or occur twice, e.g. p. 72-73 lists 1.1 Cap des Creus, 1.2. Sagunt, 1.4 Pyrgi then 1.2 Sagunt (again), 1.3 Gravisca. This type of error is repeated throughout the catalogue. To add to the confusion, on several of the pages, the text does not follow on the next page as one would logically expect in any book, but is to be found on the back of the next page or even several pages further: e.g. p. 76 lists entry 1.5 Rom with a brief section from Marcus Servius' comment on the Aenead. The text does not continue on p. 77 but on p. 78! Page 77 describes the sanctuary of Pyrgi (again, after a brief entry on p. 72).

It is very disappointing for the author, who has no doubt dedicated a great deal of time to this study, that something has gone seriously wrong with the editing of the manuscript. Regretfully, the problem is a normal outcome of a tradition of academic publishing in which publishing houses cannot provide support to authors in the preparation of their manuscript.

LIEVE DONNELLAN
VU UNIVERSITY AMSTERDAM
l.d.donnellan@vu.nl

Oliver Henry, and Ute Kelp (eds) *Tumulus as Sema. Space, Politics, Culture and Religion in the First Millennium BC* (Topoi: Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 27). pp. xxxiv+1130. Berlin: De Gruyter. ISBN 978-3-11-026750-1 e-publication €239

Tumulus as Sema is a weighty contribution to scholarship. With 755 pages of text and 377 of plates arranged into two hardbound volumes, its publication was an ambitious undertaking just in terms of sheer scale. The intellectual ambition that this volume represents, however, is even more impressive.

The book, as well as the 2009 conference on which it is based, has a central aim which initially appears to be modest. This aim is to stimulate discussion of tumuli as both landscape features and socio-cultural phenomena in the Mediterranean, the Black Sea, and neighbouring regions of Eurasia during the first millennium BC. Stimulating discussion between such a diverse group of scholars is no mean feat, however. The geographical range covered by these papers is broad; the chronological spread considerable; and the contributors work in fourteen different countries, eleven different languages, and a spectrum of different scholarly traditions. Generating any kind of coherence from such diversity is tough.

Yet, over the course of its forty-two chapters, the book manages to grasp this illusive coherence. A reader working through it systematically will be rewarded by a growing understanding not just of specific regions or individual examples, but also of tumuli as a broader cross-cultural phenomenon. As with any similar edited volume however, this book will also be a resource for those seeking to dip in and out of it on a paper-by-paper basis. This is helped by its structure. After an extremely brief foreword by the editors, there are two short introductory papers by Alcock and Naso. These are followed by forty research papers, organised into regional sections: Southern Mediterranean; Greece, Albania and Macedonia; Thrace; Asia Minor; Northern Black Sea; and Eurasia. This geographical arrangement makes the book easy to consult, and doubtless most of its readers will alight, magpie-like, on individual chapters or sections.

There is, of course, much to be gained by approaching the book in such a way. The individual contributions are, as ever with conference proceedings, variable in content, approach, and tone; but the overall standard of the papers is high. Almost all present important new material and/or analysis, and contain valuable new insights. For most of the regions covered, this book offers the reader an excellent way into the relevant literature as well as a sense of the cutting edge of research. Regions that are particularly well covered are Thrace (9 papers); and west-central Anatolia (11 papers).

It is also possible to cherry-pick your way through the papers according to their content and focus. Several papers present the results of new excavations and surveys (e.g. Amore; Chichikova; Tonkova; Rose and Körpe; Luke and Roosevelt; Ronchetta; Thierry; Daragan; van Hoof and Schlöffel). The raw data contained in these papers is extremely useful, as is the reflective discussion also offered by most of these authors. In a similar vein, other papers present regional or chronological surveys (Stoyanov and Stoyanov; Yıldırım; Hülden; Sivas and Sivas). Most papers, however, offer reassessments of previously-known archaeological material to shed light on a range of social dynamics. By far the largest group of papers focuses on territoriality and the politics of building tumuli (Carstens; Bejko; Martin-McAuliffe; Schmidt-Dounas; Stamatopoulou; Agre; Dichev; Scardozzi; Kelp). A somewhat smaller group of papers consider what might be learned from tumuli about cultural interaction (Delemen; Rabadjiev; Henry; Diler; Hürmüzlü; Doonan), gender roles (Georgieva), and social organisation (Liebhart, Darbyshire, Erder

and Marsh; Vassileva). Yet others explore technical considerations (Summerer and von Kienlin); the changing uses of tumuli (Kyriakou); and iconographic and literary representations of tumuli (McGowan; Schapp-Gourbeillon; Zwingmann).

