

GNOMON

KRITISCHE ZEITSCHRIFT
FÜR DIE GESAMTE
KLASSISCHE ALTERTUMSWISSENSCHAFT

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON

HANS-JOACHIM GEHRKE · HENNER VON HESBERG
CHRISTOPH HORN · MARTIN HOSE
JOSEPH MARAN · ERNST VOGT
KATHARINA VOLK · PAUL ZANKER

SCHRIFTFLEITUNG

MARTIN HOSE (VERANTWORTLICH) UND
MAXIMILIAN BRAUN

Sonderdruck aus Band 85, 2013



85. BAND

2013

HEFT 1

VERLAG C. H. BECK MÜNCHEN

INHALT

K. MELLMANN: J. Gottschall, The Rape of Troy. Evolution, Violence, and the World of Homer 1
 C. NERI: R. S. Garner, Traditional Elegy. The Interplay of Meter, Tradition, and Context in Early Greek Poetry 6
 N. BLÖßNER: Plato, Republic 1-2.368c4 with Introduction, Translation and Commentary by Ch. Emlyn-Jones 19
 M. D. REEVE: M. Tulli Ciceronis in C. Verrem actionis secundae liber quartus (de signis). A cura di G. Baldo 25
 A. RAMÍREZ DE VERGER: D. S. M'Kie, Essays in the Interpretation of Roman Poetry 31
 TH. BRÜGGEMANN: P. F. Mittag, Antiochos IV. Epiphanes. Eine politische Biographie 35
 CH. LUNDGREEN: F. Pina Polo, The Consul at Rome. The Civil Functions of the Consuls in the Roman Republic 41
 F. KOLB: C. Grey, Constructing Communities in the Late Roman Countryside 46
 J. G. YOUNGER: M. Anastasiadou, The Middle Minoan Three-Sided Soft Stone Prism. 2 vols. 49
 M. TRUNK: A. Monterroso Checa, Theatrum Pompei. Forma y arquitectura de la génesis del modelo teatral de Roma 60
 D. PALOMBI: P. Pinon, Pierre-Adrien Pâris, 1745-1819, architecte, et les monuments antiques de Rome et de la Campanie 64
 H. FLASHAR: J. Leonhardt, S. Leopold, M. Meier, Wege, Umwege und Abwege. Antike Oper in der 1. Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts 74

VORLAGEN UND NACHRICHTEN

I. MUSAUS: E. Tsitsibakou-Vasalos, Ancient Poetic Etymology. The Pelopids: Fathers and sons 77
 F. STEGER: R. Mitchell-Boyask, Plague and the Athenian imagination. Drama, history, and the cult of Asclepius 78
 O. WENSKUS: B. Maucolin, Untersuchungen zur hippokratischen Schrift 'Über die alte Heilkunst' 79
 C. EDWARDS: L. Annaeo Seneca, Lettere a Lucilio Libro VI: Le lettere 53-57. A cura di F. R. Berno 80
 M. HECKENKAMP: Romani Aquilae De figuris. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento a cura di M. Elice 82
 K.-H. LEVEN: J.-M. André, La médecine à Rome 84
 P. BRENNAN: R. Scharf, Der Dux Mogontiacensis und die Notitia Dignitatum. Eine Studie zur spätantiken Grenzverteidigung 85
 H. MIELSCH: E. Zimi, Late Classical and Hellenistic Silver Plate from Macedonia 88
 N. FENN: Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. Great Britain. Band 23, Reading Museum Service (Reading Borough Council. 1.). By A. C. Smith. With an introduction by J. Greenaway. Photographs by L. Bennetto and R. Miller 90
 J. ZERRES: St. Weiß-König: Graffiti auf römischer Gefäßkeramik aus dem Bereich der Colonia Ulpia Traiana / Xanten 93
 PERSONALIEN 95
 BIBLIOGRAPHISCHE BEILAGE NR. 1 1-36

Beilagenhinweis:

Mit diesem Heft verbreiten wir eine Gesamtbeilage von der Verlagsgruppe Hüthig Jehle Rehm GmbH.

Wir bitten unsere Leser um Beachtung!

gestützte «construction of a collection of conceptual models» erklärt er mit den «evidentiary limitations of the period» (227f) und kommt zu dem Schluß, der Versuch, die Umrisse der sozio-ökonomischen Verhältnisse in den spätantiken Landschaften zu rekonstruieren, sei und bleibe wahrscheinlich «a frustrating, imperfect, and incomplete exercise» (229).

Etwas weniger frustrierend wäre der Versuch vielleicht gewesen, wenn G. nicht ausgerechnet das bedeutsame Kleinasien fast gänzlich aus seinen Untersuchungen ausgeklammert und so ergiebige Resultate von Feldforschungen übersehen hätte. Wenn er bemängelt (4. 46), daß die architektonische Gestalt von Siedlungsformen ländlicher Gemeinwesen kaum bekannt sei, so ist dies nicht zuletzt auf seine Nichtbeachtung wichtiger einschlägiger Publikationen zurückzuführen, denen er eine vielfältige architektonische Gestalt ländlicher Siedlungen hätte entnehmen können. Dies gilt z.B. für die vorzüglich erhaltenen kilikischen Siedlungen¹ und insbesondere für die intensiv erforschte spätantike Besiedlung in Zentrallykien.² Hier hätte G. detaillierte Angaben zu Siedlungsentwicklung, Demographie, Wirtschaftsanlagen und -formen einschließlich marktorientierter Produktion und handwerklicher Aktivitäten erhalten sowie Rückschlüsse auf soziale Diversität, Aspekte der Risikobewältigung usw. ziehen können. Hinzu kommt, daß für Zentrallykien mit der Vita Nicolai Sionitae eine eingehende Beschreibung ländlicher Besiedlung und agrarwirtschaftlicher Verhältnisse vorliegt, die G. erstaunlicherweise überhaupt nicht berücksichtigt hat.

