

du collègue fétial sont respectivement qualifiés de *decretum* et de *responsum*. Selon l'auteur, l'emploi d'un lexique juridique ressemblant à certains égards au formulaire des sénatus-consultes et le fait qu'il se soit agi du premier accord du collège fétial pour un changement du rite de *denuntiatio* justifieraient la qualification de la réponse des fétiaux, en 200 av. n. è., comme *decretum*. Quant au *responsum* de 191 av. n. è., il doit être compris comme une simple répétition du *decretum* de 200 av. n. è., et non pas, ainsi qu'on l'a longtemps cru, comme le reflet d'un abandon du *ius fetiale* au cours du III^e siècle av. n. è. Le dernier chapitre aborde un point très précis de la procédure d'*indictio belli* : les trente (Den. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* II, 72) ou trente-trois jours (Liv. I, 32, 9 et *Serv. Dan., ad Aen.* IX, 52) d'*ultimatum* qui suivent la demande de restitution (*rerum repetitio*). Après avoir passé en revue les trois principales explications proposées pour en justifier la durée – l'hypothèse d'un double *ultimatum* (Niebuhr), l'hypothèse de la procédure civile (Mommsen, Danz, Huschke) et l'hypothèse d'une erreur imputable à Tite-Live (Voigt, Fusinato, Donatuti) – G. Turelli propose une quatrième solution, fondée sur l'expression *dies sollemnes*, utilisée par Tite-Live pour qualifier ces trente-trois jours d'*ultimatum* (Liv. I, 32, 9). Celle-ci est rare dans la littérature antique et peu d'auteurs modernes, hormis B. Albanese, s'y sont intéressés. G. Turelli définit le *dies sollemnis* comme un jour férié pour certains individus ou certains groupes, sans qu'il n'ait forcément concerné la communauté entière : dans le cadre de la *rerum repetitio*, les *dies sollemnes* correspondaient donc aux jours traditionnellement réservés pour l'occasion, dans un cadre qui n'était pas nécessairement formalisé ni rigoureux. Puis, s'appuyant sur la méthode de calcul des Romains et en considérant que le fétial qui présentait les revendications le faisait à trois reprises, l'auteur parvient à faire correspondre le témoignage de Denys avec ceux de Tite-Live et de Servius : il y aurait donc eu un jour de présentation des revendications, puis dix jours de réflexion pour la partie adverse, et ce, trois fois de suite – soit un total de trente-trois jours. Denys, quant à lui, aurait exclu de son calcul les trois jours durant lesquels le fétial présentait les revendications. Il s'agit là d'une hypothèse nouvelle sur le sujet et il se pourrait que G. Turelli ait, à cet égard, clarifié cette étape du rituel fétial. La réalité désignée par les *dies sollemnes*, toutefois, reste en partie obscure. Une lecture préalable du premier livre écrit par l'auteur sur le sujet (*supra*) peut s'avérer nécessaire pour clarifier ou faire le point sur certaines spécificités du collège fétial et pour avoir une vision plus globale de l'état de l'art sur le sujet. *Fetialis religio* est donc à envisager comme un *additamentum* d'*Audi Iuppiter*.

Liselotte LIÉGEOIS

Achim LICHTENBERGER & Rubina RAJA (Eds.), *The Archaeology of Seasonality*. Turnhout, Brepols, 2021. 1 vol. broché, XXIV-431 p. (STUDIES IN CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGY, 11). Prix : 120 €. ISBN 978-2-503-59395-1.

This volume edited by A. Lichtenberger and R. Raja aims to reconsider the temporal dimension in the archaeological discourse. It includes an introduction by the two editors explaining the purpose of the publication, and 23 contributions divided into six thematic sections. Two detailed indexes (one topographic and one general) close the volume. As explicitly stated in the introduction, the volume aims to propose a renewed theoretical

