



Review

Author(s): Rex Wallace

Review by: Rex Wallace

Source: *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. 102, No. 2 (Apr., 1998), pp. 460-461

Published by: Archaeological Institute of America

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/506502>

Accessed: 19-06-2016 11:40 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Archaeological Institute of America is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Journal of Archaeology*

BOOK NOTES

DALLE CAPANNE ALLE ROBBE: LA STORIA LUNGA DI MILOCCA-MILENA, edited by *Vincenzo La Rosa*. Pp. 386, pls. 61, figs. 166. Pro Loco di Milena, Milena 1997.

This latest contribution to Sicily's growing corpus of regional studies compiles the results of 20 years of archaeological fieldwork in the environs of Milena (formerly Milocca) in the island's south-central interior. Initially motivated by a desire to amplify understanding of the local later Bronze Age and its "Mycenaean connection," this project has expanded to encompass the entire span of human habitation in the region. In addition to making an inventory of numerous rock-cut tombs, particularly those of "tholos" design, La Rosa's fieldwork has entailed survey and surface collection as well as soundings and more extensive excavations at a number of selected locales, among which the prehistoric sites on Serra del Palco figure prominently both for their architectural remains and well-stratified deposits. Though described as "systematic" (193), the methods of regional reconnaissance employed are not presented. Minimally, one would like a clearer delineation of the areas surveyed and discussion of the fieldwalking and collection methods used—information ultimately essential for evaluation of the regional patterns revealed and their use for comparative purposes. These comments aside, the thoughtful contributions by Guzzone (Neolithic ceramics), Maniscalco (Eneolithic ceramics), Privitera and Palio (early and late Early Bronze Age ceramics, respectively), Nicoletti (lithics), and Wilkens (faunal remains) are particularly notable for their efforts to situate their material in terms of broader spatial and temporal patterns.

Compared to the wealth of information regarding the region's prehistoric occupation, the material remains of later periods receive relatively cursory coverage. The single article dealing with the Greek period presents a rather static picture, making little effort to explore the potential for change within its temporal boundaries, while discussion of Roman and medieval settlement is limited largely to the evidence provided by a single site. The final quarter of the volume consists of a diverse, though always interesting, array of items of local historical, ethnographic, linguistic, and literary interest, including excerpts from and commentary on Charlotte Gower Chapman's *Milocca: A Sicilian Village* (Cambridge, Mass. 1971). Discussion of Milena's unique configuration of agricultural hamlets (*le robbe* in local dialect) dispersed around a small, nominally urban center regrettably is limited to Gower Chapman's observations and a brief treatise on design, construction, and current conservation efforts.

Overall, students of Sicilian archaeology will find few surprises in this volume, as fully two-thirds of its 47 contributions are reprints of previous publications. Despite its format as omnibus rather than synthesis, this volume reads remarkably well, charting not only the major contours of the region's long-term history, but also providing tantalizing glimpses into the dynamic interplay between archaeological thought and fieldwork seemingly charac-

teristic of this project's own, yet unfolding, *storia lunga*. *Dalle capanne alle "robbe"* will be valued in Milena and beyond.

STEPHEN M. THOMPSON

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA 22903
SMT6Z@VIRGINIA.EDU

I TIRRENI A LEMNOS: EVIDENZA LINGUISTICA E TRADIZIONI STORICHE, by *Carlo de Simone*. (Biblioteca di "Studi Etruschi" 23.) Pp. 117, fig. 1, table 1. Leo S. Olschki Editore, Florence 1996. Lit. 50,000. ISSN 0067-7450; ISBN 88-222-4432-X (paper).

The major theme of the monograph under review is that the language of the Lemnians—to be precise, the language of the so-called Stele of Kaminia and of other short, fragmentary texts—is archaic Etruscan. Here de Simone argues that there is incontrovertible linguistic evidence for this view, and that the evidence from the Greek historical tradition may in fact provide some support for Tyrrhenian presence in the Aegean in the Archaic period.

The monograph is organized in two parts: linguistic investigation and a review of evidence from the historical tradition. De Simone attempts to merge the results of each part in the short concluding section, though not very successfully. But that is no surprise, and ultimately unimportant. If the linguistic evidence supports the position that Lemnian is an Etruscan dialect, then that result stands, regardless of what the Greek historical tradition says about the presence of Tyrrhenians in the Aegean.

The significance of the linguistic section "I nuovi dati linguistici" far surpasses that concerned with the Greek historical tradition, and is the most substantive contribution to the problem of the relationship of Lemnian to Etruscan in the last 10 years. The analyses and interpretations of the Lemnian data are insightful, methodologically scrupulous, and packed with phonological and morphological detail.

De Simone may well be right that the new Lemnian inscription from Cabirion, which reads LATITA, is to be parsed as LA TITA, and interpreted as LA(RΘAI) TITA, praenomen + gentilicium. If he is, the consequences are dramatic. The gentilicium TITA is in origin a praenomen that has been converted into a gentilicium, a morphological practice that is peculiar to Etruscan. Add to this the fact that the name TITA is a *borrowing* either from Latin or a Sabellian language, and one has solid backing for the claim that Lemnian is transplanted Etruscan. How else to explain the existence on a Lemnian inscription of a borrowing from Italic, or of a native Etruscan morphological process converting praenomina to gentilicia?