G.s gut strukturiertes und formuliertes, intelligentes Buch, das durchaus einige erwägenswerte Akzente setzt, hätte bei intensiverer Auswertung vorhandenen Materials sicherlich an Aussagekraft gewonnen.

Tübingen

Frank Kolb

*

Maria Anastasiadou: *The Middle Minoan Three-Sided Soft Stone Prism*. 2 vols. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern 2011. XXII, 802 S. 134 Abb. 131 Taf. 4°. (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Corpus der Minoischen und Mykenischen Siegel. Beiheft 9.).

This two-volume work (with consecutive pagination) by Maria Anastasiadou (= MA) represents the publication of her 2009 PhD dissertation written in English (by special permission) for the Archaeological Seminar at the Philipps Universität, Marburg, under the auspices of the Corpus der minoischen und mykenischen

¹ H. Hellenkemper/F. Hild, *Neue Forschungen in Kilikien* (Österr. Akad. Wiss., Philos.-Hist. Kl., Denkschr. 186), Wien 1986.

² F. Kolb, *Burg-Polis-Bischofssitz. Geschichte der Siedlungskammer von Kyaneai in der Südwesttürkei*, Mainz 2008, 374-417.

Siegel (CMS). The CMS recently celebrated its 50th anniversary prior to moving its archives to the University of Heidelberg. MA's book is the last therefore in the series of CMS Beihefts.

MA's subject is precisely defined: three-sided prism seals from Crete of soft stone (mostly steatite, some chlorite) – almost all date to the Middle Minoan II period (MM II; 1925–1825 BCE in the high chronology: P. Rehak and J.G. Younger, 'Review of Aegean Prehistory VII', *AJA* 102, 1998, 99). The subject of the book therefore is a sealstone shape. The author states the two goals of the study: a) «whether the prisms are stylistically homogeneous» and whether there is a close «relationship of these seals to contemporaneous soft stone seals of other forms» and b) a study and analysis of the iconography, though «An examination of the combinations of the devices/images met on the three sides of each piece falls outside the scope of this study» (1–2).

Volume 1 is in three major parts plus front matter (acknowledgements, abbreviations, introduction): a discussion of the prism shape, materials, tools and techniques; a presentation of the style groups and «clusters»; and a detailed presentation of the iconography. Finishing off the volume are seven appendices, a bibliography, concordances, and an index. Volume 2 presents a catalogue of the corpus of 626 prisms; 125 plates of line drawings of each motif on each prism; two plates of schematic poses of animals, people, and birds; and four plates of line drawings of unpublished prisms that the author has personally inspected.

In the Introduction (1–15), the author first tells us her two goals and then presents a history of the state of research on the three-sided Minoan prism. Sir Arthur Evans was the first to draw attention to the shape since these seals can carry Cretan «Hieroglyphic» writing; he derives the shape from regularizing splinters of steatite, whose sources occur infrequently on the island (31–37; fig. 12).

According to P. Warren, *Minoan Stone Vases*, 140–141, 1969, the most important sources are located at Fodele on the north coast west of Heraklion, Vorizia-Zaros on the south slopes of Ida, Miamou-Krotos in the Asterousia mountains, and the Katharo plateau and Sarakina valley to the west of Kritsa on the east slopes of Dikte. The last two sites may have been within the Malia state (J.-C. Poursat 'Malia: Palace, State, City', *Cretan Offerings*, 259–267, London 2010).

Since many such prisms have been found in the area around Malia, French archaeologists who have excavated there have also paid attention to these seals. Ferdinand Chapouthier devoted several articles to the subject and was the first to explore the iconographic relationship between the three faces ('À travers trois gemmes prismatiques', *Mélanges Gustave Glotz*, vol. 1: 183–201, Paris 1932); Henri and Micheline van Effenterre ('Vers une grammaire de la glyptique créto-mycénienne', *CMS Beiheft* 0, 22–29, Boppard 1974) created a database of the images on the separate sides and came to the conclusion that each prism was basically iconographically unique. Meanwhile, in 1956 a MM II seal-cutter's workshop was excavated at Malia by André Dessenne that was obviously the production site of most of these prisms. Further excavations were carried out by Jean-Claude Poursat in 1965 and 1975 that defined the workshop and cleared the bureaucratic complex Quartier Mu that consists primarily of administrative Buildings A and B, destroyed by fire at the end of MM II.

MA notes how the English scholar Victor Kenna (*Cretan Seals*, Oxford 1960) made no mention of the Malia Workshop, though he updates Evans's derivation of the shape; John Boardman, another English scholar (*Greek Gems and Finger Rings*, Oxford 1970), does know of the Workshop but does not take it much into consideration – he ignores, for instance, the clay sealings from Quartier Mu that were obviously impressed by prisms from the Workshop.