For those with an interest in the social production of landscape however, it is worth tackling the volume in its entirety. Reading about such a variety of tumuli in such a range of historical, cultural, and geographical contexts has a cumulative effect. The diversity necessarily stimulates comparison, as well as reflection on both commonality and divergence. Although the editors make no claim to comprehensive coverage, the reader is left with a sense of the range and breadth of the phenomenon, and the key issues of methodology and interpretation.

In terms of methodology, the book is set up nicely by the two introductory chapters, each representing an entirely different tradition of scholarship with its own conventions of publication. Alcock kicks things off by thinking about tumuli holistically – definitions, meanings, approaches, and concepts are all touched on. Alcock questions the category of tumulus itself, and attempts to put her finger on what it is that make these landscape monuments both distinctive and appealing. In contrast, Naso presents a partial survey of tumuli in west-central Anatolia, Etruria, and central Europe; offering some information about history and construction in each case. Initially intended as a comprehensive survey to illustrate the full range of relevant material, Naso's chapter falls short of this aim, but nonetheless captures something of the variety of tumulus traditions. These two chapters establish a tension at the heart of the book – the interpretive and the empirical, the reflective and the descriptive. Although many of the research chapters bring these approaches together successfully, it is a tension which remains unresolved at the end. Taken as a whole, the book represents a large body of data about tumuli. Although individual chapters do suggest interpretive directions, a broader view over the material as a whole would have been helpful to address interpretive issues on this more macro scale.

It is for this reason that some kind of concluding chapter would have been very welcome indeed. The editors, given the brevity of their introductory remarks, clearly opted for a 'light-touch' approach to their task, but some closing comments would have been helpful to tease out the many strands and weave them together into some kind of over-arching conclusion. Such a conclusion could have offered some initial answers to Alcock's implied question at the start of the book: what is so special about tumuli? Instead, the reader is left to ponder the question alone.

There are many directions that future research into this question might take. The particular nature of tumuli in the landscape is one such direction. In the future, it would be interesting to see analyses of how tumuli compare with other types of landscape markers and monuments such as rock reliefs, inscriptions, and freestanding structures. These are all ways of marking the landscape, of making a physical link to the past, and of creating a site of memory. Can we discern different strategies in the way these different types of monument are placed within the landscape, how they are incorporated into networks of routes, or how they are located in relation to each other? Is there any difference in the way that different types of landscape markers are treated over time, conditioned either by their physical affordances or social significance? How far can the physical forms of the tumulus incorporate elements of other types of monument, such as inscriptions? What can a tumulus be a *sema*, or sign, of – if anything – that other types of landscape monument cannot?

One region where such an approach might prove especially fruitful is Anatolia, where there was a strong tradition of tumulus building during the Iron Age. More than a century and a half of research has meant that we are relatively well informed about both the Lydian and the Phrygian tumuli. From Spiegelthal's excavations at the so-called 'Tumulus of Alyattes' in 1853[1] to the most recent survey of the 'Thousand Mounds' of the Bin Tepe cemetery (Luke and Roosevelt this volume), the Lydian tumuli have provided generations of scholars with both research questions and material. The Phrygian tumuli have a similarly rich research history, beginning with the Körte brothers' exploratory opening of five mounds in 1900,[2] and stretching right up to complex sociological analysis in the present day (see Liebhart *et al* in this volume). But tumuli are also found in western as well as central Anatolia. These include the 'Homeric' tumuli of the Troad, most of which were actually prehistoric occupation mounds that were reimagined as heroic burials during the Iron Age (see Rose and this volume). In addition, tumuli are also known from Ionia (e.g. Colophon and Lycia).[3] Traditions of tumulus (re) construction and (re)use varied from region to region, and yet they remained a feature of the mortuary and cultic landscape well into the Roman period.