and methodological framework for classical archaeological studies on the subject of seasonality. The selected contributions offer multiple and diversified perspectives on the topic, spanning from purely hard-science approaches to philological and iconographic studies. A relevant number of contributions focus on architectural research, along with smaller number of papers dealing with archaeological analyses carried out on other classes of materials. One of the main merits of the volume is to show the different angles and subtleties that the concept of seasonality can present. The contributions perfectly illustrate the complexity of the subject and ultimately succeed in showing how different datasets and methodologies, each with their own strengths and weaknesses, can offer insights into the various aspects – or concepts – of seasonality. This is not the place to present a detailed review of each contribution, but it possible to describe the general key aspects. There are two main recurring topics that are important to consider. The first is the problematic definition of the concept of “seasonality” itself. Several papers rightly point out that multiple temporal dimensions must be considered, each of which has a specific effect on the material or evidence we consider. The unifying characteristic recognized is that of the recurrence of certain actions or processes: the timespan in which this repetition occurs determines different “seasonalities” and consequently has different effects on the archaeological evidence. However, another aspect, whose relevance is sometimes underestimated, is that “seasonality” is not necessarily an entirely natural phenomenon: in this sense, several contributions successfully demonstrate that the concept of “season” can ultimately be seen as a human product in which political, economic, religious and social factors play as important a role as natural ones in determining the recurrence of actions and practices. Thus, it seems apparent that the complexity, dynamicity, and flexibility of the concept of “seasonality” is the *fil rouge* connecting most of the contributions in this volume. The second recurring theme is the intrinsic difficulty of gathering precise data on seasonality. This is largely due to the complexity of the phenomenon. Each region has its own specificity in terms of environment, politics, economy, and society; consequently different “seasonalities” determine very specific responses, which may vary considerably from one area to another. Most contributions underscore this aspect by showing the difference between what historical sources tell us and the material evidence from excavations and/or architectural surveys, succeeding in demonstrating how the descriptions offered by ancient authors, whose accuracy is sometimes too easily accepted by scholars, are only idealised visions or theoretical models that rarely find complete realisation in archaeological contexts. Therefore, understanding as fully as possible the various geographical and environmental factors as well as the political, social, and economic ones, is a priority for most authors. For this reason, the importance of integrating and comparing different datasets is significantly emphasized. Finally, on a more theoretical level, the volume shows how difficult it is to obtain good quality datasets to determine seasonal patterns. Not even the best-preserved contexts can offer direct answers: the complexity of depositional and post-depositional processes, as well as the different conservation of materials have an enormous impact on the evidence we gather. A precise and calibrated methodology is sometimes not sufficient to compensate for these factors. The theoretical and methodological models along with the core arguments presented in the volume would potentially represent an important and effective starting point to help build a proper “Archaeology of Seasonality”. However, there are

two aspects that negatively impact this effort. The first and most questionable is the overtly different nature of some of the contributions. As already mentioned, it is appreciable to have different perspectives and angles on the same subject, however, it is still necessary to maintain a unifying element that brings all these together, and this cannot just be the term “season” or “seasonality”. Some papers seem to eschew from a common framework, undermining the proposal of an effective theoretical and methodological approach. In particular, the purely iconographic studies, as well as those focusing entirely on literary sources, seem quite out of place. The interest and quality of the contributions themselves is beyond question, and the present comment in no way intends to minimise their intrinsic academic value. However, their philological or art-historic approach, which is clearly a hallmark of some classical archaeological traditions, seem to offer no real contribution to a discourse that, as stated in the title of the volume, is intended to be primarily archaeological. The inclusion, for example, of ethnoarchaeological or anthropological contributions, even if more loosely framed in the field of classical archaeology, might have added different and surely more effective perspectives to the volume. This last observation leads to the second problematic aspect, namely the all too limiting choice of contributions exclusively from the field of classical archaeology. As some papers briefly mention, studies on seasonality and temporal cycles have been dealt with more systematically in prehistoric archaeology since it was often the field in which purely scientific methods were first adopted. However, the complete absence of this and later periods, even if just for purely methodological reference or comparable purposes, is surprising. Rosen’s paper is the only one that refers to prehistoric phases, while few protohistoric case studies are presented in the entire volume. Initiating a debate on seasonality between specialists from different periods and geographical areas might have proved more fruitful in defining a renewed theoretical and methodological framework. The overlap in terms of questions, problems and possible methods is sometimes so obvious that it is surprising that a real exchange between scholars of the classical and medieval periods has not yet been attempted. It is understandable that the risk of such an approach could be to stretch the field of discussion too far, making it potentially dispersive: but is this not the same possibility described above? The editors themselves expressed in the subtitle of the introduction the unequivocal intention of “widening Archaeology’s Interpretational Framework”. The impression is, however, that of a missed opportunity to overcome those unchanging disciplinary boundaries and trigger a fruitful exchange of experiences. Moreover, since the main stated problems in dealing with seasonality are the scarcity of reliable archaeological records and the over-reliance on extremely well-known but exceptional cases – such as Pompeii – why not attempt to open the discussion to scholars working on other periods and areas in the Mediterranean? Of the 23 papers, only one takes the discussion to the Early Islamic period, a few refer marginally to Late Antique developments, while five directly and exclusively describe Pompeii. The imbalance in the choice of contributions is quite marked, with some papers reiterating the same concepts, thus limiting the potential novelty of the proposed methodological and theoretical framework. In conclusion, the volume has the merit of bringing together valuable contributions that offer insights on the extremely complex and fascinating topic of seasonality. It successfully highlights the main problems that archaeologists face when investigating this subject, clearly illustrating some of the main

