involving the factor analysis of correlation matrices based on very sparse tables of counts (e.g., table 5.20, derived from table 5.18). There is really no need for this these days when correspondence analysis is widely available, but even for this technique a table such as 5.18 is on the thin side.

But this point is a minor one. More serious is the fact that a study making explicit claims to rigor is severely undermined at several points by arguments that can only be described as fanciful. The key issue here is the interpretation of the Mokrin ceramic assemblages, already mentioned above. O'Shea defines three modal ceramic assemblages: graves lacking ceramics, those with only a cup, and those with a pitcher or bowl, usually in addition to a cup. He goes on to claim the following: "Given the local nature of ceramics and the association of all these containers with food and drink, the three ceramic categories appear to reflect the basic subsistence status of the deceased's immediate household at the time of death" (266). The three categories are then interpreted as representing "petitioners," "those entitled," and "providers" (266–67). Twenty pages later, this highly questionable inference has become a circular argument: "The complement to this exotic or durable wealth appears to have been local or subsistence wealth, as represented by each household's economic standing. This local sphere and standing appears to have been reflected in the death ritual by the character and elaborateness of the funerary feast and was marked in the Mokrin graves by the type of ceramic assemblages placed with the deceased" (289). Thereafter, the household subsistence status inferred from these extremely dubious foundations plays a key role in the subsequent social reconstruction, combined with the equally shaky inference that subsistence wealth was primarily under the control of women.

That other aspects of O'Shea's interpretation are also at least open to question may be seen by comparing his conclusions with those recently published by E. Rega ("Age, Gender and Biological Reality in the Early Bronze Age Cemetery at Mokrin," in J. Moore and E. Scott eds., *Invisible People and Processes* [London 1997] 229–47). She does not see the deficit in the number of adult males in the cemetery that O'Shea claims to exist and interprets in terms of deaths in raids away from the village (although evidence for warfare in terms of the incidence of trauma on skeletons is not mentioned, and might be expected if there was a high level of intergroup hostility). Rega, on the contrary, sees an excess of female mortality between one and six years, and suggests that it might stem from preferential male infanticide at birth (infants under one year are not represented in the cemetery). She also offers an alternative to O'Shea's interpretation of bone needles as indications of a female hereditary office, itself symptomatic of an approach that sees communities as matrices of vertically and horizontally differentiated roles or boxes, and does not allow for the fact that supposed "horizontal" distinctions, such as membership of a particular kin group or a specific craft role, very often, if not always, have differential social and economic standing in various respects.

Clearly, the last word has not been said on the Mokrin cemetery. Such conflicts of interpretation as those between Rega and O'Shea are almost always productive, as the successive reinterpretations of the classic British Mesolithic site of Starr Carr demonstrate. But I hope that future contributions to the debate are somewhat shorter than *Villagers of the Maros*!

STEPHEN SHENNAN

INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
31–34 GORDON SQUARE
LONDON WC1H 0PY
UNITED KINGDOM
S.SHENNAN@UCL.AC.UK

Η ΝΕΟΛΙΘΙΚΗ ΝΕΑ ΜΑΚΡΗ: Η ΚΕΡΑΜΕΙΚΗ, by *Maria Pantelidou Gofas*. (Βιβλιοθήκη της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας 153.) Pp. 332, color pls. 8, pls. 87, color figs. 5, tables 7. The Archaeological Society in Athens, Athens 1995. ISSN 1105-7785; ISBN 960-7036-53-0.

Pantelidou Gofas's book on the pottery from her rescue excavation at Nea Makri fills a crucial gap in the picture of Neolithic Attica, complementing and richly supplementing D.R. Theocharis's preliminary report on the site published some 40 years previously. The excellent photographs and drawings, clear detailed technical descriptions, and full documentation make it a pleasure to consult.

The geographical position of Nea Makri on the east coast of Attica allowed it easy land and sea communications in every direction, and the 12 successive undisturbed phases covering the Early and Middle Neolithic periods give its stratigraphy a special place in the archaeological record.

The lowest two strata are EN and were excavated down to bedrock; the earliest pottery from the site shows that the first settlers were already experienced potters. Phase 1 has only plain pottery of the kind known from the Peloponnese and Thessaly, including the typical fine gritless class with tapered rims, and rainbow and mottled surfaces. A local feature in phase 2 is the light-colored "fatty slip." The only two painted sherds came from phase 2: the first has a red lattice pattern on a thick cream slip, and from the fabric and technique is evidently an import, possibly from Chaironea; the second, with a brown pendant rim triangle on a pale yellowish-gray ground, is a local fabric. This low percentage of painted pottery is reminiscent of the assemblage from Nemea, and is a feature of the EN period in Central Greece and the Peloponnese. The second period (Middle Neolithic), beginning in phase 3, is marked by the appearance of new types and techniques alongside the earlier, but now improved, wares: they include an Orange Sandy ware, small quantities of Urfirnis, some low-luster red slip ware characteristic in the Peloponnese of the EN–MN transition or early MN (in the Franchthi Cave sequence), a little White ware, and a new class of fine burnished brown-black slipped and incised pottery.

The Urfirnis, which has local characteristics, is dull, and the fabric, a soft powdery red or orange, is perhaps closer to the Central Greek than the Peloponnesian. Interestingly, the Urfirnis from other Attic sites, like Poussi Kaloyeri, is closer to the Peloponnesian ware in hardness and luster. Some of the fine-ware bowls have beaded rims, which are

an EN and early Sesklo feature in Thessaly, but rare in the Peloponnese.

