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relief) are identified by comparison with them as Thasian work. The attributions to Thasos, often borne out by observation of the marble, are a particularly convincing part of the book. They include the pedimental sculptures of the Hieron at Samothrace and also a series of draped statues found at Palestrina. The fragment from Thasos usually assigned to the base with the signature of Philiskos of Rhodes is shown not to belong to it and to be another piece in the early-Hellenistic Thasian series.

While the greatest revelations have to do with early Hellenistic art, there is also skillful handling of later material. Linfert has found a replica on Thera, also early Imperial in date, of the draped girl at Sperlonga; the type has close parallels in Myrina terra cottas (e.g. Boston 87.384, D. Burr, *Terra-cottas from Myrina* [Vienna 1934] no. 195). Several interesting typological series are discussed, including one figure which is seen both independently and incorporated into the “Helen and Peitho” group in Izmir from Torbal. The Rhodian Nymph sitting on a rock, known in so many statuette replicas (another appears in Lorenzo Lotto’s portrait of Andrea Odoni at Hampton Court) was similarly incorporated into the Punishment of Dirce group, and identifies the Farnese copy as descending from Asinius Pollio’s marble version, brought from Rhodes, rather than from more conservative Asia Minor types where Dirce’s upper body is draped and her pose more horizontal. On the basis of an example from Stratoniikeia, under Rhodian domination from 189 to 167 B.C., Linfert dates the Nymph type, and with it the activity of Apollonios and Tau-riskos, sculptors of the Dirce group, to the early second century. Possibly, however, “Helen and Peitho” is a better parallel; the “Helen” type had had quite a long independent existence before being copied into the group. Many elements of the Toro Farnese suggest a late Hellenistic model.

Linfert’s excursus, on the altars of Magnesia and Priene, the “Ehrengrab” of the Bouleuterion at Mileto (he considers it another altar), and the find situation of the female figures from the Artemision of Thasos, is a group of studies which are significant in themselves and as points of reference for datings proposed elsewhere in the book.

The *Kunstzentren* of the title provide an organizational framework for the vast and potentially chaotic material. Distinctive, apparently local styles do characterize certain limited groups of pieces; it takes all of Linfert’s refinement, though, to find any thread of development running through all the works found at one site, or any revealing distinction between very similar pieces made in widely separated places. The field is too vast, the evidence too fragmentary and too incompletely recorded, for any book written now to be definitive. Linfert’s remarkable compilation is an important beginning.

**Ariel Herrmann**

MUSEUM OF FINE ARTS BOSTON
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02115


This folio volume contains the results of five years’ topographical reconnaissance in the hilly territory of Blera in central southern Etruria. The area as delimited in quadrant 4, sheet 143 of the 1:25,000 IGM map of Italy occupies 106 km.² and extends on the northeast from the site of Forum Cassii to Barbarano on the southeast and west from these points along the line of the north-south course of the Biedano and its tributary streams. In 1848 Dennis wrote “I do not recollect a site in the volcanic district of Etruria, save Sorano in Tuscany, where the chasms are more profound and the scenery more grand, than around Bieda,” but it has only had sporadic attention from archaeologists and topographers from the early nineteenth century to the present and that chiefly directed to the rock-cut necropolis of Blera. (Neither the Blera necropolis nor that of S. Giuliano is included here; they will be treated separately in the series on rock-cut cemeteries of central Etruria of which the first two volumes by E. and G. Colonna on Castel d’Asso were published in 1970.) It is, however, because of investigations made in the Blera necropolis in 1914 by a team from the German Archaeological Institute in Rome that Quilici Gigli’s study appears in the Institute’s Sonderschriften, enriched by previously unpublished photographic documentation from its archives (RömMitt 30 [1915] 161).

The format is that of the *Forma Italiae*: an introduction with history of previous scholarship and a synthetic account of the survey results chronologically by period from the Late Bronze Age to the later Roman Empire, followed by a detailed archaeological catalogue of 490 items. These include major and minor roads, bridges, cemeteries and tombs, settlements, habitations, farm houses and villas, cuniculi for drainage and irrigation, agricultural, architectural and domestic artifacts in metals, stone and terra cotta. Illustrations in the form of maps, topographical and object photographs, plans and sections are profuse and relevant. The usefulness of the work is immense as the summaries based on the survey show.

