di studi di tradizione piuttosto recente come l'anatolistica. Nel corso della sua pluriennale attività di ricerca, J. David Hawkins ha sempre rivolto la massima attenzione a tale incontro di discipline, facendo procedere di pari passo l'analisi epigrafica con l'analisi linguistica e il preciso riscontro di dati storici. Mi auguro di aver offerto un quadro, sia pure sommario, della ricchezza di un volume, nel quale vari studiosi, pur muovendosi in ambiti diversi, hanno inteso onorare uno dei massimi studiosi di civiltà dell'Anatolia e della Siria preclassiche.

PAOLA DARDANO

D. LEIBUNDGUT WIELAND, L. FREY-ASCHE, *Weihgeschenke aus dem Heiligtum der Aphrodite in Alt-Paphos. Terrakotten, Skulpturen und andere figürliche Kleinvotive* (Ausgrabungen in Alt-Paphos auf Cypern 7), Darmstadt-Mainz, von Zabern 2011, 31×23 mm., 235 pp., 44 pls.of which the first 8 in colour, 4 maps. ISBN 978-3-8053-4315-2.

The 7th volume of the series *Ausgrabungen in Alt-Paphos auf Cypern*, here under review, is the final publication of votive gifts (principally terracotta figurines) that have been found in the Sanctuary of Aphrodite at Paphos over the course of a century of excavations.

Cyprus was known in antiquity as the island of Aphrodite. There are many references to Cyprus as the birthplace and cultual site of this goddess in Classical texts. Excavations have also confirmed the literary sources, uncovering many sanctuaires dedicated to Aphrodite: at Old Paphos, Amathus, Kition, Golgoi, and so on (for an overview of these sanctuaries, see Karageorghis 2005).

Paphos, in particular, seems to have played an important role in the genesis of the Cypriot goddess: it is here that tradition places the birth of Aphrodite (at Petra tou Romiou) and a sanctuary had existed in the area since the 9th century BC.

Located on the southwest coast of Cyprus, 2 km. from the sea, this site, from the 3rd century BCE re-named Old Paphos/Palaeopaphos to distinguish it from the harbour town of New Paphos/Nea Paphos, 19 km. along the coast to the northwest of the island.

Old Paphos was scarcely mentioned until the 16th century, because most of the travellers were not principally interested in relics of antiquity. Thus, the ruins of the temple were only correctly identified for the first time by the Swiss traveller Ludwig Tschudi in 1519 (Maier, von Wartburg 1988: 275-6).

Nineteenth century travellers, including Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall and Ludwig Ross, also described the ruins of the temple and published a sketch plan of the structures, while many doubts remain on the excavations carried out by Luigi Palma di Cesnola. He said to have dug at Kouklia between 1869 and 1872 but "without discovering anything of importance" (1877: 206). Probably, he wanted to increase the value of the objects discovered in less famous sites of the western region of Cyprus and sold to European museums, a strategy used by other diplomats-archaeologists, including the Italian Riccardo Colucci (Masson 1990; Di Paolo 2010: 79-81).

Although the inhabitants of Kouklia have long exploited the antiquities still visible above ground (as recorded by Giovanni Mariti in the account of his journey of 1769), the first excavations in the area of the Sanctuary were carried out in 1888 by the British Cyprus Exploration and were followed, between 1950-1955, by the Kouklia Expedition of the University of St. Andrews (Edinburgh) and the Liverpool Museum.

A systematic exploration of this building, financed by the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut and the University of Zurich, only began in 1973 under the direction of Prof. Franz Maier and lasted for six campaigns (until 1979). The Swiss-German mission resumed old excavations, uncovering the remains of two different structures: the first one perhaps dating back to the final Late Bronze Age and a renowned sanctuary of the Roman age. The earlier

is a sanctuary of the open-air type (*Heiligtum I*). It has a sacred enclosure and probably a covered pillared hall at the North-Western corner. The Eastern part has completely disappeared, because of a sugar refinery built under the rule of Lusignan family. A wall of ashlar stone (remains of the enclosure) is preserved only along the western side and in the southwest corner, so the original size of the sanctuary is still unknown. The later sanctuary (*Heiligtum II*), built between the end of the 1st and the beginning of the 2nd centuries AD, is formed by the reconstructed older shrine and by a new open court sanctuary, situated immediately north of *Heiligtum I* and connected to it by a flight of stairs.