The White ware has an ivory whiteness, and an analysis of one sherd showed that it is 90% kaolin, which, in view of the volcanic inclusions, must have been imported from Melos, no doubt with the obsidian. It is fine and thin-walled, contradicting earlier theories that the heavier Peloponnesian White ware, which is often not pure white, imitated contemporary marble bowls and was thought perhaps to have come from Nea Makri. The small number of pots and their high quality would reflect the value of the imported raw material. White ware becomes progressively scarcer, although it still occurs as late as the last phase, 12, which is an early phase of LN.

The brown-black slipped and burnished ware is peculiar in mainland Greece to Nea Makri, although there are parallels from the site of Ayios Petros in the Northern Sporades; because of its sudden appearance without local antecedents, the excavator looks eastward to Anatolia and the Near East for its origins. The excavator suggests that the white-filled incised decoration may have been the Nea Makri potters' answer to the White-on-Black painted pottery elsewhere, which, from the evidence of some apparently unsatisfactory attempts, they could not or would not reproduce. The very white filling of the simple incised patterns is also thought to be kaolin, analytical confirmation of which would be welcome for both its technological and cultural implications. White-filled incised decoration and white crusting in general are common enough and not necessarily indicative of the use of kaolin. The quality of the ware deteriorates in the later phases. Another local feature is the relative prevalence of asymmetrical shapes. Ovoid and elliptical pots occur elsewhere, but are not common.

The Late Neolithic begins in phase 9. Although the innovations in phase 3 at the beginning of the MN are less striking, the difference in phase 9 from the preceding phases, even phase 8, is so marked that "9 can be seen as not just transitional, but as the beginning of a new period" (152). New material is little, although significant, but there were considerable modifications to existing types. The common Orange Sandy ware now includes a fine variation with a hard slip of different color and better quality. Urfirnis continues, but acquires an overall burnished slip whose friability is due to the firing rather than its poor quality. A new feature is the great increase in coarse ware, both the thin-walled and heavy varieties. This is also characteristic of the LN in the Peloponnese. One example each of Matt-Painted, Black on Red, Rippled ware, and beaded decoration were found in undisturbed levels. The last two phases, 11 and 12, are very similar. Typical LN shapes occur: carinations, thickened closed bowl walls, beaded rims, and ribbon handles. Two painted Urfirnis sherds were found, but no Fine Gray ware. The incised and dot-fringed zigzag decoration on an asymmetrical deep closed bowl is compared to motifs from the Attica-Kephala culture and a White-on-Red sherd looks very similar to examples from the Agora.

The excavator concludes that the end of the third period of the settlement and its final abandonment coincide with the first appearance of the Attica-Kephala pattern-burnished ware and the beginning of LN II in the Cyclades. It is always difficult to compare the chronologies of different sites because of their frequently different pottery records, but apart from ^{14}C dating, which unfortunately it was not possible to carry out at Nea Makri, pottery must remain the best diagnostic tool available to us. In this case, the virtual absence of types characteristic of the late phase of the Late Neolithic (the excavator's LN I or my period III), such as Matt-Painted, Polychrome, or Fine Gray, to name a few, which are found at other sites in Attica and Euboea, perhaps implies that for practical purposes Nea Makri came to an end soon after the transition from Middle to Late Neolithic.

W.W. Phelps

OMIROU 2
AYIA PARASKEVI
153 43 ATHENS
GREECE
PHELPS@HOL.GR

Corpus hieroglyphicarum inscriptionum Cretae, edited by *J.-P. Olivier* and *L. Godart*, with the collaboration of *J.-C. Poursat*. (*EtCret* 31.) Pp. 447, pls. 306, map 1, tables 2. De Boccard, Paris 1996. ISBN 2-86958-082-7.

The *Corpus hieroglyphicarum inscriptionum Cretae* (*CHIC*) is the first systematic presentation of Cretan Hieroglyphic (hereafter CH) inscriptions, according to established criteria for corpus publications, since Sir Arthur Evans presented the material as then known three generations ago in *Scripta Minoa* 1 (Oxford 1909) (*SM* I). *CHIC* gives scholars standardized analytical sign repertories (17) for CH script, based on a complete collection of meticulously edited texts. A total of 331 texts is presented: 266 from 32 known sites on Crete, 61 seals of general Cretan provenience, 1 seal from Kythera, and 2 roundels and 1 clay *boulette* from Samothrace. Most importantly, the editors, in producing what will now be the standard signary, have differentiated between signs on seals and signs on other, primarily clay archival, types of supports. They also correctly decoupled their standard numeration of the signs from presumed parallel signs in Linear A and Linear B. (They do offer a table of possible comparisons on p. 19.) Thus their view of the makeup of the script is not contaminated by fixed a priori assumptions. Scholars can now proceed to *independent* analyses of sign occurrences. These are a prerequisite for decipherment, or at least for understanding the administrative workings and phonological/ideographic syntax of a script.

Looking in awe at *CHIC*, it is easy to see why such a volume was a long time coming. The typological variety of texts and supports for the script is daunting, and called for shrewd analytical and classificatory schemes for the documents and for the basic sign repertories of the script. Given the complexity of the data, all users of this volume are advised to read with the utmost care the editors' detailed discussions of the typological classification of inscriptions and signs in the system (9–17, 51–53) and the principles for presenting the texts in photographs, facsimile