

dropped drastically to only a few sherds, indicating sporadic gifts thereafter—except for the remains of c. 120 lamps of the fourth–fifth centuries A.D. Ash and animal bones were mingled through the pottery, which (N.B.) was all modest ware, 'the ordinary-use pottery of the (farmer-)dedicators' own homes' (p. 77).

Why did the offerings thus dwindle away? It was, L. suggests, 'a reflexion of the agricultural history of Attica'. When the steady import of grain started, presumably after the Attic settlements at Sigeion and Elaiou on the Hellespont, the balance of farming altered, and the local grains lost their once-critical importance. (The late Roman lamps may, he thinks, reflect prayers renewed at a time of acute shortage.) His general historical conclusions (ch. IV) are soberly argued and, to me, convincing. Discussing the possible agricultural condition of Attica from the Protogeometric period onwards, as illustrated indirectly by this sanctuary, he opposes strongly (pp. 88–90) the modern theory which argues that arable agriculture 'did not really have its beginnings in Greece till c. 700 B.C., when Hesiod first began writing': before that, grazing flocks had provided most of the food supply. Here on Hymettos was an old and persistent rural cult of Zeus in one of his earliest aspects, the cloud-gatherer who brings rain for the crops.

The graffiti are mostly on plain ware, particularly cups of Young's Phaleron type and drinking-bowls, dated from the end of the eighth century through most of the seventh. L. divides the inscriptions into 4 categories, on content: (i) deity and *ἀνέθηκεν* (i.e., votive; Zeus is already specified on some of the earliest, c. 700); (ii) abecedaria and *ἔγραψεν* (i.e., direct demonstrations of literacy); (iii) names and other words (including parts of sentences; i.e., personal names and comments); (iv) miscellaneous (i.e., too fragmentary for any likely interpretation). Pp. 41–7 give a scrupulous discussion of the letter-forms, making several points important for the history of early Greek script in general, including salutary warnings: as, 70 and 71 show 'tilted' alphas, but their adjacent letters also tilted, all therefore 'probably the result of the handwriting style of the inscribers rather than a harkening back to earlier forms such as are present on the Dipylon oinochoe or in Phoenician inscriptions'; while the lunate, D-type delta, previously dismissed by myself as abnormal in Attic, is now shown to be normal in the earliest of these graffiti. (Indeed, this was perhaps the natural result for a right-handed learner who had to incise his letters retrograde; the vertical and the slope (or curve) to left come more easily than the slope to right, as is well known from the slopes for shading as done by right- or left-handed draughtsmen. The habit was fossilized in the Boiotian-type of alpha as well as delta.) In the very early abecedaria here, L. notes,  $\mathcal{F}$  is included (20; there are two known examples of its use in sixth-century Attic verse-inscriptions); but xi, unused in normal Attic script, is omitted (22, 24). Zeta chances to be absent, except perhaps in 47, where to read *Zeús* is very tempting, though the letter's base is now lost. In 2 and 73 *H* is used as  $\eta$ , and in 9  $\uparrow$  for  $\nu$ ; in all these cases the inscription is, I think, later than L. dates it (see below), but 26 almost certainly has  $\uparrow$  and is very early, and the use of these non-Attic letters is certainly interesting. L. stresses it as characteristic here of earliness, of 'the uncertainty which precedes standardization' (p. 44); it could be influence, he suggests, from the literate neighbours Aigina and Euboa. The catalogue of archaic graffiti is a scrupulously careful record of 166