The two Authors (Danielle Leibundgut Wieland, University of Zurich, and Lore Frey-Asche, University of Marburg) publish a complete Catalogue of votive gifts – 1895 in number – discovered in this Sanctuary since 1888. Terracotta figurines represent 95% of the finds, organized according to similar technical and chronological criteria used by V. Karageorghis in the series *The Coroplastic Art of Ancient Cyprus* (1991-1999).

Chapter III, preceded by a description of the archaeological context of findings (written by Franz Maier, pp. 7-18), is devoted to small figurines (and fragments): Late Bronze Age = ca. 1500-1050 BC (pp. 17-18); Archaic and Early Cypro Classic period = ca. 750-400 BC (pp. 19-60, 84-133); Late Cypro Classic-Hellenistic and Roman period = 400 BC-395 AD (pp. 61-67). Large-scale terracotta sculptures are discussed in Chapter IV. They are dated to Cypro Archaic and Cypro Classic (pp. 84-142).

The remaining 5% includes stone sculptures and other materials: marble figurines dating from Cypro-Classic to the Hellenistic and Roman age (pp. 143-147); limestone sculptures/reliefs of final Cypro Classic-Hellenistic period (pp. 147-152), some bronzes, including a gold-plated pin (p.152), 2 imported fayence objects = half of the 7th century BC (pp. 153-154), 1 bone/ivory figurine of the late Roman age (pp. 154-155).

Then follow the general discussion, remarks, final conclusions (Chapter V, pp. 157-187), Indices (pp. 189-235) and Illustrations (36 B/N + 8 color tables).

A first issue that is raised by the publication of the votive objects and their distribution concerns the organization of the sacred space (how it was used), as well as the spatial patterning of archaeological remains (the interior arrangement of the buildings).

It can be observed that objects coming from KC Area (to the west of Temenos area) are linked to those found inside the temple proper (TA Area): see pp. 11-14 and Indices, pp. 189-196.

Among the most important results of the British excavations in 1950-1952 there was the discovery, 40 m. to the west of Sanctuary below Medieval layers, of a Roman peristyle house (3rd or 4th century AD) which supersedes remains of earlier walls not belonging to the temple (Maier 1971: 45-48).

According to the British excavators, T.B. Mitford and J.H. Iliffe, "hundreds fragments of terracotta statuettes were found in the foundation of the NE part of the building" (Mitford, Iliffe 1951: 59). Some of their sketches, now published by Franz Maier (p. 12, fig. 5) show the find-spot of these objects. The findings, divided in three layers, probably belonged to a sacred pit, a *bothros*. Re-excavations in a southern room of the same Roman house in 1976 produced hundreds of other fragments of terracotta figurines of Archaic and Classical date (Maier 1977: 140), while trial trenches excavated between this building and the Sanctuary revealed the total absence of building remains (Maier 1979: 172, notes 3-7). So, it seems evident that one or more *bothroi* filled with votive gifts were outside the sacred enclosure: only the dismantling of the Roman house would have allowed the number and the extent of the sacred pits, apparently confined to the eastern and southern parts of this building.

The discovery, inside the *bothros*, of broken pottery (*ibid.*, 174) and copper slags, only recorded by British archaeologists in 1950 (Mitford, Iliffe 1951: 59), may shed new light on how the ritual space was structured, also taking into account the pivotal ideas of the cognitive archaeology (Renfrew 1994: 47-54).

In this sense, the evidence from other Cypriot sanctuaires can be very instructive.

A US archaeological mission began excavation in 1998 of a sanctuary at Polis-Peristeries (on the eastern edge of Polis-Chrisochous, ancient Marion), a Cypro Archaic site on the northwestern coast of the island, at the mouth of the Chrysochous river. East of the temenos

wall lies a circular pit (*bothros*) cut into the bedrock. The debris show evidence of ritual paraphernalia: incense burner stands, vessels, votive figurines etc. In the meantime, other materials discovered inside this pit suggest that not all of the remains reflect activities that went on inside the temenos area. According to the archaeologists, remains of craft production can be related to other areas not yet identified: for example, spaces for metallurgical activity etc. (Smith 1997: 88-90, fig. 14).

