

museo partenopeo. Si tratta di un lavoro ben condotto, di buona qualità professionale. C'è da augurarsi che altri gruppi di monumenti vengano illustrati in maniera scientifica.

*Heikki Solin*

*Anna Elizabeth Riz: Bronzegefässe in der römisch-pompejanischen Wandmalerei* (Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Rom, Sonderschriften 7), Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1990. XVIII+115 pp. 63 Pls. DM 135.

Thoroughness is not invariably a typically German feature as is commonly believed to be the case. Nevertheless, it has been a characteristic of many recent German classical studies, which makes them useful if not always innovative works. (This is not to imply that such works are always devoid of the latter characteristic). Consequently, one opens this catalogue of bronze vases in Romano-Campanian wall paintings with great expectations, especially as the lay-out and the splendid colour plates are of that good quality for which the editor is renowned. Given the nature of the work under review, colour prints are a necessity. For those of us used to the black and white world of archaeological publications, however, they constitute a particularly welcome merit. One is all the more disappointed therefore when one turns to the actual body of the work itself which, with the aim of being compact, falls far short of the "German" standard of thoroughness.

The appropriate term to define the wall paintings found in the area covered by the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 A.D. is "Romano-Campanian", though it is often used to include also wall paintings from elsewhere in Italy from the late 2nd century B.C. to the 1st century A.D. The term "römisch-pompejanisch" should be limited to Roman Pompeii only, whereas "römisch-kampanisch" should be used when other Campanian sites are also included. The author's use of the term "römisch-pompejanisch" is thus incorrect as is clearly shown by the index of find sites (Fund- und Standorte) on pp. 108–111. Moreover, there is, unfortunately, no proper introductory chapter, presenting the basic requirements of any serious study: namely the presentation of questions to be dealt with, earlier studies and the methods and (criteria used for choosing) the source material. Such basic requirements are not mere formal trivialities as the fatal consequences of their omission clearly show in this case. The first chapter, "Bronzegefässe, ein Element der pompejanischen Wanddekoration" (pp. 1–5) presents a brief overview of Romano-Campanian wall paintings in general, but not, as the title would seem to indicate, from the point of view of bronze vases as such. A more accurate title would have been "Abriß der römisch-kampanischen Wandmalerei", for example. This chapter reads fluently and is up-to-date as regards references,

but can be criticized as being too general and, more seriously, for ignoring the essential question, namely the problems concerning the chronology of the four styles and their various phases, presented here without any comments or references in the index on p. 113. A work such as this can not, of course, include an exhaustive review of previous work, but considering that these matters are in dispute, in particular the late Third Style and Fourth Style, some remarks in the Introduction (or in the chapter "Chronologie" on pp. 20–22) would have been desirable. In the Catalogue (pp. 49–106) there is, understandably, no space for further comments, but that is all the more reason why the date proposed should include a precise reference, or – perhaps more useful still – the bibliographies might also indicate the various date suggestions.

Equally desirable, if not even more so, would be an overview of the problems concerning the studies of vases. We find some information on this matter in the notes to the chapter entitled "Typologie" (pp. 10–19). The figures and lists of vases which constitute almost the entire contents of this chapter are clearly presented, but without any further discussion or clear references concerning such matters as terminology. Why, for example, "Becken" are called *luter* or *lacus* instead of *labrum*? The present reviewer is not competent to judge the reliability of this section, but matters can hardly be so self-evident as to make an overview unnecessary. All scholars studying Romano-Campanian wall paintings are certainly interested in this kind of work, but of necessity can not be specialists with regard to the intricacies involved in the studies of metal vases.

With regard to the choice of the source material and its representativeness, one wonders why examples in contemporaneous paintings from elsewhere in Italy, particularly those in Rome, have been omitted. Vases in earlier and contemporaneous mosaics, though perhaps not very numerous, should also merit a (separate) discussion, e.g. in the form of an appendix. Consequently one is all the more surprised to find some paintings and mosaics representing bronze vases to have been included in the list (pp. 33–40) which should document parallels for the painted vases among real vases. This list is found in the chapter entitled "Vergleich der gemalten Gefässe mit Originalen aus Bronze und Edelmetall" (pp. 31–41), which, if it had been properly done, could be of crucial importance. As a result, the numerous interesting observations about the relationship of painted and real vases to each other (on pp. 31–32 and 40–41) remain without proper documentation. The text includes practically no references to other literature nor to the list itself. The list of parallels (on pp. 30–40) is rightly arranged according to the typology of the catalogue of the painted vases, and there is also a reference to the plates of the work indicating the respective painted parallels. However, no information is given to allow one to estimate the representativeness of the list of parallels. In any case, its value is seriously compromised because

of the methodically faulty decision not to limit the study to bronze or to other metal vases, but to include vases not only in other materials such as terracotta and marble, but also representations of vases in paintings and mosaics (as stated above) as well as vases found in stuccoes and on coins! This is not the place to check the reliability of these comparisons systematically, but, for example, the marble *luter* (why not *labrum* used in the inscription of the piece itself!?) from the Forum baths in Pompeii compared with a quite different *luter* nr. 187 Pl. 53,1 raises serious doubts in this respect.