CMS II, 2 (1977) published the prisms excavated from the Workshop (nos. 86–189) and Paul Yule's influential work (*Early Cretan Seals*, Mainz 1980) first put together the seals made by the Workshop and those found elsewhere, 'the Malia Workshop Complex'. Since 1980, most scholars have attempted to connect more closely the Workshop prisms and the prisms from the broader geographical area (J.-C. Poursat, 'L'Atelier des sceaux et le Quartier Mu de Mallia', *CMS Beiheft* 1, 159–165, Berlin 1981) and to determine an interior chronology. While the three-sided steatite prisms do seem to follow the earlier ivory cubes in Yule's Border/Leaf Complex (MM I) and to precede similar prisms but in harder stones (most dating to early MM III, ca. 1825–1750; J.G. Younger, *The Iconography and Stylistic Development of Aegean Glyptic in its Middle Phase* [ca. 1725–1550 B.C.], *Jonsæter* 1993), they seem themselves to form a coherent MM II group with no discernible interior chronological development.

A short section (12–15) lays out the structure of the book and focuses on some of the difficulties in dealing with the iconography. MA divides the iconography on each seal face into three components: «image» comprises the entire representation on a seal face (usually called the «sealtype»; e.g., a man sits holding a bow and arrow); «device» comprises the iconographic units (e.g., the man, the bow and arrow); and «motif» comprises the subunits (e.g., the bow and the arrow, separately). The author also has had to invent numerous conventional terms to denote the devices, which she then prints in italics often with single quotes to connote that the device may look like something (e.g., a 'papyrus blossom') but may actually be something else (a J-spiral with a spreading, floral-like top).

The first major section describes the class («The MM Three-sided Soft Stone Prism», 16–62). Since many of the prisms found in the Malia Workshop are apparently unfinished, the author looks to the 107 prisms found in tombs for a definitive idea of what a finished piece looks like: a small prismatic block (generally forming an equilateral triangle in section) with three sides fairly equal in size (in plan: circular, square, or, more commonly, elliptical), all three of which carry an image. MA thinks the inspiration for the shape might have come from shaping a boar's tusk tip into a gable (a squat prism with a larger base and two smaller sides); she points to such a gable from Archanes-Phournoi (fig. 11d) with the dentine at one end hollowed out and the other end drilled for a stringhole. She mentions in passing Poursat's conclusion ('La Glyptique et les autres arts dans l'Égée prépalatiale', *CMS Beiheft* 8, 341–348, Mainz 2000) that the prism continued the tradition of multifacial seals (beginning with Yule's Parading Lions/Spiral Complex, a series of EM II–III bifacial stamp cylinders and his MM I Border/Leaf gables and cubes) in order to carry a complex of images, including hieroglyphic and hieroglyphic-like inscriptions.

The materials of the prisms are almost entirely steatite (95.4%, Mohs 1–2), occasionally chlorite and schist, and artificial substances (faience and paste). A small number of prisms, including a few found in the Malia Workshop, are made of breccia, a harder stone (Mohs 3.5–4) found primarily on Kakon Oros to the east of Heraklion on the north coast (33). The soft-stone prisms were engraved with hand-held tools (obsidian blades, needles, burins, scrapers, and bronze saws), all of which were found in the Workshop. Another technique consisted of drilling circles and «cup sinkings» with the hollow or solid drill applied to a stationary seal from above, bowing the drill while pressing one's chest against it for pressure. Vertical pressure drilling and more vigorous abrasion could engrave the breccia seals, but a new tool, the horizontal spindle (or bow-lathe) was apparently invented in the last phase of the Workshop to drill these and even harder stones more efficiently. The new tool consisted of a stationary rotating axle bowed by an assistant, outfitted with drills and cutting wheels. The seal would then be moved against the rotating tip. This tool survives into the succeeding period and is the primary tool for cutting the hard stones (agate, cornelian, amethyst) that characterize Minoan seals of MM III–LM III (ca. 1825–1300 BCE) as well as classical and Roman seals.

MA makes it clear that she relies considerably on Walter Müller of the CMS for her discussion of materials, tools and techniques. She distinguishes three kinds of stones: soft, medium hard, and hard stones. And she describes how hand-held tools and vertical pressure drilling were used for the soft stone seals, the horizontal spindle for the hard stone seals, and a mix of techniques for the medium hard stones. In her catalogue, almost all of her prisms are of soft stone: 15 prisms of chlorite, two of paste, and the rest of steatite. There are two exceptions, her nos. 282 (CMS III, no. 216) of «medium hard stone» and 577 (CMS VS 3, no. 356) of breccia. Thus, she seems willing to include in her focus group seals of medium hard stones, including breccia; it is therefore a puzzle why she mentions but does not include in her catalogue other three-sided prisms of medium hard materials, especially CMS II 2, nos. 150 and 168, both of breccia and both excavated from the Malia Workshop (mentioned on p. 60, n. 332).

In technique, the author seems occasionally confused. She discusses 58a (CMS XI, no. 217a): a goat with begun cup sinkings created by the hollow drill (vertical pressure) for shoulder and hip and then lines gouged across the body from cup sinking to cup sinking. «It seems possible that these lines constitute a successful attempt to 'cover' the core of this boring» (42). This is standard practice, however, drilling cup sinkings for the shoulder and hip and then modeling the chest and stomach between (J.G. Younger, 'Creating a Sealstone', *Expedition* 23.4, 1981, 31–38; and 1993, above, 166–167). The fact that we see the lines means the modeling is unfinished. Similarly, stringholes were almost always created after the engraving of the seal; but MA asserts that «To the best knowledge of the author, no prism exists which doesn't have a stringhole channel» (47, n. 268), implying that the stringhole was drilled before the face was carved, yet she lists five seals with engraved sides but no stringhole (therefore unfinished: 47, n. 269).

