakley has pulled together and assessed published accounts that are often very hard to find, and this will make more familiar some lesser-known sites of Samnium. Beyond this, one sometimes has to wonder what it all adds up to. The choice of the hill forts of Samnium as a subject and the unity of this subject (such as it is) are presumably drawn from the author's interest in the Livian account of the Samnite Wars (e.g., 5, 131–40; cf. x–xi). The main conclusion to be drawn from this work is how little we know about most of these hill forts, and how few answers we have in most cases to the most fundamental of questions, concerning dates of construction, terminal dates of occupation and use of any kind,

relationship with settlements, necropolises, and cult centers, and finally the number of these sites that were settled on anything like a permanent basis, rather than acting as seasonal and occasional refuges. It is not clear that it is a synthesis combined with autopsy (but not fresh survey or excavation) that is the best way of advancing our knowledge at present. Instead, we will have to hope for further long-term surveys and excavations of individual sites, along the lines of De Benedittis's work on Monte Vairano, and wait a few more years for a more conclusive overview of hill forts in Samnium.

EMMA DENCH

BIRKBECK COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
MALET STREET
LONDON WC1E 7HX
UNITED KINGDOM
E.DENCH@HISTORY.BBK.AC.UK

LA STIPE VOTIVA DEL TEMPIO "E" DI METAPONTO, by *Giorgio Postrioti.* (Archaeologica 117; Corpus delle stipi votive in Italia 9.) Pp. 159, pls. 26, foldout plans 2. Giorgio Bretschneider, Rome 1996. ISBN 88-7689-146-3; ISSN 0391-9293.

The *Corpus delle stipi votive in Italia*, edited by M. Torelli and A. Comella, deserves particular recognition as a wide-ranging collection of volumes offering scholars an overview of the vast array of materials held in the storerooms of museums that they would otherwise be unable to use. This is the ninth volume in the series and the second devoted to regio III. It presents the votive offerings found in the so-called "Temple E," situated in the eastern part of the sacred area at Metapontum and erected in the third century B.C.

After a brief introduction (13–15) with an outline of the history of the excavations, the volume is divided into two parts. The first (17–135) consists of the analytical catalogue of the finds, the second (137–53) is a summary of the chronological, cult, and historical questions associated with Temple E.

The catalogue lists the finds under five headings, the largest section (21–115) being devoted to the terracotta votive tablets and figurines. A series of tables or bar charts offering an immediate illustration of the frequency of the types and their variants would have been useful, both as a source of statistics and also to spare the reader the task of searching for data scattered throughout the catalogue.

The catalogue of terracottas has certainly been produced with care: individual descriptions are given of all the legible pieces, including the sometimes dozens that are absolutely identical. It would have been possible to confine such descriptions to the single types and variants, together with the fragment used for their reconstruction, followed by a simple statement of the total numbers. Equally useful, especially for the types and variants preserved only in part, would have been the inclusion of drawings indicating the positions of noncontiguous fragments. This method provides a simple and rational way of publishing a substantial number of fragments, and makes it unnecessary to weigh down the text with long descriptions (see A. Muller, "La coroplathie: Un travail de petite fille? Les figurines de terre cuite, de l'atelier à la publication: Questions de methode," *RA* 1994, 179–87).

Careful analysis of the fragments has led to reconstruction of the types and their comparison with other previously published specimens from the same molds. In addition to those cited, mention may be made of others that illustrate the range of diffusion of terracottas similar to those deposited in Temple E. Several other fragments, for example, can be referred to the type represented by the statuette of a crouching silenus with a woman sitting on his shoulder (BI, 73–83). In addition to the unpublished fragments from the town and sanctuary of San Biagio alla Venella held by the Metaponto Museum, there is the head of a silenus found in the indigenous site of Pomarico Vecchio (see M. Barra Bagnasco, "Pomarico Vecchio (Matera). Scavi in un abitato indigeno (1989–91)," *NSc* 1992, 209, fig. 46), as well as the fragments found on Metapontine farms (see V. Barberis, "Le fattorie della chora metapontina. Note sui culti," *Bollettino storico Basilicata* 11 [1995] 29–31, fig. 15). These finds are of wide and especially cultic interest, since they illustrate the diffusion of this type not only in Metapontum and its chora, but also in indigenous areas.

Despite his minute analysis, the author refers the whole of this material to the period 320–270 B.C. and makes no further chronological distinctions. This, of course, was a period of great vitality in Lucania prior to its first contacts with the Romans, and one to which the structures and materials of a variety of localities are generally assigned. Yet even though the dating of isolated terracotta fragments may be problematic, when more substantial quantities are available, as here, it should be possible to suggest narrower dating ranges. Particularly with respect to types that have not been previously studied, such as the pinakes with maenad and silenus (AI to AV), the number of fragments and the many ways in which the figures are portrayed (satyr or silenus facing right or left, standing or in lively movement) could be used to at least work out an internal sequence and thus result in greater precision, even in terms of time.

The deposit contained very few ceramic fragments: just over 30 of fine type and about a dozen of common type, all illustrated by drawings (figs. 4–10). As the author remarks, however, they serve to corroborate the chronology of the deposit. It would therefore have been desirable to look further afield for comparisons in the catalogues of the Taranto Museum, or in G. Pianu, *La necropoli meridionale di Heraclea* I (Rome 1990), for example, and in the numerous articles on ceramics found in the Basilicata and Puglia. Morel's work is taken as the basic text. Even so, some of the comparisons are not convincing: fragment D6 (fig. 4f), for instance, is compared with Morel's shape 2625 and thus dated to the beginning of the third century, whereas it seems closer to the Archaic rimmed skyphoi typically produced at Metapontum. Fragment D9 (fig. 5c), too, is likened to foot type 3611 b1, which has a much wider stem, whereas it is perhaps the neck of a lekythos and, in any event, cannot be classed among the handleless cups.

These remarks in no way diminish the interest of the work. More than praiseworthy, indeed, is the prompt