Thasian cult practice (and we are given no account at all of funerary practice). So too, although a significant proportion of these reliefs have remains of inscriptions, some of which go beyond simple names (one extends to 16 lines), Holtzmann has no interest in these inscriptions (bar the possibility of dating on their basis), either in themselves or in their relationship to the reliefs. The reliefs here have become essentially detached from everything else.

Reading the work of a fine scholar is always a pleasure, but in this case the pleasure is distinctly qualified by the many missed opportunities.

Robin Osborne
University of Cambridge
ro225@cam.ac.uk

Barbara A. Barletta. *The Sanctuary of Athena at Sounion*. pp. 360, with col. and b/w ills. 2018. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens (Ancient Art and Architecture in Context 4). ISBN: 978-0-87661-967-4, hardcover £65.

The extensive and lavishly illustrated book by Barletta is partly based on an unpublished manuscript by H.A. Thompson, the former director of the Agora Excavations, and of W.B. Dinsmoor Jr., the architect of the excavation. It was first editorially revised by M. McAllister and finally Barletta assumed the task to publish it after her own intensive studies of the sanctuary and its remains. Because of her untimely death, she did not see the final publication which was provided meticulously by D. Scahill.

After a general introduction (pp. 2–13) dealing with the topography and an overall history of research at Sounion, Barletta starts her treatise with a detailed research history of the sanctuary of Athena (Ch. 1, pp. 14–52), which began more than one hundred years ago with the excavations by V. Staïs. The discovery of many architectural elements of the temple of Athena being one of the 'itinerant temples of Attica'[1] on the Athenian Agora stimulated the vivid interest of the American excavators, who undertook their own investigations at Sounion between 1967 and 1969. Barletta herself has thoroughly studied all finds and architectural parts that were kept in the National Museum at Athens, in the former excavation depot at Sounion, now in the museum at Lavrion, and on the spot. Unfortunately several objects from the former excavation depot at Sounion as well as from the site of the sanctuary itself had meanwhile vanished (p. 12). For the illustrations and maps, Barletta could lean on the archives of the ASCSA, the Agora Excavations, and her own drawings and photos. Many finds are for the first time here published in usable illustrations. For a publication that draws so heavily on former material from different archives as well as on own data, it would have been appropriate to quote the date and authorship of every plan or photo in their legends. Regarding the votive relief of the so-called Stephanophoros (p. 23f., fig. 16) of 470/60 BC, regrettably the convincing explanation by Th. Schäfer[2] has been omitted.

The oval enclosure to the Northwest of the sanctuary remains enigmatic, especially considering the disposition of the two temples in relation to it, if the enclosure should indeed be earlier than these and the rectangular temenos wall as Barletta holds. If this was the earliest feature on the spot, then why did the builders choose a slope with a gradient of more than 10% instead of the rather flat hilltop? After repeated autopsy, I hold this oval enclosure to be a Late Roman or Early Byzantine sheepfold or mandra being constructed from the stones of the rectangular temenos wall. Such mandra are frequently found in South Attica, generally preferring slopes instead of flat sites.[3]

In Ch. 2 (pp. 54–84) Barletta discusses the so-called 'Small Temple' in the sanctuary of Athena, which was excavated by V. Staïs, who dated it to the 6th cent. BC and interpreted as a predecessor of the classical temple. Thompson and Dinsmoor hold instead that it was contemporary with it and suggested that it was the heroon of Phrontis, the helmsman of Odysseus (Hom. *Od.* 3,278–285), who was killed by Apollon at Sounion. The arguments in favour of his cult at Sounion, which is nowhere attested, are meagre. Because of the inexistent foundations of the two stylobates in front of the temple and its very shallow foundations in general it has to be assumed that the columns and the entablature were made from wood, while the walls of the naos most probably consisted of mudbrick. Barletta,

[1] H.L. Thompson 1962 Itinerant Temples of Attica, Abstract of Paper read at General Meeting, 1962, *AJA* 66, p. 200; *Agora* XIV, 160-168.

[2] Th. Schäfer, Dikella, Terma und Tettix. Zur Palästritenstele von Sunion, *MDAI(A)* 111, 1996, pp. 109–140.