The earliest evidence for a settlement comes from a promontory due east of Barbarano where surface pottery characteristic of the late Bronze Age was found. To the Villanovan necropolis at Chiusa Cima and Poggio Montano (both just beyond the limits of the Blera quadrant) can be added eighth century pottery from the neighborhood of Blera itself. For the archaic period the survey has produced evidence of territorial organization with examples of primary fortified ridge settlements with outlying agricultural districts, in some of which are signs of villages and in others substantial tombs which suggest comparatively
wealthy land holders. Communications followed the southeast to north/northwest line of the settlement pattern: two roads apparently diverged beyond Grotta Porcina, one heading north toward Castel d’AssO-Orvieto, the other northwest toward Tuscania-Vulci, while from Blera a route ran west toward Tarquinia and the coast. This state of affairs was little altered in the Hellenistic period, although here as elsewhere in Etruria possible signs of Roman encroachment may be read in new fortifications; and changes from the earlier route system observable in the course of the Via Clodia near S. Giuliano in the south and in the direction of Castel d’AssO to the north may indicate the decline of these sites in the third century.

The land presents quite a different aspect in the late republican and early imperial periods from that suggested by a few tendentious literary sources. The intensity of cultivation is reflected by the rapid growth of secondary and tertiary roads connecting numerous agricultural and light “industrial” establishments of small to medium size, not oriented to particular towns. There is only one large villa estate of third or fourth century date, imperfectly known because it underlies S. Giovanni in Tuscia. (It is to be noted that the situation is analogous to what has been observed in the south Etruria survey of the British School in Rome and farther north in the territory of Cosa.)

The preceding descriptions of the development of the territory of Blera depend upon the author’s interpretations of various kinds of physical evidence: quantity and distribution of roof tiles, pottery and implement types, styles of masonry and concrete work, tomb architecture and burial practice, cemetery locations, road beds and cuttings. She has been careful to provide full documentation so that, if one should choose to question particular points, the relevant data are usually available in written and pictorial form. There are some matters that could obviously only be checked by following in her footsteps, others are no longer recoverable as she or her few predecessors saw them. Readers familiar with her methods from Tuscania (1970) will appreciate the more her scrupulous critical precision.

The Blera volume is representative of the quantity and quality of the research for the Forma Italicae that has gone on in recent years notably through the Istituto di topografia antica of the University of Rome and Professor Ferdinando Castagnoli. Different factors have stimulated this increased activity (as was true for the pioneering efforts of Gamurrini, Cozza, Pasquini and Mengarelli with the original Carta Archeologica in the last century and for Lugli earlier in the present one) and it would be idle to analyze them here. What is important is to recognize the fundamental contribution such studies can make to the investigation of ancient Italy. And, if there is an irony in that the costs of these volumes may delay their publication and restrict their circulation, it is one with which the entire archaeological community must contend. The Forma Italicae needs no defense and Stefania Quilici Gigli is to be congratulated on this most recent of her contributions to it.

Russell T. Scott

Department of Latin
Bryn Mawr College
Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania 19010


Dyson’s study of Cosa’s utilitarian pottery will come as a relief to those who feared that it would be published in the same manner as the site’s thin-walled wares (Moevs, MAAR 32). Moevs’s approach was to set up a hypothetical model of technological development and decay of wares and their surface coatings, to establish a rigid classification of forms, and to derive most of the information on dating from these rather than the stratigraphy of the excavations. In contrast, Dyson presents eight distinct groups of pottery, more or less well stratified, dated ca. 275-150 B.C., ca. 200 B.C., mid-second century B.C., ca. 70-60 B.C., ca. 100-30 B.C., Tiberian-early Claudian, late first-early third century A.D., and late fourth-early fifth century A.D. respectively. The text is clearly and logically organized and the drawings can be related to their descriptions without difficulty, although tabulation of the descriptions on the pages facing the drawings might have been both an economy and a convenience, allowing commentary and pure description to have been separated. The sherd descriptions themselves would have benefited from Munsell color-chart references, and petrological identifications of the compositions of various wares. It is a little surprising that the author did not identify the “flat bottomed pans with red interior glaze-paint” (12). They are clearly “Pompeian red” wares, discussed in a recent monograph by C. Goudineau, “Note sur la Céramique à Engobe Rouge Interne Rouge-Pompéien,” MêlRom 82 (1970).

Dyson’s division of the pottery into Kitchen, Coarse and Domestic wares (14) is not employed by European pottery students, because it is unworkable on most sites, where the quality of clay and workmanship and the function of a vessel are not constantly related. Cooking pot fabrics used by the Roman army in Britain vary from thin and fine to thick and coarse as a result of the derivation of supplies from different production centers at different dates. That the division works for Cosa may be a further indication of the continuity to which the author frequently refers, but it should be applied cautiously to other sites.

The drawings are arranged in these fabric categories within the stratified groups, allowing their composition to be seen at a glance. Although this presentation is infinitely preferable to a type-series, the addition of an outline type-series would have been helpful—the