Another important issue, almost untouched by the Authors, is the distribution of the votive materials. Two areas seem particularly significant: the Northern hall of the sanctuary and the group of Western rooms (TA V), close to the *bothros*.

The most precious materials (marble statuettes, bronzes and gold objects, ivory figurines) come from the northern sector of the open court, while terracotta figurines seem to be concentrated in the TA V area (Rooms 10 A-C), such as in the north-eastern part of the Roman house, i.e. the area occupied by the *bothros/i*. The different distribution of the materials recalls the similar arrangement observed at the Sanctuary of Polis-Chrisochous. In particular, the position of the valuable objects (directly in front of the open court) can suggest some hypotheses: perhaps this area was used for displaying the wealth of the sanctuary or was accessible only to the city's elite citizens.

The detailed architectural study of this building (building techniques, fixed and moveable furniture, chronology etc.) will provide some answers to these questions: they are expected to be published in the forthcoming volume *Das Heiligtum der Aphrodite: Grabungs und Baubefund* of F.G. Maier and M.-L. von Wartburg.

Terracotta figurines deserve special attention, especially females ones. They are, in a particular way, related to the worship of the goddess Aphrodite.

A local fertility cult is attested at Paphos as early as the 3rd millenium BC. But, the name of Aphrodite appears very late. Until the 5th century BC, the inscriptions speak of a "Big Goddess", *wa-na-ssa* in Mycenaean language (Collombier 1999: 124-125).

This place of worship became one of the most famous sanctuaires of Aphrodite in the Greek and Roman world. Its buildings and rites were frequently mentioned by Classical authors. But, no precise information about the cult of this goddess can be gleaned from these references. Only few elements are recorded, for example that *simulacrum deae non effigie humana, continuus orbis latiore initio tenuem in ambitum metae modo exurgens, set ratio in obscuro* (Tacitus, *Historiae* II, 3).

So, apparently the cult at Paphos was aniconic: the goddess was not represented as a human figure. The temple did not contain a statue but a conical stone. Roman coins give a clear idea of typical architectural elements of the sanctuary, including a conical element (the sacred stone?) housed in an open shrine.

Moreover, excavations seem to have confirmed these data. A basalt stone 1.22 cm. high has survived and it is now preserved in the Cyprus Museum, Nicosia. The archaeologist John L. Myres, visiting the site in 1913, described this "Black Stone" located near the western end of the Roman South Stoa (Myres 1940-45: 97-8). It was already described by excavators in 1888 and was partly sunk in a large hole through a Roman mosaic pavement.

The existence of an aniconic cult has been convincingly supported by Franz Maier who suggested Mycenaean antecedents, as well as by Tryggve N.D. Mettinger, a biblical scholar who spoke of an "explicit" aniconic cult at Paphos but with no Semitic roots (1995: 84).

The problem of aniconism at Paphos is particularly significant for understanding the identity of terracotta/stone female figurines discovered in the area of the sanctuary: are they iconic representations of the goddess in a "maximalist" perspective or worshippers and associated with sympathetic magic in a "minimalist" one?

In general terms, the evolutionist models which were usually applied in order to understand the phenomenon of aniconism failed to recognise that the veneration of shapeless stones was a meaningful religious act and not a form of primitiveness. Recently, Peter Stewart re-examined this issue with particular reference to the Roman Eastern coins (2008: 300-314). Baetyls seem a typical phenomenon of the Roman East: exotic exceptions to the classical norm (anthropomorphic cult) that date at least as far back to the local Bronze Age (see now Durand 2005). The scholar lists a series of images of aniconic baetyls, notably on coins

from Bostra and Adraha, Madaba, Tyre, Sidon, Byblos and Emesa, up to Seleucia Pieria and Carrhae in the north. They comprise various forms: a cone-baetyl at Byblos; hemispherical rocks at Emesa and Seleucia and other curious combinations of cubes, spheres and so on.