The 626 prisms that MA includes in her catalogue come primarily from east-central and eastern Crete, especially from Malia – Malia was the production center (54), most of the seals probably being made in the Workshop in Quartier Mu. The

Workshop contained unfinished and finished prisms (140 seals in the building and surrounding area), blocks of steatite, smaller pieces of schist, breccia, and rock crystal, and the tools mentioned above. There were also two seals probably not made there, a schist button seal (CMS II 2, no. 149) and a half-ovoid of white paste (CMS II 2, no. 109).

Among the debitage from the Workshop were unfinished seals of harder stones: the two prisms of breccia mentioned above, with only two sides engraved; lathed signets («Petschafts») of fluorite (CMS II 2, no. 128 said to be of «rock crystal»; carved with two small circles), «brown obsidian» (CMS II 2, nos. 129 and 130, both with barely begun designs), of «brown conglomerate with yellow flecks» (CMS 2, no. 136, lapis lacedaemonius?, shaped only), and a foliate back seal of fluorite (CMS II 2, no. 148 said to be of «rock crystal», shaped only). None of these has finished designs and none has a bored stringhole, which MA thinks attests to the inexperience of the carver: «while the craftsman was experimenting, often successfully, with engraving harder stones, he/she had not yet mastered the art of piercing such materials for the creation of the stringhole channel.» But if boring the stringhole occurred after carving the design and before polishing the seal, then it is simply another indication that these seals are unfinished. These seals therefore may have been among the last products of the Workshop.

Adjacent to the Workshop but not connected to it are the two administrative buildings A and B, which held clay documents inscribed in Hieroglyphic and sealings impressed by seals (CMS II 6, nos. 176–209), some of which were soft stone prisms of the Workshop.

MA specifies only Malia sealings CMS II 6, nos. 191–194 (61, n. 342). There are others: CMS II 6, nos. 175, 195, and 196, impressed by soft stone prisms made by the Malia Workshop. Quartier Mu also produced sealings impressed by harder stone prisms: CMS II 6, nos. 185 with two cat faces, and 176, 177, 180, 181 with Hieroglyphic inscriptions.

MA's second major section focuses on «Style Groups» (63–159). Most of her 626 prisms in the catalogue belong to her main group of «Malia/Eastern Crete Steatite Prisms» (63, n. 348). She notes the overlap between her group and Yule's Malia Workshop Complex and Poursat-Papatsarouha's Style de Malia. And she discusses at length Eberhard Thomas's attempt to discern a development in the Workshop through six «stylistic tendencies» (71–75). As the author points out, this development could only work if the debitage from the Workshop represented its entire lifetime – this is unlikely.

Instead, MA sees three main groups and a number of clusters. The three main groups include prisms with «Deep Cut» (75), «Hasty Cut» (77), and «Irregular Cut» engraving, the last recognized by Dessenne as «le gâcheur» and by Poursat as an apprentice, perhaps even a child (78, n. 434). These groups may represent different hands, although the Workshop physically could not have accommodated many workers; Poursat thought only one (Fouilles exécutées à Mallia. Le Quartier Mu, III, 1996, 110) while MA thinks perhaps two working side by side (75). After a discussion of these major groups, the author then pulls together smaller «clusters» (82–101). A large cluster revolves around her no. 2 (CMS VS 3, no. 22) from Malia Quartier Nu (82–84, n. 454). She does not give this cluster a name but does charac-

terize it as different from the main group, Malia/Eastern Crete Prisms, although probably also produced at Malia.

The rest of the stylistic discussion focuses on short discussions of small clusters of seals that are related iconographically and stylistically. There seem to be at least 18 such named clusters; some of these are clearly defined (e.g., Cluster of the Full-Figured Bovine [five members], Cluster of the Plain Quadruped [three examples], Cluster of the Bulky Quadruped [three members]) but most contain so few examples that it is difficult to evaluate the purpose of identifying them – discerning the different ‘styles’ of the clusters does not chart an internal chronological development for the Workshop and does not, in most cases, define separate ‘hands.’

Although MA’s goals do not include identifying stylistic hands, it is possible to infer from her discussions that the three larger groups (Deep Cut, Hasty Cut, Irregular Cut) represent her two artists working side by side plus a child-apprentice. Apart from the large cluster around her no. 2 (CMS VS 3, no. 22) representing another workshop at Malia, she also states that one of her small clusters, that of the Man and the Ruminant (nos. 113 [CMS II 2, no. 306], 286 [CMS III, no. 185], and 560 [Paris CdM N4420]), represents the work of one hand, possibly also her cluster of the Triangular Scorpion (nos. 493 [CMS VI, no. 79], 549 [Paris CdM M5820]) if not the product of a single pattern-book.

The distribution of the Malia/Eastern Crete Prisms concentrates the group in east-central and eastern Crete, mostly around Malia, the Lasithi plain, the gulf of Mirabelo (all comprising the Malia state: Poursat 2010, above), but also Palaikastro and Zakros farther east; some prisms come from the Knossos area and the Mesara. No prism comes certainly from west of Ida.

