Review
Author(s): Michael Crawford
Review by: Michael Crawford
Source: *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 100 (2010), pp. 334-335
Published by: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/41724848
Accessed: 20-01-2016 21:32 UTC

means always) and considers the entire ornamental repertoire of pieces to try to date them, avoiding an overly narrow focus on sub-classes of ornament studied in isolation from each other. Ch. 5 presents the typological analysis, and ch. 6 this broader contextualized approach, which considers the matter of marbles and workshops. Ch. 7 is the partially-illustrated catalogue of nearly 500 items, to which the text of the previous chapters refers and which in itself represents a significant amount of archival work. A brief conclusion follows.

D. sets out to write an archaeological/architectural work including a catalogue, rather than an historical study (he refers readers in search of one to the appropriate works by Zevi *et al.*). One consequence is that the reader must turn to the short conclusion to see how D. fits his subject matter into the wider story of the history, development, and function of Puteoli. For many, this will be the best place to start: here D. offers some interesting glimpses of the connection between imperial interventions and local social change and the town's architecture and civic spaces, beginning under Nero and continuing with restorations and additions in later reigns. Given D.'s insistence on the importance of cultural and historical context to the study of the monuments, a fuller treatment of this aspect or an introductory chapter locating the monuments and fragments within the wider history of the town, or of comparable towns in Roman Italy, would have added much to the book for a general reader. It would also have been good to see a plan of the Roman town, however incomplete, with the monuments discussed here placed in their contexts (there is one fold-out archaeological map, with the remains marked onto the modern street plan of the town of Pozzuoli).

As it is, the specialist interested specifically in Puteoli or in the methodology of architectonic analysis will find much of interest here; the student of the broader history of Roman urbanism will have to hunt thoroughly among D.'s chapters, but will find interesting material to justify the search.

The book is illustrated with photographs and reproductions of old excavation documents; these are all in black and white only, many without scale markers, and some rather grainy. For the astonishingly high price of €300, however, one is entitled to expect a more lavish presentation; this paperback volume of 362 pages is not particularly robust or elegant — the review copy is already showing damage at one corner — and unfortunately represents very questionable value for money.

University of Reading MATTHEW NICHOLLS
m.c.nicholls@reading.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435810000900

G. VOLPE, M. STRAZZULLA and D. LEONE (EDS), *STORIA E ARCHEOLOGIA DELLA DAUNIA IN RICORDO DI MARINA MAZZEI*. Bari: Edipuglia, 2008. Pp. 516, illus. ISBN 978-88-7228-522-X. €65.00.

At the moment of her tragically early death in 2004, Marina Mazzei, although not yet fifty, had for some time simply *been* the archaeology of Daunia: not only for her record of excavation and publication of many of the area's major monuments, but also for the passion of her defence of those monuments against their depredation by illegal excavation. It is not surprising that this fine volume in her memory should devote much space to the problems of the *tutela* of archaeological sites, in the face of the conscienceless greed of collectors. There is also much on the chamber tombs of Daunia and their frescoes and on the iconography of Apulian vases, as well as important articles by D'Ercole on archaic trade and by Verger on female clothing on the Daunian stelae. Central to the presumed interests of readers of this journal is an article by Marchi, that documents the replacement of the dispersed nuclei of a city by a concentration of settlement that seems to accompany the arrival of Rome. Goffredo is right to reject Toynbee's absurd view of Hannibal's legacy, though wrong to suppose that there is anything British about clinging to it; on the other hand, to begin a discussion of transhumance with 'la maturazione delle complesse dinamiche di destrutturazione e transformazione degli interessi dell'aristocrazia canosina, innescate dagli impulsi di modernizzazione indotti dalla romanizzazione', apart from not meaning very much, runs up against an awkward fact: while inscribing loom-weights seems hardly at all to have been a Greek or a Latin phenomenon, we now know of nearly twenty loom-weights inscribed in one or other Italic language, without exception from the Central Appennine areas of high summer pastures or the winter pasture areas of the South-East. Similarly, Grelle chooses to believe the Livian account of the extermination of the population of Luceria before the foundation of the Latin colony, despite the fact that the case of the Salassi demonstrates the complete worthlessness of such Roman-origin accounts. In the case of Luceria, the coinage gives us the names of some of the members of the office-holding class within a generation