These images are included in temple facades or aediculae of one kind or another, exactly as conventional statues were shown. Tacitus called these cult images *simulacra*, the same word applied to cult statues in temples (its etymology implies an association with iconic representation: *simulacrum* = with similitude). Stewart concludes that simple images coexisted happily with more conventional anthropomorphic images: it is a "visual oxymoron" (*ibid.*: 313), i.e. two different approaches to the representation of deities that operated side by side in the Graeco-Roman world.

So, during the Classical period, Cyprus and, in particular, the cult at Paphos has many points of contact with the evidence from the Near East. We may wonder if this same aniconic cult reaches back into the Bronze, Geometric and Archaic Ages, something Stewart seems to be convinced of this: the anthropomorphic images begin to appear very late and coexist with the aniconic types.

Regarding the pre-classical Near East, the aniconic tradition has long been held to be one of the unique traits of ancient Israelite religion. In recent decades, the uniqueness of the Israelite approach to the divine image is radically changed: it can only be comprehended after a delineation of its similarities with other Near Eastern phenomena. T.D. Mettinger distinguished, in fact, between "de facto traditions" of aniconism (indifference or mere absence of anthropomorphic images, etc.) and "programmatic traditions" (repudiation of images), a very rare phenomenon, apart from Israel (Mettinger 1995: 19). According to him, cultures can have both aniconic and anthropomorphic traditions at the same time. If this trend is universally accepted with rare exceptions (Nicolle 2005: 185-186 who says of co-existence of traditions but in different cultures), the relationship between the aniconic and anthropomorphic remains under debate.

If in the Near East (since the 3rd millenium BC) deities are based on a human model, there are many objects worshipped in a religious cult: musical instruments, cultic paraphernalia, images, symbols, etc. (Selz 1997: 172). Although these objects seem to represent non-anthropomorphic entities, many of them demonstrate associations with personified divine entities (Lambert 1990: 128-129).

So, the representation of non-anthropomorphic deified cult objects cannot be used to argue for a non-human concept of the divine. Deified objects should be regarded as emanations of divinities perceived as having human form. The issue is not whether deified inanimate objects could have been worshipped as independent cult objects but, rather "the hierarchical relationship that was envisioned between non-anthropomorphized cult objects and anthropomorphic divine images" (Ornan 2009: 95-100). The distinction between anthropomorphic and non-anthropomorphic was probably not fundamental: a series of objects entities (weapons, thrones, baetyls etc.) were imagined as existing in a series of "transformations", each evoking some aspect or quality attributed to that god and each functioning as an equally valid form of that god (Porter 2009: 188).

In the Aegean Bronze Age, Minoans as well as Mycenaeans imagined their divinities as humans: this fact is evidenced by iconography as well as by written records. But, although there are some positive hints towards the existence of anthropomorphic cult images, we rather get the impression that this was in general not the case either on Minoan Crete or in Mycenaean Greece. There are no proofs that cult images representing specific deities in a distinct form played an essential role in the rituals of the Bronze Age Aegean. The lack of cult images as well as the emphasis on representations of ritual practices and cult celebrants suggest that the religious focus of attention was not so much the image of the venerated deity itself, but rather the perpetuation of the ritual (Blakolmer 2010 with preceding bibliography).

Also motifs, such as the double-axe, the "horns of consecration", the column, the snake, that functioned as cult symbols both in Minoan Crete and in Mycenaean Greece, are not strictly confined to the cultic sphere and rather belong to a palatial symbolism with strong religious components (D'Agata 1992).

It seems that the degree of abstraction in the visual conception of Minoan and Mycenaean deities eliminated each iconographic specificity. So, Minoan and Mycenaean imagery presents itself as "deeply iconic in the figurative conceptualisation of forms and aniconic in the rejection of specificity" (Mylonopoulos 2010: 13).

It is evident that modern scholarship suggests several possibilities of interpretation of the apparent dualism of aniconism-iconism. At this point, what can we say of the cult at Paphos before the Roman period? What happened after the end of the Late Bronze Age when the sanctuary was, probably, built is unknown.

Most of the votive materials are dated to the Archaic period (750-475 BC according to the authors).