For the Malia/Eastern Crete Prisms, dating is equally certain: no prism comes from a secure context earlier than MM II, although several come from Late Minoan contexts. MA concludes that the bulk of the prisms were carved in MM II, although it is possible the Workshop craftsmen continued carving hard stone prisms after the MM IIB destructions, but not for long – the prisms from Late Bronze contexts are surely heirlooms (114–115). On the early end, it is possible that some prisms «with EM III/MM I Influences» (115–120) may date earlier than MM II. There are five of these. Her nos. 98 (CMS II 2, no. 216), a gable from the Workshop carries «parading lions»; 160 (CMS II 2, no. 118) also from the Workshop, and 399 (CMS XII, no. 11D) carry hatched motifs, a hallmark of the Border/Leaf group; 7 (CMS VS 1A, no. 56) carries a lion on side c with upturned tail, a trait that is found on early cylinders; and 23 (CMS IS, no. 107) carries a rosette on side c, a motif that occurs commonly on early Mesara seals.

MA then turns her attention to non-Malia groups of soft stone prisms that were probably produced in central Crete. There are seven of these. The group of the Mesara Chlorite Prisms is the largest, consisting of 16 prisms all but one of which is of chlorite. Within the group there are eight clusters, each consisting of one to a few seals; the Agrimi/Scorpion cluster is perhaps the clearest with bold motifs taking up the entire seal face.

The discussion of this group of Chlorite Prisms again links peripheral seals to it, identifies sealings from Phaistos that were impressed by the group’s seals, and closes with comments on distribution (the prisms with secure provenance all come from Mesara tholoi) and dating (MM I–II).

The large group of the Central Crete Ornamental Prisms (148–159) consists of seals with centered circles and/or parallel lines; the simplicity of the designs may have led scholars to ignore this group. There are other seal shapes that have these simple motives, stamps and Petschafts, gables and disks, and seals belonging to this group impressed some 20 sealings from Phaistos. MA divides the group into two clusters, the Steatite Cluster and the cluster of White Prisms, based on material and a preference for centered circles in the former and dots («blobs») in the latter cluster.

Another group, that of the Phaistos Agrimi (138–140), consists of prisms with presentational designs of recumbent agrimia, squatting monkeys, and regardant waterbirds with few filling motifs. The group is clear and instantly recognizable.

The remaining five non-Malia groups are less convincing. The Dawkins Prism group (137–138) is assembled mostly on iconographic grounds. One prism, her 604a (the Dawkins prism) carries a man seated on a stool, which MA relates iconographically to side a of a reel (HM 2674; fig. 72a) from the Kouse tholos and then to an «Archaic» reel, NYMM 42.11.1, published in Boardman 1970 (above), pp. 123 and 137, pl. 279. The two reels are almost identical in showing a seated man and a standing woman apparently about to have sex (the reverse of the «Archaic» reel depicts two agrimia mating). Anastasiadou gave a talk at the 2011 annual meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America on these two reels («A Middle Minoan and an Archaic (?) Reel with Similar Iconography», AIA 112th Annual Meeting Abstracts 34, 2011, 139–140). Compare CMS II 1, no. 446a, a dentine stamp cylinder from Viannos that seems to show the same scene. Mating agrimia appear as Late Minoan miniature terracottas from the Iouktas peak sanctuary (once on display in the Heraklion Museum), on the Late Minoan gold ring CMS VII, no. 68, and on a Mycenaean Pictorial krater (E.T. Vermeule and V. Karageorghis, *Mycenaean Pictorial Vase Painting*, no. XL85, Cambridge 1982). The author wonders if her cluster of the British Museum prisms is even genuine (141–142; 595 n. 2626). Three other clusters also seem difficult to defend. Two present seals with loopy designs, called «cable devices», although that term is never defined. To the Platanos Prism with Cable Devices (her no. 106 [CMS II 1, no. 309]) she links CMS II 2, no. 201 and VII, no. 1 (with linear quadrupeds) and to the Kalo Chorio and Psychro Prisms with Cable Devices (her nos. 62 [CMS II 1, no. 453] and 276 [CMS III, no. 226]) she links CMS II 1, nos. 109 and 490 and III, nos. 35 and 36. CMS II 1, no. 109 comes from an early excavation of the Ayios Onouphrios tholos and should be genuine; its face carries two simple loops that resemble Linear A signs (perhaps *301 J; cf. HT Wc 1026); if so it joins at least two other seals inscribed with Linear A: CMS VS 1B, no. 310, XI, no. 311 [very doubtful], and XII, no. 96). The other seals in the Kalo Chorio/Psychro cluster carry complex and messy designs: CMS II 1, no. 453 has been known since the late 19th century, but its findspot is not precisely known and its date may not be Bronze Age; the other seals have unknown provenance: CMS 1, no. 490 and III, nos. 35, 36, and 226. If the group is defined by the messy loops (thus omitting CMS II 1, no. 109), then it depends on one probably authentic seal (CMS II 1, no. 453), whose date is debatable, while the rest may not be authentic. Finally, MA’s cluster of the Platanos Ornamental Prism depends on relating seals with very simple designs (e.g., cross with a dot in each quadrant).