inscribed sherds varying from the remains of longish inscriptions (which may have spiralled round the pot: e.g. 16, 50, 58, 60, 62, 66, 71) to single letters. A few suggestions: 1. Read *Ἀνδρογ[ένης καὶ] ἠοῖ [ἡ]μῆς?* 2. *Σημίοι (sic) Δί;* as L. notes, this is complete, and written on a sherd. Did it accompany some gift, as a label? It is here dated as seventh century, which may well be true of the sherd, but not necessarily of the inscription; the latter, with its open eta, is unlikely to be earlier than the sixth century. On lettering, the same should be true in other cases, which might all be written on old sherds picked up on the site: as 9, —*δεια ἡσακλη (sic)*; this lettering suggests a date around 500 or even later (*ἡκαλή[θεν]?* —*ἡε(ρ)ακλή[σει]* Young, *ἡε Ἀκλή*—, doubtfully, L.); as also 73, 88 and 100, and, above all, 173, part of a stone slab, like a marker, found near the 'Heroön': *ἡερ*—, in lettering certainly not earlier than the fifth century (Herakles?, Young; *ἡέρσοος?*; L.; or even *Ἠερ[μεί]?*). If these dates are right, some visitors did come during the classical period; but they make no significant difference to L.'s conclusion that the sanctuary's importance faded after the early sixth century. 56. *Δρόπυλο[s]?* 61. *ταῦτ' ἔγ[ραψε]*? 62. [*ἡ]ότε πίν[εις]*?

The interesting problem remains—why was so much inscribed ware offered, so early, to this agricultural deity? L. suggests that Attica had only recently become literate, and that the inscriptions were, in a sense, the dedication: an inscribed pot was still an impressive object. He may be right; at least the quantity of graffiti suggests that, in the worshippers' view, Zeus Semios liked to see inscriptions. The categories (above) could imply that, though some pots were inscribed on the spot, others were brought along *because* they were inscribed; one is even tempted to wonder whether Zeus' epithet was thought now, by some simple minds, to include these alphabetic *σήματα*, as well as weather-signs. Finally, L. rightly warns us that fine, decorated ware was, naturally, rarely scratched over with graffiti; we should not expect to find so much writing on the sherds from a major sanctuary at this date. The Hymettos sherds simply demonstrate anew how freely the alphabet spread through the levels of Greek society, once it had arrived.

L. H. JEFFERY

Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford

**ERETRIA. Ausgrabungen und Forschungen: fouilles et recherches.** 5. HURST (A.) *Ombres de l'Eubée?* DESCOEUDRES (J. P.) *Die vorklassische Keramik aus dem Gebiet des Westtors.* AUBERSON (P.) *Le temple de Dionysos.* Bern: Francke. 1976. Pp. 67, [24] plates, [24] text figs., 1 folding table, 9 plans in pocket. Sw.fr. 80.

This volume holds three Eretrian essays, some five years in the printing. A. Hurst makes a brave attempt at identifying Euboean names in the Linear B records. An Amarynthos but no clear Chalcis or Eretria give food for thought.

J.-P. Descoedres presents Archaic pottery from the West Gate area. He proves the sequence of the find groups from the statistics of pottery types represented in each. The exercise is one probably better tried on well-stocked graves since there are so few points for comparison and parts of the sequence are self-evident. It is an interesting demonstration of the technique, however, if somewhat

involved and likely to provide problems in reference. There is a lot to be said for the renumbering of excavation deposits and finds before they are published, but this essay lies somewhat outside the main scheme of the Eretria publication. D. strikes a pessimistic note on absolute chronology for pottery although he satisfies the material he has to deal with, and in thinking that the earliest Attic tetradrachms support the dating of Sophilos (n. 308) he breaks new ground which few may wish to work further. I suggest that his fig. 13 shows part of a ship with its oarsmen, proceeding left—our first view of Eretrian sailors. It is good to find an Eretrian origin for the Delos C23–7 group indicated in the finds (p. 40).

P. Auberson gives a characteristically neat account of the Doric temple of Dionysos and its kin in the Greek world. The date appears to be mid-fourth century and it goes with other 'short' 6 × 11-column temples of this date and later (Asklepios at Epidauros and Kos, Zeus at Stratos and the Olympia Metroon). The plans are immaculate.

J. BOARDMAN

Merton College, Oxford

TIRYNS. *Forschungen und Berichte*. Ed. U. Jantzen. 8.

**Das Kuppelgrab von Tiryns.** By K. Müller [and other articles by various authors]. Mainz: P. von Zabern (for Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Athen). 1975. Pp. [x] + 154, 2 col. plates, 84 plates, numerous text figs., [7] plans (2 folding). DM 158.

