

criticized (P. Allison, 'Labels for ladles: interpreting the material culture from Roman households', in P. Allison (ed.), *The Archaeology of Household Activities* (1999), 57–77). This shows not a weakness of the book but a weakness in our understanding, or absence of interest, in how objects were deployed in texts by Latin authors and the variation in the literary deployment of words referring to objects. The fact that such objects appear in texts is of itself interesting and makes a statement about the materiality of the first century A.D. The book through its description allows us to once again appreciate how many questions are unresolved in Pompeii and just how much of our interpretation continues to rely on the survival of the relatively few Latin texts from antiquity: Ovid, Pliny and Vitruvius. At the end of reading the book, the pictures claim our attention and cause us to read around them to understand their significance. This is very much a book of an exhibition for the public.

University of Kent  
r.laurence@kent.ac.uk

RAY LAURENCE

doi:10.1017/S0075435814000252

R. HOBBS, *CURRENCY AND EXCHANGE IN ANCIENT POMPEII: COINS FROM THE AAPP EXCAVATIONS AT REGIO VI, INSULA 1* (Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies Supplement 116). London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London, 2013. Pp. x + 283, illus. ISBN 9781905670413. £48.00.

The Vesuvian cities have provided a wealth of archaeological evidence for the day-to-day life of townspeople and an indispensable proxy for urban life in first-century Roman Italy. In spite of such relative plenty, a detailed understanding of money-use in Pompeii and Herculaneum is lacking. An unknown number of coins have been removed over the centuries by pilferers and antiquarians; yet even what has been left behind by foragers includes many coins which were corroded beyond recognition by the acidic soils. Hobbs attempts to make the most of this situation by combining a detailed archaeological survey of the numismatic evidence from Pompeii's north-westernmost insula with comparative evidence from the rest of the city as well as the region at large. His contribution provides not only a helpful and accessible catalogue and metrology of the numismatic data, but his discussion contains several noteworthy contributions to debates over the prevalence, use and function of money in the city and region.

Readers often turn to volumes such as this one for the catalogue of coins, and here they will not be disappointed. In addition to a hoard of ninety coins found in the sewers beneath a Republican bath-house in the southernmost region of the city, all 1,188 coins found in the insula have been photographed and described in detail. Clear illustrations are substituted for photos in cases where specimens are particularly corroded or worn. Thorough notes on archaeological context and dating evidence are included for each and every coin. Generalists will probably struggle a little as they get used to H.'s system. Part of this is not unexpected, but the situation could have been helped on a few occasions. For example, it would have been beneficial to have the key to H.'s phasing at the beginning of the first appendix to help decipher the pages of tables which follow. Instead, the reader is expected to pour back through the narrative in order to excavate the figures from somewhere in the middle of the third chapter. Unhelpfully, there is no list of figures or tables provided. However, apart from small quibbles, the evidence is mostly presented in a useful and accessible manner. References to physical spaces and evidence are almost always accompanied by relevant and easy-to-understand maps and charts.

In addition to the catalogue and metrological datasets, the book's narrative is well worth the read. H. acquaints the reader with the Anglo-American Project in Pompeii's (AAPP) twelve-year excavation of the insula, the occupational history of the space itself (which pottery remains suggest dates to at least the late fourth century B.C.), as well as the city-wide evidence for money use. All numismatic evidence is placed into one of two over-arching categories: 'live' coins were being used either as stores of value or as exchange media at the time of the eruption, while 'dead' coinage was lost, discarded or otherwise ownerless. Such broad categories could be problematic, yet all the coins found in the insula, save four, have a clear archaeological context associated with them. This is typical of H.'s tendency to take few risks with his material.