De Simone's analysis and interpretation of the constituents of an onomastic phrase (AKER TAVARSIO VANA-LAŠIAL = "Aker Tavorsio, (son) of Vanalasi") from the Stele of Kaminia are equally compelling. The morphological

analysis of the genitive VANALAŠIAL is a case in point. He argues for a division into morphological constituents à la Etruscan: base *VANA-, suffix -LA (e.g., Etruscan TITE-LA), suffix -SIE-/SI (e.g., Etruscan NUME-SIE) + genitive -AL (Etruscan LARIS-AL). Moreover, he claims that the sibilant consonant in the -SI suffix has undergone palatization to -ŠI, a phonological feature found in north, but not in south, Etruscan inscriptions. The result, then, is that Lemnian may not just be archaic Etruscan, but may well be dialectal north Etruscan.

Whether or not de Simone's analyses will convince the linguistic community I cannot say, but I do know that it is challenging publications like this one that move the discipline forward.

REX WALLACE

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS
AMHERST, MASSACHUSETTS 01003
RWALLACE@CLASSICS.UMASS.EDU

ISTHμία. EXCAVATIONS BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES AND THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES AT ATHENS VI: SCULPTURE II: MARBLE SCULPTURE, 1967–1980, by *Steven Lattimore*. Pp. xviii + 64, pls. 36, plans 2. American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Princeton 1996. \$55. ISBN 0-87661-936-7.

This volume presents a catalogue of 107 sculptural fragments discovered in the excavations at the Roman Sanctuary of Poseidon at Isthmia, conducted by Ohio State University and the University of California, Los Angeles from 1967 through 1980. Although the fragments come from a variety of contexts, including the Northeast Gate, Tower 14, and the domestic structures of the East Field, over half were found in the Roman Bath. Of the pieces catalogued, eight heads, one torso of a running Artemis, and six reliefs are substantially preserved.

The organization of the volume parallels that of Mary Sturgeon's earlier publication of sculpture from Isthmia (*Isthmia IV: Sculpture I: 1952–1967*, Princeton 1987). The brief introduction presents the archaeological context of the sculptures. For the history of the site, issues of material, sculptural practice at Isthmia, and the relationship of Isthmia to Corinth, Lattimore refers readers to Sturgeon's volume.

The catalogue presents human heads and fragments of heads first, then fragments of human arms and legs, draped females, animal figures, relief sculpture, and unidentifiable sculptures. Following findspot, dimensions, condition, technical features, bibliography, and description, many entries contain discussion of subject matter, comparanda, date, and sculptural type (*Kopienkritik*), with extensive citations of recent secondary literature. Notable pieces include two heads of Polydeukion (cat. nos. 1 and 2), a locally carved relief of the musical victor L. Kornelios Korinthos (cat.

no. 87), and a three-figure stele of Nymphs (?) carved in non-Graeco-Roman, geometric style (cat. no. 91).

In a three-page summary, Lattimore concludes, first, that most of the sculptures may be dated to the mid-second century A.D., the peak of the Isthmian sanctuary, when Herodes Atticus dedicated the cult group of Poseidon and Amphitrite; second, that the majority of the sculptures found in the East Field were probably displayed in the domestic structures there; third, that most of the sculptures found in the Bath represent subjects appropriate to this context, and were probably part of the architectural adornment of the building (on this topic, readers might also consult H. Manderscheid's synthetic volume *Die Skulpturenausstattung der kaiserzeitlichen Thermenanlagen*, Berlin 1981); and, lastly, that the sculptures from the Bath were probably made by a Corinthian, rather than an Attic, workshop.

Lattimore's catalogue provides further material for the consideration of sculptural displays in domestic and bath contexts. More importantly, his thorough documentation of a group of three-dimensional and relief sculptures that range widely in carving technique and style—though not in date—provides invaluable evidence for the continuing dialogue on sculptural workshops of Roman Greece, and particularly of the Peloponnese.

ELISE A. FRIEDLAND

DEPARTMENT OF ART
ROLLINS COLLEGE
WINTER PARK, FLORIDA 32789-4499
EFRIEDLAND@ROLLINS.EDU

VICTORY OF PROPAGANDA. THE DYNASTIC ASPECT OF THE IMPERIAL PROPAGANDA OF THE SEVERI: THE LITERARY AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE, AD 193–235, by *Drora Baharal*. (*BAR-IS* 657.) Pp. ix + 116, figs. 107. Tempus Reparatum, Oxford 1996. £35. ISBN 0-86054-845-7-846-5.

In this volume, the author argues that Septimius Severus links himself in his propaganda to his Antonine predecessors, and to Marcus Aurelius in particular; also, that Septimius's successors in the dynasty make no break with the established policy. This has long been common knowledge, and the author has nothing new to contribute to the field. Worse than this, however, she confuses the evidence and commits numerous errors—one example being her assertion (9) that the Antonine dynasty begins in A.D. 96 with Nerva. There are also such naive statements as the following comment on Caracalla's admiration for Alexander (83): "Hero-worship is not a modern phenomenon, and was common amongst children and youth in antiquity." Finally, there is the author's habit of addressing the reader in small rhetorical questions, as if he or she were still at school.

Baharal focuses on portraits, but her classification is inconsistent and takes no account of the inscriptions (4). Her conclusion (39) is alarming: "There is a tendency to make his [Severus's] own portraits, as well as those of his rivals and his predecessors, resemble the likeness of Marcus Aurelius." If this is genuinely the conclusion you reach,