

he also analyses his material from different points of view: from that of the monument on which material appears, that of topographical and chronological differences, that of the functional environment in which the furniture is presented, and that of the connection with the furniture of other ancient peoples. Furthermore, he presents all this in the form of statistical tables; he attempts to discover the original materials, and so on.

All this clearly involved an enormous amount of work, and the results are of well great value to archaeologists and etruscologists. The work is not, however, completely free from methodological weaknesses. The analysis is carried out in such small sections that for the most part it is superficial; the conclusions actually contain very little and certainly nothing unexpected. More serious is the absence of basic definitions. What is meant by 'Etruscan' or 'Etruria'? 'Furniture' is defined as "Unter "Möbel" sollen hier nur - abgesehen von wenigen Ausnahmen wie Sarkophagen und Körben - Möbel im eigentlichen Sinne verstanden werden." All problems of dating are ignored; since the references are also missing, this part of the catalogue is virtually useless. The grounds on which the material was selected remain unclear. The terms 'Italic', 'Latin', and so on, are almost unknown to the writer; one almost gets the impression that Italy was inhabited only by Etruscans and then later by Romans; for the purposes of comparison the other Italic cultures would occupy a central position. Nor do I accept without further explanation the subordinate position of the Hellenistic period. Of the Volterranean cinerary urns, only four are included in the material; on what grounds were they chosen? What is the value of the statistics, when certain groups of monuments are included in their entirety, and of others only one per cent? When some datings are made in fifty year periods - which is often over precise -, the three centuries of the Hellenistic era constitute only one period. Of course the datings within this period are very difficult, but they will always remain so, if even the basic collections of material do not attempt to differentiate and analyse the material of this period.

*Jorma Kaimio*

*Bianca Maria Felletti Maj: La tradizione italica nell'arte romana.*

I. Archaeologica 3. Giorgio Bretschneider, Roma 1977. 404 p., LXXXIII tav. Lit. 80000.

Il presente volume, pubblicato nella nuova collana dell'editore Giorgio Bretschneider, è rimasto l'ultima opera della ben conosciuta studiosa romana. Questo lavoro, notevole per l'impegno e ricchezza di documentazione, sia illustrativa che letteraria antica e moderna, si presenta assai bene anche per quanto riguarda la veste tipografica. Nonostante le giustificazioni presentate a pag. 50 si lamenta forse la mancanza di un trattamento più profondo e personale della questione "tradizione italica" e dello sviluppo dell'arte italica nei secoli precedenti alla definitiva conquista romana della penisola. Sembra, inoltre, che alcuni aspetti di questo ammirevole lavoro

siano stati superati, già al tempo della sua pubblicazione, ad es. da non poche relazioni tenute al convegno "Hellenismus in Mittelitalien" nel 1974 e pubblicate nel 1976.

Molto utile è l'indice delle illustrazioni, completato anche dalle relative pagine nel testo. Meno riuscito invece l'indice dei monumenti e soggetti in qui questi non appaiono citati sotto i nomi dei relativi personaggi o luoghi, bensì sotto "ara di...", "fregio di...", "tomba di...", ecc. Ciò rende l'opera di difficile consultazione.

Si tratta tuttavia di un lavoro onesto e utilissimo sotto più aspetti, degno della fama della compianta autrice.

Paavo Castrén

*Marianne Maaskant-Kleibrink: Catalogue of the Engraved Gems in the Royal Coin Cabinet the Hague. I: Text (380 p.); II: Plates (189). Government Publishing Office, The Hague, Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, Wiesbaden 1978. Hfl. 400.-.*

This superb and luxurious edition once again bears witness to the great vogue of the Gemmenforschung. The principal aim of the author is to give a critical edition and description of the great and important collection of gems in the Royal Coin Cabinet in the Hague. In this, the author deserves our appreciation and gratitude for the accuracy with which she has carried out his task. Moreover, the edition contains valuable information on the chronology of the gems along with suggestions for new stylistic categories. The author has also succeeded in establishing a workshop for certain of the gems. This is also of interest for social history. Thus, we are told of the existence of greater workshops in Aquileia and Pompeii. This book contains many valuable insights for the study of the stylistic evolution and chronology of the gems.

I shall content myself with expressing some remarks on the interpretation of the gem inscriptions. Nr. 59: the inscription is surely late, for Q. L() A() clearly represents the initials of the owner. We cannot even say whether it is republican (will nevertheless be CIL I<sup>2</sup> 3696). - 96: probably a Cn. Vat() Stab(ilio). Will be CIL I<sup>2</sup> 3664. - 108: since the name *Tuilius* does not exist, it has to be taken as *Tullius*, even if the photo clearly reads TVILI. The inscription is of further interest since the praenomen of the freedman is not that of the patron, thus indicating that the inscription is old. Will be CIL I<sup>2</sup> 3663. - 219: SEXMF is explained by the author as *Sextus Marci filius*. This is not possible. It should be *Sex. M() F()*, rather than *Sex(tius) M.f.*, since a praenomen is necessary. Will be CIL I<sup>2</sup> 3697. - 533: in my mind the inscription is authentic (note χαῖρα). Ἀχιλλεύς may be a personal name. - 735: should perhaps be understood as Ἐπάγαθε? - 860: should be read *Artemidoriana*, an interesting and unique suffix derivation from *Artemidorus -a*. - 873 is *Deci*. - 1033 should be read *Venerius*, with ligatures of VE, NE and VS. - The magical inscriptions have been treated less carefully;