[3] H. Lohmann, *Atene. Forschungen zur Siedlungs- und Wirtschaftsstruktur des klassischen Attika* (Köln – Wien 1993) pp. 254–260.

on the base of the roof elements ascribed to this temple, advocates a date of ca. 500 BC and follows Staïs' interpretation. The convincing arguments of H.R. Goette,[4] which point to a date after 480 BC, are rejected by Barletta on insufficient grounds (p. 23).

With Ch. 3 (pp. 86–160), Barletta turns to the temple of Athena itself, which represents one of the earliest examples of Ionic architecture in Attica. Together with Ch. 4, which is devoted to the parallels of the temple and Ch. 5 which treats its afterlife, these three chapters form the core of her study.

The temple of Athena was completely dismantled down to the euthynteria, which is still in situ, already in antiquity. While Staïs and Orlandos assumed two phases of construction, Thompson and Dinsmoor adopted only one. After having thoroughly discussed the foundations of the temple as well as every single architectural element, which are fully documented in excellent drawings and photos, Barletta presents a convincing reconstruction of the building. It was constructed in one phase, displaying pseudodipteral colonnades only at two adjacent sites with 10 unfluted columns at the eastern and 12 at the southern side (in contrast to the 13 proposed by Orlandos). Based on the evidence available no cogent explanation for this unique plan can be given. The krepis consisted of a single step, which constituted the stylobate. The unfluted columns rose over disk-shaped bases devoid of decoration and lacking a torus. The ionic capitals were of the torus-type and richly painted. The entablature was of the Cycladic- or Island-Ionic type with a (now completely lost) frieze over a two fascia architrave. A pitched roof with marble roof tiles probably of Parian origin, was placed symmetrically over the building, with its ridge supported by the two southern interior columns. It had pediments at the east and west with raking geisa, but it is uncertain, moreover unlikely, that they continued onto the flanks. Citing Vitr. *De Arch.* 4,8,4 who compares the temple of Athena at Sounion to other transversely oriented temples with the entrance in the middle of the longer side, previous scholars have assumed a second entrance in the south wall of the naos. Although the position of the altar on the southern side of the temple is clearly in favour of this, the question might safely be answered only by means of new excavations.

Ch. 4, The Temple of Athena in Context (pp. 162–218), is devoted to its classification within the history and development of ancient architecture. The temple does not only display an unusual plan, its order – the Ionic order – is untypical for Attica at this early date too. Compared to the later buildings on the Acropolis using the Ionic order, the appearance of the temple at Sounion seems rather modest. Using the evidence from a much broader geographical area (p. 163 fig. 175) than available to former scholars, and from excavations of much later date than those at Sounion, Barletta discusses fully any available parallel for the plan of the temple, its main features, and its architectural elements. The existence of a (painted?) frieze, postulated by Thompson and Dinsmoor, although no fragments have survived, is also favoured by Barletta. Her meticulous analysis ends up in the following conclusions: The Temple of Athena Sounias dates to the 2nd quarter of the 5th cent. BC. It integrates ideas from different geographical regions and architectural styles, especially from the Cycladic Islands, but its architect has also been familiar with developments in Western Greece, East Greece and Chios.

Ch. 5 (pp. 220–252) treats the afterlife of the temple. The precise date of its dislocation to the Athenian Agora as well as its secondary use – Roman Market, Southeast Temple or Southwest Temple – are discussed. In a third instance elements of the temple were used in the post-Herulian wall. The idea that the temple of Athena was destroyed during the raids of Philip V in 200 BC, as Barletta holds (p. 220), is contradicted by the drastic account of Livy (31,26,1–13). It is suggested that nothing of the temple would have been left that might have allowed for its reuse on the Agora. However, in the context of these raids no site is mentioned in Southern Attica, which by then was already largely deserted.[5] The main theatre of war in 200 BC comprised Eleusis, the Peiraeus and Athens itself.[6] Sounion was most probably finally abandoned after the slave revolts of 134 and ca. 104 BC.[7] This date fits perfectly with the reuse of some of the columns of the temple of Athena in the Roman Market (p. 224) during the 1st cent. BC.

A long and copious sub-chapter is devoted to the reuse of earlier material in antiquity (pp. 235–249), especially to the reuse of architectural elements in Athenian buildings. The topic is then extended to the reuse of Roman-Period sculpture (pp. 239f.) and

[4] H. R. Goette, *Ὁ ἀξιόλογος δήμος Σουνίων. Landeskundliche Studien in Südost-Attika* (Rhaden i.W. 2000) p. 36.