MA’s third major chapter concerns the iconography of the prisms; it is the longest section in the book (160–369, plus most of the plates of volume 2). There are five sections: the individual «devices» or motifs of the iconography (160–327); composition (327–340); the «nature of the images» (341–358); the process of creating the images («iconogenesis», 358–364); and the iconography of the prisms from the Malia Workshop (365–369).

The longest section concerns the individual «devices» or motifs, the building blocks of the iconography that «cannot be broken down to their constituent elements in a meaningful way» (160; e.g., bow). Some motifs can be combined into «representational composites», like a bow and arrow, that are «meant to be seen as one unit» (160). Some motifs can be fused, like two waterbird bodies conjoined to form a whirl or a papyrus flower joined to a spiral. Some motifs stand alone on the seal face («free-standing») while supplemental motifs (like dots or wedges) can fill spaces.

Most of the iconography section consists of a catalogue of 269 motifs, beginning with no. 1, «Frontal man» (166) and ending with nos. 268, «Miscellaneous unidentifiable devices/images» (289–294) and 269, «Fragmentary unidentifiable devices/images» (294–296). Each catalogue entry in volume 1 is actually a short textual presentation that describes what one sees in the outline drawings in the plates in volume 2. Thus, for motif 1, «Frontal man», there are twelve outline drawings (pl. 1), each accompanied by MA's catalogue number plus their CMS or museum citation. All instances of the motifs are drawn, even when several occur on one prism face (e.g., three separate drawings for the three frontal men on 120a, CMS II 2, no. 308a). The plates also subdivide the motifs into groups. Thus, Motif 2, «Man in profile» (pls. 1–10), is divided into «Standing/Walking», «Running», «Bent at the Waist», «Seated», «Lying», and «Performing the Crab» (= as acrobat). Within these major subsections, there are smaller ones: so, for «Seated», there are «head straight, hanging arms», «one arm extended in front», «head down», etc. Examining every drawing of the motifs is instructive as to the variety, but since the drawings also reproduce the image exactly as shown even on a broken face, one must be careful to realize that the lack of a body on «Seated, head down» prism 144a (CMS II 2, no. 98a) is simply the result of the seal face being broken at that point.

There are sections, however, in the plates that are less informative, mainly because of MA's decision to include every single motif on every single seal face in an outline drawing. Motifs that may be clear on the seal, like fish, become ovals with short protrusions (fins) on pls. 28–30. Composite motifs like the 'Pole' with 'String vessels' are catalogued separately: Motif 113 ('Pole', pl. 55) and Motif 111 ('String vessels', pls. 53–55); these are brought back together as «Representational composite» 2 (pls. 107–109), just as bows (Motif 133) and arrows (Motifs 127, 128) are catalogued separately and together («Representational composite» 1, pl. 107). Less intriguing are the drawings of the Hieroglyphic signs (e.g., Motif 156, «Trowel», pls. 63–64, every one of which is Hieroglyphic sign 044) or every line (Motif 206), wedge (Motif 207), and triangle (Motif 209).

The text in volume 1 that describes every motif is short. So, the text for Motif 1, «Frontal man» (166) tells us the stylistic groups on whose prisms the motif occurs, the number of representations, and then a verbal description of the individual images. The description ends with a brief characterization of the function of the image. Thus, «Frontal man» occurs as a main device, «alone in an image» or «combined with other devices», as well as «descriptive and 'pictographic' images.» These last two terms are not defined here, but rather farther along on p. 341: «descrip-

tive» means that the image is met in everyday life (e.g., a frontal man) while «'Pictographic' is a conventional term to refer to images in which representational motifs ... are combined with each other in ways ... not ... seen in the real world» (341), like a seal face presenting a boat and agrimi head together (unlikely to occur together in the real world).

The only representation of a «Frontal man» that is said to be «pictographic» (166, n. 814) is problematic. MA's prism 265b (CMS III, no. 174b) presents a seated figure next to a large quadruped placed vertically, the head either at top or at bottom or both (conjoined protomes). In her catalogue entry for the prism (564–565), MA describes the figure as having a «loop-shaped ear» (564) but the CMS text (III p. 273) suggests that the figure's head, shown in profile (and thus not frontal), has either a back-lock of hair or a horn. If a horn, the figure is not a man; if a back-lock (cf. her no. 428, CMS XII, no. 15b), the figure would be an adolescent, a boy or girl (for Minoan adolescent hairstyles, see E.N. Davis, «Youth and Age in the Thera Frescoes», *AJA* 90, 1986, 399–406). The CMS text also gives a description of the animal: it is placed vertically, with the head either at the top, with foreleg in front and long tail at the bottom, or upside down; or the animal is really two animal protomes combined with a head and foreleg at top and bottom. MA follows the CMS's final suggestion for the quadruped: she recreates it as a «Z-whirl of Protomes of a dog/lion». That would certainly qualify the image as «pictographic». But if the prism face simply presents a person with a dog (or even a lion), then that would be «natural». The reviewer suspects there are other examples in the iconographic catalogue that are similarly problematic.