Tumuli were not, however, the only form of monumental landscape marker that was deployed

[1] Van Olfers 1859
[2] Körte and Körte 1904
[3] Colophon: Mariaud 2010; Lycia, e.g. Kızılbel: see Mellink 1998

in Iron Age Anatolia. Rock-cut monuments were also an important means of shaping the landscape and of creating links with the ancient inhabitants of the land.[4] In particular, the Hittite tradition of relief carving was carried through into the Early Iron Age by various successor states. Where the road between Smyrna and Ephesus crosses the mountains at the Karabel pass, the kings of Mira carved both regal figures and hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions into the rock as a testament to their reign[5]. These reliefs continued to accrue social meaning as the centuries passed – Herodotus, for example, famously attributed them to the pharaoh Sesostris[6]. Similarly, in the Konya plain the Ivirz monument uses both Luwian inscriptions and Hittite-style images of kings and gods to bear witness to the glory of the eighth-century kings of Tuwana.[7] In Phrygia, traditions of rock-carving were more often associated with cultic activity than with statements of rule. Rock-cut shrines either took the form of an architectural façade, usually with the appearance of a house, focused around a niche where a cult image is assumed to have stood; or of freestanding step-monuments[8]. In Paphlagonia, similar traditions of rock-cut shrines existed,[9] while in Lycia similar architectural façades were used to front rock-cut tombs.[10] Rock-cutting traditions survived through into the latter part of the first millennium, particularly in the false-door tomb frontages of western and central Anatolia.[11]

In Iron Age Anatolia then, there was a rich tradition of using monumental landscape markers to demarcate territory; to root dynasties and communities in the land; and to create connections with ancestors and previous inhabitants. Tumuli were an important means of doing this, but they were not the only means – rock-cut monuments were similarly used and similarly ubiquitous in the landscape of western and central Anatolia. There must, of course, be regional and chronological differences in the use of the two, as well as specifically local traditions and practices. Teasing out these similarities and differences would be an exciting exercise, shedding light on the unique and particular nature of both tumuli and rock-cut monuments; but also more generally on conceptions of landscape, monumentality and memory in Anatolia.

Another potentially fruitful direction would be the association between tumuli and the mortuary sphere. Although not all tumuli necessarily contain burials, there is a widespread connection between the dead and the mounds of earth that are often heaped upon them. Once again, western and central Anatolia may provide an instructive case study for such a study. The tumulus tradition here could usefully be considered in the context, not just of other types of landscape monument as suggested above, but also against the backdrop of settlement mounds. In many parts of Anatolia, the *höyük* or settlement mound is a standard form of archaeological site. The use of mudbrick as the dominant building material for domestic architecture, coupled with conservative tendencies in the choice of settlement location, meant that over the course of the Bronze Age, the region saw the development of many substantial *höyüks*. These *höyüks* were built up gradually with succeeding occupation levels constructed over the compacted remains of earlier periods. These mounds could easily rise to over 30m in height and extend to over a kilometre in diameter. The citadel mound of Troy, for example, originally stood at 32m tall and covered an area of about 2 hectares; while the mound at Yassıhöyük occupied an area of roughly 9 hectares at a height of 13m.

Cultural and environmental changes at the start of the Iron Age meant that some settlements were no longer located on top of *höyüks*, but instead on plains nearby or close to them. In the second half of the first millennium for example, inhabitants of cities such as Ephesus and Troy would have seen the physical remains of previous settlements looming physically above them. Settlement mounds such as these would have fulfilled some of the same social functions as tumuli. They were a tangible link with the past, as well as demarcating territory and landscape. However, they must also have been conceptually distinct from tumuli – after all, they were mounds of the living rather than mounds of the dead. In most cases, occupation mounds would also have been visually distinct from tumuli, being considerably larger and with a recognisably different shape. What different meanings and uses, then, may have attached themselves to settlement mounds as opposed to burial mounds? Did the mortuary connotations of a tumulus entail a different form of engagement with the landscape, and a different configuration of the relationship between the present and the past? Once more, studying tumuli within their wider context has the potential to illuminate much more than just the monuments themselves.

To return to the volume under review, Henry and Kelp's book does not offer reflection on these or any other potential future directions for research. It does not bring together the disparate ideas and material contained in the chapters, or offers to

[4] Rojas and Sergueenkova 2014; Harmanşah 2015
[5] Hawkins 1998
[6] Herodotus 2.106
[7] Hawkins 2000, 516-8
[8] Berndt-Ersöz 2006
[9] Vassileva 2012
[10] Zahle 1979
[11] Roosevelt 2006

coherent overview or critical reflection on the phenomenon of tumuli as whole. This is a missed opportunity. Although the editors are careful from the start to emphasise that they will offer no overall conclusions about the social and cultural significance of tumuli, the cumulative effect of the papers is to hint at precisely this, and a concluding chapter would have added greatly to the volume.