of the foundation of the colony, part Daunian, part Samnite; and the same coinage uses an Italic decimal system, not the Roman duodecimal one. In the case of Venusia, there is no literary evidence, but again the coinage uses a decimal system. Grelle cites the Brundisinus of Messapian origin, serving with Rome, who betrayed Clastidium to Hannibal, but neither the abundant epigraphic evidence for citizens of the Latin colony of Messapian origin nor the great chamber tomb at Mesagne, which shows a Messapian élite tranquilly preserving its burial customs a couple of generations after the foundation of the colony. The volume closes with a series of major articles on Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages in Apulia.

University College London MICHAEL CRAWFORD
imagines.italicae@sas.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435810000912

O. DE CAZANOVE, *CIVITA DI TRICARICO. I. QUARTIER DE LA MAISON DU MONOLITHE ET L'ENCEINTE INTERMÉDIAIRE*. Rome: L'École Française de Rome, 2008. Pp. xiii + 687, illus. ISBN 978-2-72830-787-6. €187.00.

This is the first volume in a projected series documenting excavations conducted by L'École Française de Rome from 1988 to 2005 on the Lucanian settlement at Civita di Tricarico. Located on a plateau in the mountainous inland region now known as Basilicata, the site was settled and fortified for the first time in the fourth century B.C. It experienced considerable disruption during the latter half of the third century, but more limited occupation — now with distinctly central Italian characteristics — persisted into the first century B.C. Civita thus has considerable potential for contributing to ongoing debates about the development of fortified settlements in this region, the nature of Lucanian culture and society, and the local effects of subordination by Rome.

The main objectives of the project, set out in the opening chapter, involved the systematic testing of two prevailing beliefs about Lucanian fortified settlements: firstly, that they functioned primarily as refuge areas and contained only a few aristocratic residences; and secondly, that they did not survive after Rome established control over the region in the 270s B.C. With this in mind, the project's efforts were concentrated in the previously-unexcavated central sector of the settlement, and within a small inner fortification where structures of the second century B.C. were already known.

The present volume documents the first seven years of work, focusing on a group of houses in the centre of the plateau and a defensive circuit which passed through the quarter. Far from being largely uninhabited, this area proved to have been densely populated with simple *pastas* houses, laid out around 360 to 340 B.C. in quasi-regular square building plots. This suggests planned settlement, though whether it represents the nucleation of a previously-dispersed local community or some form of external colonization remains uncertain. Not all of the early houses remained in use, but one, dubbed the 'Maison du Monolithe' by the excavators, was repeatedly extended and modified between about 300 and 240 B.C. The installation of a colonnaded portico and a water-collection pool (whose monolithic limestone base has lent the house its name) suggest the growing influence of Greek architectural models, perhaps mediated via central Italian channels.

The quarter changed radically when a new defensive wall was put up between 240 and 225 B.C., enclosing some houses but obliterating others. The context for this circuit is uncertain without closer dating, but given its effect on the housing quarter and the absence of any proper foundations, it appears to have been a hasty effort erected under pressure. In stark contrast to most Lucanian fortifications, though, the northernmost half of the new wall followed a rectilinear course, and was equipped with squared towers which de Cazanove argues may have been regularly spaced. The straight course may simply have been an economical method of reducing the defended area of the settlement; but along with the regularly-spaced towers, it too suggests external influence. The impression is reinforced by the design of the main gate, which C. shows through comparative examples to have been typical of contemporary Roman colonies.

Following the construction of the wall, the 'Maison du Monolithe' was again remodelled. It remained a domestic residence, but was reduced to half its former size. Over its old foundations a new structure was built, probably for communal rather than domestic use. This consisted of a single room facing out onto a terrace and towards the new west gate. A black and white geometric mosaic in the centre of the room and carbonized remains of probable couches around the edge indicate a dining function, while pottery found in the destruction layer was mainly tableware. C. explores