POTTERY FROM ETRURIA

M. Bentz, C. Reusser (edd.): *Attische Vasen in etruskischem Kontext. Funde aus Häusern und Heiligtümern*. (Beihefte zum Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum 2.) Pp. 120, maps, ills, figs. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 2004. Cased, €49.90, SFr 86. ISBN: 3-406-51904-0.

L. M. Michetti: *Le ceramiche argentate e a rilievo in Etruria nella prima età ellenistica*. (Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei: Monumenti Antichi, Serie Miscellanea, Volume VIII [Serie Generale LXI].) Pp. 284, ills, b/w and colour pls. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, 2003. Paper. ISBN: 88-7689-198-6.

G. Pucci, C. Mascione (edd.): *Manifattura ceramica etrusco-romana a Chiusi. Il complesso produttivo di Marcianella.* (Bibliotheca Archaeologica 10.) Pp. 340, maps, ills, figs. Bari: Edipuglia, 2003. Cased, €42. ISBN: 88-7228-306-X.

The vast majority of Athenian black- and red-figured vases, including the 'best' of them, have come (and keep coming) from the soil of ancient Etruria. Well preserved because they were deposited in graves, thousands of them have found their way in the past two centuries to innumerable public and private collections all over the world. In the process, most have lost all information not only about their specific associations, but also about their place of origin. Specialists have taken this as an excuse for treating them exclusively in terms of the Athenian milieu in which they were produced, and hardly ever refer to that of their Etruscan consumers (for the few exceptions to this approach, see Part III of *Céramique et peinture grecques. Modes d'emploi* [Paris, 1999]). Material from non-funerary contexts, on the other hand, is usually too fragmentary and worn to attract—at least until fairly recently—the attention of illegal treasure hunters, thus avoiding the degree of decontextualization that we lament for the cemeteries, but also failing to attract the scholarly interest needed for prompt and proper publication. The poor information available for the forty sanctuaries and eighty habitation sites known in one way or another in Etruria, noted by C. Reusser while compiling his comprehensive survey on the use and significance of imported Attic pottery there (*Vasen für Etrurien* [Zürich, 2002]), led him to organize, in November 2002 in Regensburg, the conference of which the first volume listed above contains the proceedings.

After the Introduction by the editors (pp. 7–8), seven papers in Italian, three in German, and one in French deal with nine individual sites from the Po Valley to Southern Etruria, the general situation in Gaul and Spain (P. Rouillard, pp. 115–20), and votive inscriptions on Attic vases (D. H. Steinbauer, pp. 107–14, proposing to espunge *Suri* and *Veali* from the list of divine names). Of the sites discussed, five are habitations and four sanctuaries. The former are found in the port city of Adria (Hatria), from nineteenth-century excavations (M. C. Vallicelli, pp. 9–16 and F. Wiel-Marin, pp. 17–24); a settlement at San Cassiano, 15 km from Adria itself (1800 sq m explored 1995–2002: M. Harari, pp. 25–34); House IV 1, 2 at Marzabotto (old excavations, now revisited by Benz and Reusser, pp. 35–44); two other settlements at Gonfienti outside Prato (rescue excavation 1996–2001: G. Millemaci and G. Poggesi, pp. 45–52), and at Castellina del Marangone on the coast between Caere and

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Tarquinia (German–French project 1995–1999: I. Wehgartner, pp. 77–84). The sacred areas are at Pisa (rescue work 1977 in Piazza dei Cavalieri, and official research 1993 near the Leaning Tower: S. Bruni, pp. 53–66), on the acropolis at Volterra (regular campaigns since 1987, plus earlier data from the whole area: M. Iozzo, pp. 67–76), and the South or 'minor' sanctuary at Pyrgi (research since 1984: P. Baglione, pp. 85–106).

