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

presentation of the entirety of these votive materials, which certainly constitutes a useful contribution toward our understanding of the many facets of Metapontum's religious practices. Various features of these terracottas lead the author to suggest that Dionysos was the divinity to whom the deposit was dedicated, with whom one could join Persephone.

The author suggests that this particular cult with its agricultural connotation, inserted within the urban sanctuary, should be linked to the greater interest in the countryside—and the wealth associated with it—that at the end of the fourth century B.C. must have involved a larger number of Metapontum's citizens. The deposited material may thus be supposed to be the manifestation of a religiousness proper to classes that were not aristocratic, whose emergence is connected with the renewed social equilibria of the period. This attractive supposition, however, requires cautious assessment. Its truth can only be determined when all the materials from the other deposits at Metapontum are better known.

In addition, while we may agree that in this period some cults were common to city and country alike, a closer analysis must be made of the areas around the polis of Metapontum. As matters now stand, I do not believe it is possible to place on the same level the Metapontine chora and the indigenous sites close by, particularly Cozzo Presepe and Pomarico (the two mentioned on p. 151), since the most recent literature, especially that dealing with the latest excavations and their identification of regular layouts, shows that they were independent settlements and can no longer be regarded as phrouria.

MARCELLA BARRA BAGNASCO

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO
VIA JUVARRA 16 BIS
10122 TURIN
ITALY

TEL ANAFA I.1–2: FINAL REPORT ON TEN YEARS OF EXCAVATION AT A HELLENISTIC AND ROMAN SETTLEMENT IN NORTHERN ISRAEL, by *Sharon C. Herbert*, with contributions by *D.T. Ariel*, *W. Farrand*, *G. Finkielsztejn*, *Y. Meshorer*, *R. Redding*, and *A. Stein*. (*JRA* Suppl. 10.I.1–2; Kelsey Museum Fieldwork Series.) I.1: pp. 334, pls. 3, figs. 148, plans 35, maps 6, tables 25; I.2: pp. 153, foldout figs. 2, figs. 49. Journal of Roman Archaeology, Ann Arbor 1994. $129. ISSN 1047-7594.

TEL ANAFA II.1: THE HELLENISTIC AND ROMAN POTTERY: THE PLAIN WARES AND THE FINE WARES, by *Andrea Berlin* and *Kathleen Warner Slane*, with contributions by *L. Cornell*, *J. Elam*, *M. Glascock*, *H. Neff*, *J. Gunneweg*, *A. Rautman*, and *J. Yellin*. (*JRA* Suppl. 10.II.1; Kelsey Museum Fieldwork Series.) Pp. 418, pls. 155, figs. 11, tables 58. Journal of Roman Archaeology, Ann Arbor 1997. $89.50. ISBN 1-887829-98-9; ISSN 1063-4304.

The small site of Tel Anafa in northern Galilee was occupied from the Bronze Age through the Roman period, with a Medieval Arab reoccupation after its abandonment in the first century A.D. Only the Hellenistic and Roman phases produced substantial remains of architecture and associated artifacts. In her introduction, Sharon Herbert characterizes Tel Anafa as a "type site" for almost all classes of artifacts found there because of the well-stratified contexts and the excavators' policy of saving all recovered material.

In addition to a long chapter on the history and occupation of the site, the first volume (in two parts) contains studies of the stamped amphora handles (D.T. Ariel and G. Finkielsztejn), coins (Y. Meshorer), a Tyrian sealing (A. Stein), the geological setting (W. Farrand), and vertebrate fauna (R. Redding), while the second volume is devoted to pottery. Other finds will be the subject of a planned third volume. The studies included in the present volumes permit a reconstruction of changes in agricultural practices, patterns of trade, and eating habits, allowing for conjectures about changing ethnicity of the inhabitants.

One of the strengths of these volumes is the detailed discussion of strategies of excavation and the presentation of the material. The section on occupational history and stratigraphy is organized to permit reading at different levels of detail. For each phase, an overview section is followed by more extended discussion of the remains and the associated deposits; material from important deposits is summarized in footnotes, and readers are referred to the specialized studies. Balk drawings and locus summaries are included in volume I.2. Information is presented in both narrative and chart form, creating a very accessible book.

A strategic decision was made to concentrate excavation on a large Hellenistic structure built in the late second century B.C., according to the datable finds. The plan of the building, like a Greek courtyard house, and the stucco decoration of its walls find their best parallels at Pergamon and Delos, while the sizable bath complex is most closely comparable to the baths in the palaces and houses of the Greek colony of Aï Khanoum in Afghanistan. Noting the rarity of elaborate baths in Greek private houses and their presence in Punic houses, Herbert suggests that the Tel Anafa bath complex may reflect Punic custom. That seems an unlikely explanation for Aï Khanoum, however, so that Paul Bernard's suggestion that such complexes may have been characteristic of Seleucid palace architecture is worth considering. Only the discovery of more Seleucid sites in the area between the eastern Mediterranean and Central Asia can answer this question.

The character of the site changed dramatically following the construction of the large Hellenistic building. For example, the plain-ware pottery of the earlier period was almost entirely local, and Berlin convincingly demonstrates an increasingly sophisticated assemblage of cooking wares, drawn from Phoenicia rather than from southern Palestine, but with a substantial number of amphoras and drinking vessels, suggesting a strong influence from Greek culture. Berlin feels that the change in pottery assemblage argues for an influx of a new group of more cosmopolitan settlers, while Herbert more cautiously suggests that the difference could be due to changing habits of the same population. According to Redding, the faunal remains sug-