More important still is the question of the representativeness of the actual catalogue comprising 232 entries. The author does not mention whether or not the work attempts to be a comprehensive corpus of the bronze vases in the wall paintings of Pompeii and its neighbourhood. The inaccurate title of the work can be interpreted in either way, and equally enigmatic are the two first sentences on p. 1 referring to the already earlier stated need for such a corpus. In any case, and particularly if a complete corpus is not aimed at, there should be at least a brief explanation about how and by what criteria the material has been selected. The bibliography alone, which in the list of contents goes under "Verzeichnis der Abkürzungen" (pp. viii–xviii) is abundant, but nonetheless not sufficient in this respect. It includes the catalogue *Pitture e pavimenti di Pompei I–III* (1981–86), but because its texts do not list all details it would be important to know whether the author has also used the archive (of photographs) itself and checked all the vases in situ (the splendid colour photos reveal an extensive field work). Here a list of the key-words used (e.g. in an appendix) would have been useful also from the point of view of the terminology.

With the aforementioned is also connected the crucial question of how reliably a bronze vase can be distinguished in a wall painting from those representing silver or gold. This is discussed quite insufficiently en passant and strangely enough in the chapter on "Chronologie" on p. 21. The author refers to Plin. nat. 34,1,3.6, mentioning four kinds of bronzes (two of which resemble silver and gold!), which in the wall paintings can be distinguished in the colours bluish-silverygrey, golden brown, reddish-brown and brownish-grey. Because of their more compact and darker tones these should be clearly distinguishable from silver and gold vases. The catalogue does, unfortunately, not describe the colours. I have serious doubts about this claim because the author neglects to include a list of uncertain cases, where damage prevents one from judging the colours, e.g. the vases in the vignettes and in the upper part of the paintings in the atrium of the Casa dei Ceii. Moreover, among the well preserved representations there are border line cases: in the middle zone of the N-wall of the atrium in the Casa dei Vettii there is a female figure offering a crater-like vase to a purple gallinule (*Porphyrio porphyrio*). The colour of this vase, not included

in the work discussed, is a similar dark grey as, for example, nr. 143 Pl. 43,5 or nr. 165 Pl. 49,4. Likewise the *situla* nr. 99 Pl. 33,6 contains a yellow *sistrum*. The latter is regarded by Riz as representing a golden *sistrum*, but the instrument most likely was of bronze. In my view, this colour cannot be distinguished from the yellow *lacus* nr. 177 Pl. 26,1 which is believed to represent bronze. Similar doubtful cases are the following not included in the work under discussion: yellow craters in the triclinium (e) in the Casa dei Ceii, the amphorae in the viridarium (h) of the same house; the cortina on the tripod in the triclinium (16) in house I 7,1; grey craters in the Palaestra; a labrum and a crater in the garden paintings in the summer triclinium II 9,7 (cf. also the crater in the garden painting in the viridarium (k) in the house VII 2,25). These sporadic examples should show that uncertain cases would have needed to be discussed, e.g. in the form of an appendix. To have discussed representations of all metal vases together might have resulted in a too voluminous opus, but as the author, at any rate, must have checked the silver and gold vases also, it would have been advisable to add at least a list of these.

Despite the brave attempt and evident amount of hard work done, this study as such does not meet the expectations aroused by its interesting subject. It is to be hoped that it could be rewritten, possibly, as part of larger study of all metal vases in Romano-Campanian wall paintings.

*Antero Tammisto*

*Marco Milanese: Scavi nell'oppidum preromano di Genova* (Genova – S. Silvestro 1). *Studia archaeologica* 48. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 1987. 385 p. ITL 300.000.

Genova ebbe anche una storia preromana. Strabone chiama il sito un emporion dei Liguri. Distrutto dai Cartaginesi nel 205 a.C., il posto fu riedificato due anni dopo da Sp. Lucrezio e divenne un importante punto strategico. Le testimonianze dell'insediamento preromano sono da una parte una necropoli nell'area della via XX Settembre, dall'altra i resti dell'oppidum stesso nella zona della Collina di Castello. Il volume qui presentato è dedicato all'illustrazione degli scavi di due edifici della città preromana della Collina di Castello, nell'area di S. Silvestro, condotti fra il 1977 e il 1981 dall'autore del volume, un giovane promettente archeologo genovese. Sia gli scavi che la pubblicazione testimoniano di un ottimo studioso, che ha saputo esporre i suoi risultati in modo minuzioso, inquadrandoli nella situazione storica ed economica del tempo.

*Heikki Solin*