The identification of most motifs, however, is clear (boar, fish, sheep head [actually, face]) but many of the descriptive tags (titles) are puzzling. «Frontal 'ape'» and «'Ape' a in profile» (Motifs 6 & 7) may be male figures with an exaggerated penis depicted, not an ape with tail. In any case, if these really do depict simians, they are more likely to be imported monkeys (P. Rehak, «The Monkey Frieze from Xeste 3, Room 4», *Meletemata*, vol. III: 705–709, Liège and Austin 1999). Other motifs have unhelpful tags (e.g., the indecipherable Motif 8, «'Ape' b in profile»; Motif 99, 'Boar with centipede legs'; Motif 101, 'Centipede with muzzle'; Motif 173, «Nose paisley»; Motif 197, «Candy motif»). It might have been better to group the «centipede» boars under pictorialized boars and the «nose» paisley as just another variation of paisley (the «candy» motif is a simple type of hatching with dots).

A series of separately themed discussions follows the catalogue of images. About half the images are representational, half the rest are vegetal or ornamental; a small number are unidentifiable. The style is summary with few details rendered (most as deviations in the profile, like «dentation» for boar bristles); poses are usually in side view or frontal – there are almost no examples of three-quarter views. There are a lot of headless images (e.g., waterbird bodies) and other floating body parts («erased» in heraldic terminology) – «the significance of such depictions ... is unknown» (297).

A short section on poses (299–302, with schematic outline drawings on pls. 126–127) explains in words the poses of people and animals; there is no reference to the reviewer's 'Iconography of Late Minoan and Mycenaean Sealstones and Finger Rings', Bristol 1988, or Yule 1980 (above) – the typologies for poses there of earlier and later seals could have served as points of departure for a discussion of poses specific to the prisms.

Another section deals with images that appear regularly together. Again, these have conventional names. There are two «Representational composites»: the bow and arrow (302–303) and «Elongated motif (pole, bars, or ladder bands) slung with ‘String vessels’». It is likely that the «elongated» motif is a yoke, since a man carries one across his shoulders with globular vessels attached (389b [CMS XI, no. 122], 502c [CMS VI, no. 44], and CMS II 1, no. 300b) or with two trussed agrimia (CMS VI, no. 25a). This motif has elicited much interest and MA briefly mentions the various interpretations (303) without much bibliographic citation or speculation as to what representational object lies behind the motif.

MA calls trussed animals «animals with crossed legs»: agrimia (pl. 13), bovines (pl. 16), boars (pl. 18), and quadrupeds (pl. 24). She does not speculate on why their legs are crossed nor does she relate their crossed legs to the trussed agrimia on the yoke carried by the man on CMS VI, no. 25a (not in her catalogue). To the reviewer their trussed pose is identical (both in shape and purpose) to that of the trussed calf on the Ayia Triada Sarcophagus.

Images, especially patterns, that repeat on a seal face are called «Repetition Compounds» (304–317), like several circles on a single face, and bits of images attached to larger motifs are called «Supplemental Compounds» (317–324), like a cross with bird feet protruding from the center, spirals with added papyrus flowers, or circular borders with pendant hatched triangles.

MA’s discussion of composition is similarly clinically descriptive: «Six basic strategies are mobilised for the combination of the iconographic units: parataxis, rotation, antithesis, flanking, angle/curve-filling, and enclosure» (330, fig. 101). Each of these is then briefly described followed by a discussion of their «decorative effects» (334–340).

The final three sections of «Iconography» consist of general discussions of the «images» at large (341–358), iconogenesis (358–364), and the images on the seals excavated from the Malia Workshop (364–369). In general, half the images are «descriptive» (i.e., derived from nature), under half are ornamental (i.e., patterns), with «pictographic» images (not «natural» to the real world) and Hieroglyphic signs making up the rest.

With «descriptive» images, narration is rare (e.g., the man seated at a gameboard, 497a, CMS VI, no. 45a; the potter carrying pots on a yoke while a happy dog leaps up, 502c, CMS VI, no. 44c; the potter at his kiln, 498b, CMS VI, no. 34b). MA seems to regard our desire to provide narrative interpretations with some skepticism: «the thought that a person is depicted while making a pot, hunting/fighting, holding the sea-creatures he/she fished, transporting an object, holding an unidentifiable device, playing a game, and taking some liquid out of a large pot respectively is reflexive. To which extent such compositions were actually simply narrative or functioned as symbols of some sort is unknown» (349).

MA is rightly reluctant to engage in a discussion of the meaning of the iconography of a seal; this topic has perplexed scholars for years. Evans thought some seals might refer to the profession of their owner (*Scripta Minoa* 1909, 131–134); a man with a bow and arrow on CMS VIII, no. 12 with quadruped could depict a hunter and prey but it is hypothetical if that was the sole occupation of the seal’s owner. The situation gets more complicated when more than one seal can be attributed to

a single individual (cf. I. Kilian-Dirlmeier, ‘Das Kuppelgrab von Vaphio’, *JRGZM* 34, 1987, 197–212, who attempts to link the iconography of all 29 seals in the Vapheio cist to various aspects of the deceased’s *persona*). Nonetheless, it seems obvious that the many depictions of pots and of men with pots on seals made by the Malia Workshop probably refer to the potter’s quarter next door (H. Wingerath, *Studien zur Darstellung des Menschen in der minoischen Kunst der älteren und jüngeren Palastzeit*, 22–48, Marburg 1995) – and that a happy dog back then was much like a happy dog today, as the author undoubtedly knows (cf. fig. 96 depicting a dog [her dog?] in pose types 1.1 and 1.2).