[5] B. 220; for the desolation of South Attica see also Lohmann supra note 3 pp. 248. 294; H. Lohmann, Ein neuer Befund zum Chremonideïschen Krieg: Das sog. Atene Fort im Charaka-Tal (Attika), *Boreas* 19, 1996, pp. 5–68.

[6] For more detail see Chr. Habicht, *Athen: Die Geschichte der Stadt in hellenistischer Zeit* (München 1995) pp. 197–221.

[7] Habicht supra note 6, pp. 262. 293.

architecture (pp. 240–242) thereby providing many new and thought-provoking insights.

Ch. 6, Conclusions (pp. 254–259), gives an exhaustive summary of the results of the study, followed by a detailed catalogue (pp. 261–293) listing all architectural objects that can be attributed to the sanctuary of Athena at Sounion, thereby providing a most valuable base for any future study of it.

The brilliantly written and lavishly illustrated book of Barletta goes far beyond a collection, documentation and presentation of all relevant archaeological objects from the sanctuary. Special regard is paid to the temple of Athena Sounias concerning its date, style, reconstruction and afterlife, which are discussed thoroughly and in full detail. The width and depth of the study are impressive. It presents, therefore, the most complete and comprehensive publication of the sanctuary, thereby not limiting itself to questions of architectural history and to the study of the Ionic order, especially to its implementation in Attica in the Early Classical period, to which it contributes considerably. The present publication of the Sanctuary of Athena at Sounion remains a precious legacy of the much regretted author.

HANS LOHMANN
BOCHUM UNIVERSITY
hans.lohmann@rub.de

Susan I. Rotroff. *The Athenian Agora XXXIII: Hellenistic Pottery, the Plain Wares*. pp. 480, with 98 ills and 90 plates. 2006. Princeton NJ: American School of Classical Studies at Athens. ISBN 978-0-87661-233-0, hardback $150.

Rotroff's *Hellenistic Pottery, the Plain Wares* is one of the key Hellenistic Pottery publications available to specialists in the field. The publication, by now more than a decade old, is still a shining example of the ideal pottery publication. It combines a rigorous, exhaustive and authoritative presentation and discussion of ceramic data with substantial contextual analysis. The lavishly illustrated volume joins its sister volumes, *Agora XXIX* and *XXII*, in providing a complete picture of the Hellenistic period pottery attested at the Athenian Agora.

The volume is composed of four parts. Part I provides a general introduction and a summary of key trends and observations visible in the data. Part II encompasses the core part of the book and discusses in turn household ware, vessels for oil and unguents, and finally cooking ware. Part III is formed by the pottery catalogue and part IV the deposit summaries. A series of appendices rounds of the book.

Part I is subdivided into 3 chapters. It is the most interpretative section of the book and required reading for all those interested in the Hellenistic pottery of Athens. Chapter 1 sets out the aims of the study, the type of material considered and discusses the limitations of the data under review (e.g. the fact that a large proportion of the plain ware pottery has been discarded). A key aim of Rotroff was to identify the various plain ware fabrics and forms and establish a chronological range for their occurrence at the Agora.

In Chapter 2, Rotroff focusses on the fabrics she has identified in the material under review. Helpful tables list the fabrics identified together with associated ceramic shapes. Each fabric is discussed in turn and accompanied by an illustration of the plain ware shapes attested in this ware. This visual overview is very helpful for the reader in considering the relationship between the various shapes and fabrics. At the end of this chapter is included a large table which lists all the fabrics identified and includes a line drawing for each of the shapes identified. It instantly provides an overview of which shapes occur in which fabric and as such helpfully summarizes the preceding information.

Chapter 3, the last chapter of part I, is titled descriptive overview and conclusions. It focuses in turn on decoration, potting techniques, function, relationship between local and imported material and finally general observations. This chapter, of interest to both the specialist and general reader, aptly summarizes all the key trends visible within the material. Of particular interest is the section on the provenance of the plain ware. We learn, e.g., that one third of the cooking ware and a quarter of the house ware was imported.

The final section of this chapter draws everything together; outlining that despite similarities in shape with vessels recovered at other sites the Athenian assemblage yields few external parallels and is distinct in nature and character. Very importantly, Rotroff ends this chapter with a warning to survey archaeologists. Substantial Roman influence on the Attic plain ware repertoire is visible only during the third decade of the 1st century CE. Rotroff warns, therefore, that archaeologists heavily reliant upon