Pyrgi is a special case. Interpreted by its excavators as the place of worship for foreign visitors to the busy port, it has yielded an unusually large amount of Attic pottery—including a monumental phiale depicting the Slaying of the Suitors. Here Baglione follows up her previous report (*ScAnt* 10 [2000], 337–82), discussing two intact deposits and the particular associations of certain functional shapes that find their closest parallels in Greek sanctuaries of chthonian deities, also connected with the Dionysian sphere; affinities are noted especially between Pyrgi, Sicily and the North Adriatic. Her comments on how the ritual use of Attic black-figure olpai was replaced in the fifth century by a local plain ware version, found in their hundreds all over the area, are unfortunately the only ones of their kind in the whole volume. Also at a premium are clear indications of the proportion of Attic to other, imported or local, wares: 2 per cent at Marzabotto; about 3 per cent at San Cassiano (though Figs 4 and 5 contradict the text on p. 29); eight pieces in all at Gonfienti, unspecified at Pisa, fifty to sixty at Volterra, seventy at Castellina—where this number is higher than that (forty-four) from the cemeteries, with more red-figure and very high quality thoroughout (Lydos, Euphronios, Onesimos, Makron, Penthesilea, Polygnotos)—and about 4,500 at Adria, equally divided between black- and red-figure (the latter covering two centuries, against the 550–450 B.C. range of the former). As for the relative quantities of functional shapes, the overwhelming prevalence in all sites of drinking vessels, especially kylikes, is particularly evident, with larger containers more common in black- than red-figure; also notable is the presence of lekythoi (many of the Phanyllis Class, widespread in Sicily), particularly at Adria and Pyrgi, and of more material of the Haimon Group than previously documented (also at Pisa).

The most significant new factor emerging from these urban sites, however, besides the solid evidence they provide of a widespread use of Attic pottery outside the purely funerary context, is the clear indication of a substantial continuity of imports from the Kerameikos during the whole fifth and well into the fourth century (red-figure being followed by non-figured, St Valentin and black-glaze), in sheer contrast with what we knew from the funerary contexts.

If the evidence presented in this volume (and in Reusser 2002, cited above) sounds the death knell for the ill-conceived idea that Attic vases were worthless ballast, used by the Etruscans as a cheap surrogate for richer metal wares and destined only for the undiscerning dead, such a function was certainly fullfilled in the changed circumstances of the fourth–third century by the silvered vases analysed by Michetti. Not only are they found, with very few exceptions, in chamber tombs, but their status as non-functional dummies is proved by the usually open bottoms, the prevalent exuberance of plastic and relief decoration, and the unstable quality of the 'silver' coating. Like the Attic imports of the previous centuries, the shapes are connected with the banquet and the use of wine; but in sharp contrast with them, drinking vessels are extremely rare (not a kylix in sight), the emphasis falling instead on larger containers and parade pieces.

Three major achievements mark the value of M.'s study: the detailed and lavishly illustrated catalogue of 739 items (many previously unpublished); the documented raising of the chronology, from a still widely repeated date in the late third–early

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

second century to a general mid-fourth to mid-third range; and the firm distinction of three production centres—besides the long recognized Volsinian one (360 pieces, probably from various workshops in both Orvieto and Bolsena), another one at Falerii (previously only suggested: 311 pieces) and a third one at Volaterrae (68 high quality pieces). Since that distinction is a result of M.'s investigation, it seems odd to adopt it as the premise around which to organize the typological study (Chapter 2, pp. 21–41), typology (Chapter 6, pp. 125–141: a purely descriptive list of shapes, which would have been better integrated either with Chapter 2 or with the catalogue), and catalogue (Chapter 7, pp. 144–166). The risks inherent in a preconceived arrangement of this nature are seen *inter alia* in the forced attribution to one specific centre (Falerii) of some pieces for which it is either declared uncertain (such as the phialai with quadrigae nos 489–504) or should be (e.g. the uncoated amphorae from Tarquinia, nos 483–5).

Significant differences distinguish the repertory of shapes in the three centres. Volsinian workshops only produced actual vessels: about eighty kraters, eighty amphorae and situlae, sixty jugs (oinochoai and olpai), fifty paterae and phialai, and various other shapes in small numbers. At Volaterrae, three kraters, six situlae, twenty-one jugs, etc. are joined by nine candelabra and two thymiateria. By contrast, the Faliscan production extends to a large number of plastic, non-containing pieces: sixty-nine small female figurines, probably representing the handles of perishable perfume sticks (appropriately accompanied by thirty-two alabastra), and forty-nine 'supports' shaped as female or negro (only three) heads; also notable is a number of 'large vases' with a heavy decoration of many applied relief figures. Common to the three centres are '*rocchetto*' kyathoi, strainers, and sundry other shapes.