Readers searching for theory-driven analysis will need to look elsewhere. Apart from a bit of discussion on methodology in the introduction, H. avoids direct engagement with models and

approaches. The skilful presentation of the AAPP's findings, however, makes this volume a critical augmentation to ongoing discussions about indirect exchange in the Roman world. Previous discussions of currency use in Pompeii, particularly from Jean Andreau (in W. V. Harris (ed.), *The Monetary Systems of the Greeks and Romans* (2008)) and Richard Duncan-Jones (in E. Lo Cascio (ed.), *Credito e moneta nel mondo Romano: atti degli Incontri capresi di storia dell'economia antica* (2003)) lack the rich archaeological detail which is provided here. These previous works focus mostly on how the Vesuvian evidence fits within wider patterns of monetary use in the Roman world. H.'s book, however, gives us a needed close-up of the evidence within a severely limited geographic space. That he makes regular comparisons with other bodies of evidence from elsewhere in the city only strengthens the importance of the material. The obvious problem of H.'s approach is that we do not receive a clear and explicit idea of how representative the Pompeian evidence actually is, but there is little question that H.'s discussion and the accompanying catalogue will provide a launch-point for renewed debate about the function and supply of currency in Roman Italy.

Washington and Lee University  
elliottc@wlu.edu

COLIN P. ELLIOTT

doi:10.1017/S0075435814000264

C. ORTON and M. HUGHES, *POTTERY IN ARCHAEOLOGY* (2nd edn). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. xx + 340, illus. ISBN 9781107008748 (bound); 9781107401303 (paper). £65.00/US\$99.00 (bound); £25.00/US\$39.99 (paper).

*Pottery in Archaeology* (*PiA*) offers what it says on the tin: a 'Manual in Archaeology' seeking to acquaint anyone interested with the potential and stumbling blocks of ceramic analysis. With this job description come obligations regarding format (a large number of short chapters; excellent visual aids), contents (wide coverage of periods and study areas), and style (accessible writing). There is no doubt that *PiA* meets these expectations and is a valuable contribution to the Manuals series, sketching the historical context of pottery studies (Part I), laying out its basic issues and potential (Part III), as well as offering practical handles on a range of 'how to' questions with regard to ceramic analysis (Part II). *PiA* is designed to cater for a varied audience of 'practical archaeologists', 'general readers', and 'students' (xviii). The first edition (Orton, Tyers and Vince (1993)) has been commended for exactly those reasons, but what — if anything — does this new, second edition add?

'Add' proves to be the right phrasing, as the approach to revision embraced in this case is limited to addition. The new chapters on experimental archaeology and craft and standardization fill in blanks in the previous edition rather than introducing the reader to cutting-edge developments. Moreover, these forays into ceramic production organization could have been integrated to better effect with some of the existing chapters on production. Failure to do so betrays a reluctance to rethink the structure of this volume.

Nevertheless, readers will wholeheartedly concur that the organization of a volume of this scope is a daunting task. Repetition is no more than a by-product of the book's extraordinary possibility of customized use: readers can pick and mix relevant chapters. Allowing such flexibility in use without losing consistency is probably *PiA*'s biggest feat. Explicit cross-references between chapters and the much-improved clarity of section titles and layout compared to the first edition facilitate this.

But the additive approach to revising the first edition hides a more fundamental issue in the way *PiA* conceptualizes the study of pottery — and by extension of artefacts. This is shown in the separation between 'Practicalities' (Part II) and 'Themes' (Part III). Partly a pragmatic strategy of accessibility — as discussed above — this choice of organization buys into a particular model of the nature and scope of archaeology. More specifically, it claims to be able to draw a line between factual analysis (practicalities) and interpretation (themes). This is reminiscent of Hawkes' so-called ladder of inference: a long out-dated model of archaeological inquiry which graded access to the past from straightforward (technology) to impossible (social and religious aspects). Put differently, the more 'material' a component was, the less 'social', and the closer to the archaeological material analysis. Such a stance is implicit in the statement that '[s]tatus, or symbolic function' is 'even less accessible than practical function' (31), or in the cutting short of the section on 'symbolic meaning' by stating that '[i]t is difficult enough [to access] through