Many female figurines belong to the standing type with Upraised Hands, very popular in the Aegean area at least from the 2nd millenium BC.

Although in several studies many different views have been expressed on how the position of the raised hands is to be interpreted, nevertheless a certain impression arises that the majority of the Aegean terracotta figurines should be understood as praying humans in the moment of invoking a divinity, even if some special emblems on their headgear have been interpreted as divine attributes (Blakolmer 2010: 41).

So, where is the borderline between the image of a goddess and the image of a mortal priestess or worshippers conducting some ritual action? Is there a real separation between divine and human figures in rituals as well as in iconography?

The two authors seem convinced that the cult at Paphos is exclusively iconic and that the great terracotta statues can be identified with the goddess herself, represented in an *Epiphanie-Gestus* (for a dissenting opinion, see Keesling 2010: 102 and preceding bibliography).

This identification seems to be supported by other elements, such as headdresses, headgear and jewels (pp.176-182). The aspect of the goddess (frontal and with Upraised Hands) recalls Bronze Age iconography, an archaizing form that may be related to the foundation of the Sanctuary.

These assumptions are quite convincing, but some questions remain open.

The ritual gestures can have various meanings which causes a certain degree of confusion: for example, the clear distinction between deities and worshippers. What appears to be a distinctive attribute of the goddess (the position of the hands, for example) can be, instead, a symbolic sign of a more general religious character.

Some emblems (the crescent, for example), associated with necklaces and headgear can have many functions, but apparently the clear identification of individual deities cannot be part of them (considering the Aegean evidence). Aegean artists preferred rather anonymous and thus undecipherable modes of representing the divine.

At the same time, the hypothesis of a Near Eastern influence (on Aphrodite as Ashtart, see also Budin 2004) must be re-examined, because here deities have a more definied "iconographic" personality. Besides, the position with Upraised Hands is specifically associated with minor deities, intermediary figures between men and gods.

The history of studies concerning the cult of Aphrodite at Paphos demonstrated that an "explicit" aniconic cult (supported by F. Maier and others) became an "explicit" iconic cult. But is there a real necessity for anthropomorphic cult statues?

Very recently, the traditional dichotomy between "cult statues" and "votive offerings" was revised with some interesting suggestions (Mylonopoulos 2010: 4).

The publication of this volume raises some pivotal issues that can be further discussed in the light of new archaeological and textual findings.

SILVANA DI PAOLO

REFERENCES

Blakolmer F. 2010, A Pantheon Without Attributes? Goddesses and Gods in Minoan and Mycenaean Iconography, in Mylonopoulos (ed.), 21-61.

Budin S.L. 2004, A Reconsideration of the Aphrodite-Ashtart Syncretism, *Numen* 51/2, 95-145.

Collombier, A.-M. 1999, Les sanctuaires de Chypre: essai de typologie, in R.F. Docter, E.M. Moormann (eds.), *Proceedings of the XVth International Congress of Classical Archaeology, Amsterdam July 12-17 1998. Classical Archaeology Towards the Third Millenium: Reflections and Perspectives*, Amsterdam 1999, 123-126.

D'Agata A.L. 1992, Late Minoan Crete and Horns of Consecrations: A Symbol in Action in R. Laffineur, J.L. Crowley (eds.), ΕΙΚΩΝ. *Aegean Bronze Age Iconography: Shaping a Methodology. Proceedings of the 4ʰ International Aegean Conference, University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia 6-9 April 1992* (Aegaeum 8), Liège, 247-255.

Di Paolo S. 2010, "...dall'esempio dei suoi colleghi di Francia, Inghilterra e d'America...", ovvero il collezionismo di emulazione: la raccolta Colucci nel quadro dell'archeologia cipriota della seconda metà del XIX secolo, in A.M. Jasink, L. Bombardieri (eds.), *Researches in Cypriote History and Archaeology. Proceedings of the Meeting Held in Florence April 29-30th 2009*, Florence, 75-83.

Durand, J.-M. 2005, *Florilegium Marianum VIII. Le culte des pierres et les monuments commémoratifs en Syrie amorite* (Mémoires de NABU 9), Paris.