methodological complexities. However, the stated aim of offering a renewed theoretical and methodological framework, promoting a proper “Archaeology of Seasonality”, seems to be only partially achieved: some contributions, despite their intrinsic value and quality, appear out of context, while others seem to insist on similar topics or examples. A greater variety in terms of case studies – both geographically and chronologically – would not only have set the promising foundations for future debate, but also offered a more complete methodological reference.

Nicolò PINI

Luca GIRELLA & Ilaria CALOI (Eds.), *Kamilari. Una necropoli di tombe a tholos nella Messarà (Creta)*. Rome – Athènes, Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 2019. 1 vol. broché, 866 p., nombr. ill. n/b et coul. (MONOGRAFIE DELLA SCUOLA ARCHEOLOGICA DI ATENE E DELLE MISSIONI ITALIANE IN ORIENTE, 29). Prix : 154 €. ISBN 978-960-9559-19-5.

Cet ouvrage constitue la publication finale intégrée de l’architecture et du mobilier de la nécropole de Kamilari, complexe de trois tombes à *tholos* (A, B et C) situé dans la Messara (Crète méridionale), à 3 km au sud-ouest du site palatial de Phaistos. Le site fut découvert fortuitement et exploré en 1959 par Doro Levi qui publie alors une première présentation des structures mises au jour, accompagnée d’une sélection du mobilier. Il y esquisse les contours de plusieurs aspects du rituel et du culte des morts. Luca Girella et Ilaria Caloi s’entourent ici de nombreux spécialistes pour offrir un réexamen complet de la nécropole dans une approche holistique. En reconstruisant les contextes stratigraphiques par l’étude minutieuse de l’architecture, des artefacts et des écofacts (notamment le matériel ostéologique humain inédit), ils apportent un nouvel éclairage sur les pratiques funéraires et rituelles des communautés de cette région, du Minoen Moyen [MM] IB au Minoen Récent [MR] IIIA2, autrement dit durant les périodes protopalatiale, néopalatiale et palatiale finale, soit du XIX^e au XIV^e siècle av. n.è. Le premier chapitre introductif aborde l’historiographie du site, sa localisation et ses caractéristiques, de même que les principales problématiques de recherche. Les trois tombes sont présentées dans des chapitres distincts : la *Tholos A* à Grigori Koryphi (architecture, céramique, autres types de mobilier) dans le vaste chapitre 2, tandis que la *tholos B* à Mylona Lakkos est présentée selon la même structure dans le chapitre 3 et la *tholos C* fait l’objet du succinct chapitre 8. Le matériel ostéologique, archéozoologique, malacologique et anthracologique est traité dans les chapitres 4 à 7. En guise de conclusion, une riche synthèse sur les pratiques funéraires et rituelles envisagées de manière diachronique est proposée dans le chapitre 9, et l’insertion de la nécropole dans le contexte de la Messara occidentale est discutée dans le chapitre 10. L’architecture et l’organisation spatiale de la *tholos A* à Grigori Koryphi (une chambre circulaire, cinq pièces annexes et une cour) sont abondamment décrites et illustrées ; il est attesté qu’elle était couverte par une voûte en pierre, corroborant la théorie déjà avancée par Levi. La reconstruction de la stratigraphie des contextes, relativement négligée lors de la fouille de 1959, représente un des enjeux principaux de cette publication. Sur la base d’archives inédites, dont plusieurs sont reproduites, une restitution de la position initiale des objets est proposée (Fig. II.2.4, p. 65). Ce travail débouche sur une description