The volume as an artefact is a pleasure to read. It is the latest offering in the lavishly-produced *Topoi* series, designed to showcase the research of the Topoi Excellence Cluster in Berlin. Like others in the series, it is beautifully produced, with very few errors. The text is accompanied by a separate volume of full-colour plates, making them easy to consult in tandem. The text volume is primarily written in English, although two papers are written in German and one in French. It is completed by helpful indices of names, places, tumulus names, and ancient sources. One rather odd oversight is that the illustrations for Ronchetta's paper are included within the text volume, rather than in the separate volume of figures as for all other papers. This decision seems particularly strange given that the figures take up a considerable portion of the text volume (53 pages). Otherwise, this is a fabulous volume, and will be a crucial addition to any serious archaeology collection.

Berndt-Ersöz, S. 2006. *Phrygian Rock-Cut Shrines. Structure, Function and Cult Practice*. Leiden: Brill.

Harmanşah, Ö. 2015. *Place, Memory, and Healing: An Archaeology of Anatolian Rock Monuments*. London and New York: Routledge.

Hawkins, J.D. 1998. Tarkasnawa King of Mira, 'Tarkondemos', Boğaköy Sealings and Karabel. *Anatolian Studies* 48: 1–31.

— (ed.) 2000. *Corpus of Luwian Hieroglyphic Inscriptions*. Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft, New Series 8. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Körte, A. and G. Körte 1904. *Gordion, Ergebnisse der Ausgrabung im Jahre 1900. Jahrbuch des deutschen archäologischen Institut* (Ergänzungsheft 5). Berlin: Georg Reims.

Mariaud, O. 2010. The Geometric Graves of Colophon and the Burial Customs of Early Iron Age Ionia, in A. Mazarakis Ainan (ed.) *The 'Dark Ages' Revisited: Acts of an International Symposium in Memory of William D. E. Coulson*: 687–703. Volos: University of Thessaly Press.

Mellink, M.J. 1998. *Kızılbel: An Archaic Painted Chamber Tomb in Northern Lycia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Roosevelt, C. 2006. Symbolic Door Stele and Graveside Monuments in Western Anatolia. *American Journal of Archaeology* 110: 65-91.

Rojas, F. and V. Sergueenkova 2014. 'Traces of Tarhuntas: Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Interaction with Hittite Monuments', *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 27: 135-160.

van Olfers, I.F.M. 1859. *Über die lydische Königsgräber bei Sardes und den Grabhügel des Alyattes nach dem Bericht des K. General-Konsuls Spiegelthal zu Smyrna.* Berlin: Abhandlungen der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Vassileva, M. 2012. The Rock-Cut Monuments of Phrygia, Paphlagonia and Thrace: A Comparative Overview, in G. Tsetskhladze (ed.) *The Black Sea, Paphlagonia, Pontus and Phrygia in Antiquity. Aspects of archaeology and ancient history* (British Archaeological Reports International Series 2432): 243-52. Oxford: Archaeopress.

Zahle, J. 1979. Lykische Felsgräber mit Reliefs aus dem 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. *Jahrbuch de Deutschen Archäolgischen Instituts* 94: 245-346.

Naoíse Mac Sweeney
University of Leicester
nm241@leicester.ac.uk

S. Müth, P. I. Schneider, M. Schnelle, P. D. DeStaebler (eds) *Ancient Fortifications. A Compendium of Theory and Practice*. pp. 352. 2016. Oxford & Philadelpia: Oxbow Books. ISBN 978-1-78570-139-9 hardback $88.00. 978-1-78570-142-9 e-publication $44.00.

Fortifications of different kinds and various ages are handed down to us all over the world in great numbers, frequently in excellent state of preservation and sometimes also of remarkable aesthetic qualities. Since prehistoric times they did not only determine the appearance of settlements, towns, and landscapes, but also the life of the inhabitants – economically, politically, and socially. Nonetheless, for any number of reasons, mostly founded in the history of the different archaeological disciplines, the systematic study of ancient fortifications did not keep up with the scientific research on ancient settlements or works of art. The reasons for this deficit are clear: due to their sheer size isolated ancient fortresses as well as fortifications of ancient towns form a laborious, time consuming, and expensive subject of research. In addition, excavations of fortresses and fortifications of any kind are not expected to