This volume reverts to the pattern of volumes V and VI and contains a widely varied selection of reports concerning material of widely differing periods and dates of excavation. It is excellent to have Kurt Müller's report on the tholos in print at last. Architecturally this tholos is most important and the last word on its date has certainly not been said. Tablets were later to be recovered at Tiryns even than at Mycenae and the three here published are of little interest *per se* but, as is clearly emphasized, they do show that the bureaucratic and administrative system which we now know from other sites was also in practice here. A further section deals with decorated roof tiles of sixth century B.C. to second century A.D. now in the Nauplia Museum. It is unfortunate that the good series from Mycenae was not included.

The other four sections deal with minor aspects of work in the Mycenaean period at Tiryns since 1968. These articles do not stand independently and constant reference to volume V (in particular), both text and illustrations, is needed. P. Gercke describes follow-up work in the area of the important Megaron W. In view of the meticulous care of his excavation and overall work it is a great shame that he (not primarily a Mycenaean specialist) did not have his catalogue checked, but this does not vitiate his results. Of particular importance are the sections between Megaron W and the citadel wall illustrated in Beil. 5 and discussed p. 10, as this can be used as evidence in the interpretation of the *epichosis* deposit on the west. Other parts of the volume show the effect of co-operation among the groups working in the Nauplia Museum and I have seen at first hand much of the material presented here, including sherds of 'handmade burnished

ware' (cf. Pl. 9: 1h) from both the Megaron W area and the niche in the 'Unterbürgmauer' which do not seem to have been included in the publication. In details, I would suggest a date no later than IIIB for Pl. 47 no. 38; this shape, which is not an alabastron, is basically IIIA; and Pl. 82 no. 67k is probably FS 240, on which this pattern is common. I regret the lack of full drawings of the vital dating evidence p. 105 nos. 15–20 and profiles of the IIIC rims p. 148 no. 67. I dispute J. Schäfer's interpretation of the IIIB/IIIC transition. In my view the features whose popularity distinguishes the chronological phase IIIB<sub>2</sub> (in the Argolid) from IIIB<sub>1</sub> do not continue as the type fossils of IIIC.

Overall we are now acquiring a most interesting history of Tiryns and its settlement pattern in Mycenaean times, which both parallels and contrasts with that at Mycenae itself. The various authors are still too inclined to try to date individual sherds as opposed to deposits and strata; the scattered nature of the work reported so far and the many individuals partaking do not help the achievement of a comprehensive archaeological interpretation and they are not able to distinguish the unusual from the standard. This will be made easier when the very large and important samples of IIIB and IIIC material from Tiryns are finally published to form a basic corpus for us all. Let us hope the publication of these deposits will be of the standard they and Tiryns itself deserve.

ELIZABETH FRENCH

University of Manchester

MALLIA. *Fouilles exécutées à Mallia. Exploration des maisons et quartiers d'habitation (1956–1960)*.

4. By H. and M. van Effenterre. (*Études crétoises*, 22.) Paris: Geuthner. 1976. Pp. 111, frontis., 32 plates (2 folding), [3] text figs. Price not stated.

The French excavations at the Minoan site of Mallia, in their quiet persistence and continuous publication over fifty years, as volumes of *Études crétoises*, render that site at present the most instructive in all Bronze Age Crete for the reconstruction of the urban and social systems, through investigation of the interrelationships between the many different types of building. The Late Bronze Age Palace, the constructions beneath it, now at least equalled in status by the huge Middle Minoan building called *Quartier Mu*, Middle Minoan shrines, workshops, apparently public buildings round a large open area, and above all a great series of town houses, all these with much of their equipment found *in situ*, have been excavated and published and the topography of the whole site and its environs excellently surveyed.

In all this careful work Henri and Micheline van Effenterre have played a notable part. The volume to hand, *Maisons IV*, is the third for Mallia they have published, in addition to the earlier volume on the Mirabello cemeteries. Sadly they announce in an epilogue that it will be the last. Forty years of stimulating excavation and publication is a record few are likely to emulate and we honour them.

*Maison Theta*, the authors explain, is not a clearly