Plastic decoration in various techniques is almost exclusively vegetal at Volaterrae, mainly figural at Falerii, and both at Volsinii; the subjects are essentially mythological, referring to the underworld and Dionysian spheres. The coating of the external surfaces consists generally in the silvery effect of the applied tin foil, but gilded, yellow-paint, polychrome, and uncoated examples are included; they are detailed in the catalogue, but they are not identified or discussed in the analytical chapters, nor are they mentioned in the *Osservazioni sulle tecniche di fabbricazione* (pp. 105–8). Analysis of shapes and decorations brings out the connections between distinct craft traditions—particularly black-glaze and silvered pottery, terracottas (*coroplastica*), and metal wares (*toreutica*); it also confirms the lively relationships of the Etruscan craftsmen and their patrons with the cultural and economic environments of the Early Hellenistic Greek peripheries of Magna Graecia and Macedonia.

In all three centres, this kind of ware represents a specialized production, distributed to the immediately surrounding area but seldom exported (from Volsinii to Vulci, Clusium, and Spina; from Volaterrae to Populonia; from Falerii to Barbarano, Norchia, and Tarquinia). As for the clients, a clear difference is perceived by M. between the country-living exponents of an aristocratic revival at Volsinii and Volaterrae, and the members of a well-off middle class of the Faliscan and Tarquinian areas (esp. pp. 108–24). Such social diagnosis is, however, more asserted than properly supported by any explicitly presented evidence, least of all from the few firm contexts known for the material itself.

The lack of museum and provenience indexes is inconvenient. Even so, this book will provide the next generation or more with an indispensable reference tool on a significant class of Etruscan Early Hellenistic pottery.

Later and more modest wares are the subject of *Manifattura*. This is the final report

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

on the excavation of a group of pottery kilns in the countryside near Chiusi–Clusium. Working for twenty-five weeks between 1987 and 1991, a team from Siena University was able to explore entirely the small 'production complex', in which eight individual kilns were in successive use from the end of the third to the beginning of the first century B.C. The total excavation of any ancient feature from top to bottom and over its whole extension is an extremely rare event that permits a more than usually wide-ranging elaboration and definitive interpretation of the finds—both fixed and mobile. Here, the careful analysis of the ceramic materials provides the basis for understanding the stratigraphic sequences and their association with very confused structural remains. While the procedure is legitimate and indeed indispensable, its presentation is less so, since Part II (*Lo scavo*, 17–72) eschews an objective description of the remains as found, and proceeds straight to their interpretation, from virgin soil to modern intervention (six working periods are thus defined, which are followed by abandonment in the first century, and then limited reuse for firing lime rather than pottery). This should have come as a second level of elaboration and not the only one available to the reader; parallels and discussions are useful, but they do not compensate for entirely missing measurements and virtually unreadable sections.

The treatment of the small finds (Part III: *I materiali*, pp. 75–328, including archaeometric and environmental analyses) is, however, almost exemplary in its thoroughness, despite the fact that, apart from ten worn bronze coins, the rest is a mass of fragmentary discarded pottery of a quality that was mediocre even when at its saleable best. Ten categories are defined by technique or function: black- and red-glaze, thin-walled, coarse, and plain wares (the latter including some timeless money-boxes); and commercial amphorae, lamps, loom-weights, stacking-rings, and *tubuli* for vault construction (while tiles, which are plentiful and probably also fired *in loco*, are not catalogued anywhere). The slow changes in types and quality are well described, as is the major break around the mid-second century, when a still craft-like variety of forms and categories gives way to a more standardized and careless production.

Institute of Classical Studies, London F. R. SERRA RIDGWAY
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni362

A SURVEY OF ROMAN ART

P. STEWART: *Roman Art*. (*Greece & Rome* New Surveys in the Classics 34.) Pp. viii + 155, ills, colour pls. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Paper. ISBN: 0-19-852081-6.

There used to be an attitude to Roman art that it did not exist in its own right but merely as a product of Hellenic civilization, as noted by the author of the volume here reviewed. However, several studies within the last ten to fifteen years have attempted to adjust this view, or rather to look at Roman art more on its own terms; why was it made and for whom, how was it used and what did it mean? S. has already made a valuable contribution to this field.[1] The present volume continues in this direction and is an extremely useful overview of the field of Roman art, focusing on sculpture, paintings, and mosaics.

S. has divided the material into six chapters, moving both chronologically and

[1] *Statues in Roman Society: Representation and Response* (Oxford, 2003).

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni362 Published online by Cambridge University Press