The purpose of «pictographic» motifs is even more elusive. Still, the unique character of every prism and its cluster of images seems to demand a legible or at least intelligible purpose. The author discusses these images (354–356) but points out that, while most Hieroglyphic steatite prisms carry only signs 044–049, a transaction term (J.G. Younger, ‘Cretan Hieroglyphic Transaction Terms’, *Cretan Studies* 9, 2003, 301–316), others carry different and sometimes complicated inscriptions (for example: Hieroglyphic signs 044–005, another transaction term, occurs on 519b [CMS VI, no. 28b]; 038–010, another fairly common signgroup, occurs on 457b [XII, no. 89b]; and the complex and unique inscription 012–016–062–018 occurs on 69a [II 2, no. 244a]) — this would argue for some owners of steatite prisms (presumably humble, therefore) being actually literate in Hieroglyphic, not just the owners of medium hard and hard stone prisms.

Middle Minoan iconogenesis (i.e., how one motif changes into another), has been much discussed (G. Walberg, *Tradition and Innovation*, Mainz 1986). MA contributes analyses of motifs that change through fusion, transformation, and abstraction (358–364) and gives informative illustrations of the process (figs. 125–130).

The final discussion in the Iconography section concerns the prisms excavated from the Malia Workshop itself (365–369). Working on the assumption that the Deep Cut style represents the work of one hand, then slight differences in rendering iconographically similar motifs might differentiate the motifs further. For example, three different ways of rendering animal «heads» (faces) might actually be the attempt to render three different animals. Similarly, The «dog/lion» comes in a robust (lions?) and a slim version (dogs?).

After a section titled «Conclusions» (370–378, actually a summary), there then follow seven appendices, of which two are immediately useful. Appendix 1 gives a list of the find contexts and ceramic dates (379–384). Appendix 2 gives an alphabetical list of the «Find Places», both secure and putative (385–395).

Finishing volume 1 is a short bibliography (436–450), a list of illustrations (451–458), several concordances (names of the devices and their catalogue numbers; MA’s catalogue numbers and publication sources, although this information can be readily found in the seal catalogue; seals in the CMS and MA’s catalogue number); and finally a short index.

In sum, MA’s two-volume work focuses on a certain class of Cretan sealstone, the three-sided prism of steatite and chlorite, and finds that all date to MM II and break into one large group that was made at Malia in the Workshop excavated in Quartier Mu and smaller groups that were made elsewhere at Malia and in central and south-central Crete. The iconography of seals made at Malia is more or less

homogeneous while the central Cretan prisms share a different iconography. The author thus brings sharply into focus a group of seals that has not received much attention since Yule 1980 (above). Since these seals form a bridge between the earlier groups of seals (especially the Parading Lions/Spiral Complex and Border/Leaf) and the later seals of MM III and the Late Minoan period, we now have the complete production of seals in Crete in sharp focus. Scholars of Minoan seals and art are in the author's debt.

The book has faults, of course. It is the published form of a dissertation and consequently has a narrow focus and is filled with details and lists. It was also written in English, not the author's native language nor that of her dissertation directors; there are lots of typographical errors and some infelicities of expression. The catalogue (volume 2) gives the names of the motifs on each seal face but not its motif number: to find an outline drawing of any motif on any seal mentioned in the catalogue one must go to the first concordance at the end of volume 1 (459–466) and then find the drawing in the relevant plate in volume 2. More serious, perhaps, is the scantiness of the bibliography (missing: most of the present reviewer's own studies of MM and LM seals!) and the author's decision to reinvent technical and iconographic terminology; the pioneering work of earlier scholars is often ignored.

Because of her concentration on a narrow focus (a definition of the class and a description of its properties) and because of the need for dissertations to present data, MA cannot treat in any detail those aspects that make the Malia prisms fascinating: each prism's specific and unique iconography (cf. H. and M. van Effenterre 1974, above) and the relationship of these multifacial seals to the documents written in Cretan Hieroglyphic, themselves often multifacial. These are aspects likely to be taken up by MA herself, now that her basic data have been compiled and analyzed – or by other scholars. The reviewer awaits the results.

Lawrence, Kansas

John G. Younger

*

Antonio Monterroso Checa: *Theatrum Pompei*. Forma y arquitectura de la génesis del modelo teatral de Roma. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas; Escuela Española de Historia y Arqueología en Roma 2010. 422 S. 285 Abb. 4°. (Serie Arqueológica. 12.).

Das Theater, das Pompeius auf dem Marsfeld errichten ließ und das von ihm im Jahre 55 v. Chr. feierlich eingeweiht wurde, war bekanntlich das erste dauerhaft und aus Stein errichtete Bühnentheater der Stadt Rom. Zu dem Komplex gehörten auch der Tempel der Venus Victrix und eine *porticus post scaenam* von gewaltigen Ausmaßen. Diesem Ensemble widmet sich die Monographie von Antonio Monterroso (M.), in der alte und neue Erkenntnisse auf eindrucksvolle Weise zusammengeführt sind.

Das Werk beginnt mit Einführungsworten der Direktoren der Spanischen Schule für Geschichte und Archäologie in Rom und der akademischen Lehrer M.s in Córdoba, Sevilla und Aix-en-Provence, Pilar León und Pierre Gros. Aus ihnen geht hervor, daß M. ursprünglich nach Rom kam, um die römischen Theater der Baetica zu untersuchen (15; 27), sein Interesse fokussierte sich aber bald in Rich-