Hogarth D.G. *et alii* 1888, Excavations in Cyprus, 1887-1888. Paphos, Leontari, Amargetti, *JHS* 9, 147-271.

Karageorghis, J. 2005, *Kypris. The Aphrodite of Cyprus. Ancient Sources and Archaeological Evidence*, Nicosia.

Keesling C.M. 2010, Finding the Gods. Greek and Cypriot Votive Korai Revisited, in Mylonopoulos (ed.), 87-103.

Lambert W.G. 1990, Ancient Mesopotamian Gods: Superstition, Philosophy, Theology, *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 207, 115-130.

Maier, F.G. 1971, Excavations at Kouklia (Palaepaphos). Fifth Preliminary Report: Season 1970, *RDAC*, 43-48.

Maier, F.G. 1977, Excavations at Kouklia (Palaepaphos). Ninth Preliminary Report: Season 1976, *RDAC* 1977, 133-140.

Maier, F.G. 1979, Excavations at Kouklia (Palaepaphos). Tenth Preliminary Report: Seasons 1977 and 1978, *RDAC*, 168-176.

Maier F.G. 2001, From Hammer von Pugstall to F.B. Welch. The Archaeology of Old Paphos, 1802-1899: in V. Tatton-Brown (ed.), *Cyprus in the 19th Century AD. Fact, Fancy and Fiction. Papers of the 22nd British Museum Classical Colloquium, December* 1998, Oxford, 70-79.

Maier F.G., Karageorghis V. 1984, *Paphos. History and Archaeology*, Nicosia.

Maier F.G., von Wartburg M.-L. 1988, Strangers at Palaeopaphos, *RDAC*, 275-276.

Masson O. 1990, Quelques episodes de la vie des frères Palma di Cesnola, *RDAC*, 285-297.

Mettinger T.N.D. 1995, *No Graven Image? Israelite Aniconism in its Ancient Near Eastern Context*, Stockolm.

Mitford T.B., Iliffe, J.H. 1951, Excavations at Kouklia (Old Paphos), Cyprus 1950, *Antiquaries Journal* 31, 51-66.

Mylonopoulos J. 2010, Divine Images *versus* Cult Images. An Endless Story About Theories, Methods and Terminologies, in Id. (ed.), *Divine images and Human Imaginations in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Leiden-Boston, pp. 1-19.

Myres, J. 1940-5, The Black Stone on the Site of the Paphian Temple at Kouklia, *ABSA*, 97-98.

Nicolle Ch. 2005, L'identification des vestiges archéologiques de l'aniconisme à l'époque amorrite, in Durand (ed.), 177-189.

Ornan T. 2009, In the Likeness of Man. Reflections on the Anthropocentric Perception of the Divine in Mesopotamian Art, in Porter (ed.), 93-151.

Palma di Cesnola L. 1877, *Cyprus. Its Ancient Cities, Tombs and Temples*, London.

Porter B.N. 2009, Blessings from a Crown, Offerings to a Drum: Were There Non-Anthropo-morphic Deities in Ancient Mesopotamia?, in Ead. (ed.), 153-194.

Porter B.N. (ed.) 2009, *What is a God? Anthropomorphic and Non-Anthropomorphic Aspects of Deity in Ancient Mesopotamia*, Winona Lake.

Renfrew, C. 1994, The Ancient Mind: Elements of Cognitive Archaeology, in C. Renfrew, E.B. W. Zubrow (eds.), *The Archaeology of Religion*, Cambridge, 47-54.

Selz G.J. 1997, "The Holy Drum, the Spear, and the Harp": Towards an Understanding of the Problem of Deification in Third Millenium Mesopotamia, in I.L. Finkel, M.J. Geller (eds.), *Sumerian Gods and Their Representations*, Groningen, 167-213.

Smith, J.S. 1997, Preliminary Comments on a Rural Cypro-Archaic Sanctuary in Polis-Peristeries, *BASOR* 308, 77-98.

Stewart P. 2008, Baetyls as Statues? Cult Images in the Roman Near East, in Y.Z. Eliav *et alii* (eds.), *The Sculptural Environment of the Roman Near East. Reflections on Culture, Ideology, and Power*, Leuven-Dudley (MA), 297-314.