Florence was clearly the place to visit in late May 1985. On the banks of the Arno the Second International Congress of Etruscology convened, 57 years after the first one in 1928. Among some 1,300 participants listed on p. xvii-xxxii one finds an impressive number of great names in the study of the ancient world. Many of these famous scholars have (so far) made their contributions outside the field of etruscology. Their presence in Florence is as good a proof as any of the great general interest generated by Etruscan studies during the last few decades.

The great names of Etruscan studies were certainly present as well, as the 116 papers published in these volumes testify. They are included under nine headings: "Storiografia e metodologia", "Storia e archeologia", "Urbanistica e architettura", "Arti figurative", "Economia, produzione e scambi", "Religione", "Epigrafia e lingua", "Vita pubblica e privata", and "Naturalistica".

This is not the proper place for an exhaustive discussion of the content of the papers. May it suffice to say that the aspects offered by so many experts on so many questions of general or more restricted interest will cause Etruscologists to return to these volumes time and again. A few scattered remarks may be able to show their usefulness.

Who would have thought that one of the most valuable treatments of ancient lead poisoning published in recent years could be found here? This is "Nuovi metodi e prospettive nella paleoantropologia di età storica" by G. Fornaciari & F. Mallegni (III, 1445-80). The paper's title conveys no real picture of its content. Among other things the authors discuss lead poisoning in ancient societies, basing themselves on recent research not only in Etruria, but also around Rome, and elsewhere in the Roman empire. Interesting parallels to lead content in bones from modern societies are also given.

Another interesting paper, like the previous contribution from the section "Naturalistica", is the last but one in vol. III and may run the risk of being overlooked. In "The Portonaccio materials from Veii: a scientific analysis" W.M. Gaugler and R.A. Anderson present results based on a scientific analysis of the clay from a fragmented statue from Veii. The statue quite likely belonged to the same group as the famous Apollo, which once stood on the roof of the Portonaccio temple.

When the fragments from the Portonaccio statue were tested for thermoluminisence, this gave a firing date between 503 and 257 B.C. (The precise date of 503 B.C. gives the impression of being an exact figure, but of course may be an approximation, in which case the consequences are less interesting. For more data on the scientific analysis, though not on the dating, see Gaugler & Anderson, AJA 84, 1980, 92f.)
De novis libris iudicia

It is often argued that it was Rome's last king Tarquinius Superbus who commissioned the cult image for the new Roman temple of Jupiter Capitolinus from the Veijan artist Vulca. (There are however multiple problems of interpretation; see e.g. M. Pallottino, EAA VII, 1966, 1206f.; O.-W. von Vacano, ANRW I.4, 1973, 524-529; A. Andrén, RPAA 49, 1976/77, 65; M. Cristofani, Prospettiva 9, 1977, 2-7; G. Colonna, PP 36, 1981, 56-59). As we know from ancient Roman chronology, and as has been stressed rather emphatically by many modern non-revisionist scholars, Tarquinius was expelled from Rome in 510 B.C. In 509 B.C. the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus was dedicated.

Another assumption sometimes encountered is that Vulca is identical with the "Maestro dell'Apollo" who made the statues for the Portonaccio temple. Scholars holding this view commonly assume that Vulca worked first at Veii, and that he was called to Rome only after having proven his skills in his native city. If this is true, it seems that the cult image of Jupiter could not have been made before 503 B.C. at the earliest. Nor could the last king of Rome have been expelled and the Republic introduced until some time after the canonic date of 510/09.

As alternative explanations one might suggest that the fragments analysed by Gaugler and Anderson come from a statue not belonging to the same context as the famous Apollo. Or, indeed, that on chronological grounds Vulca and the "Maestro dell'Apollo" must be different persons. Further investigations would be welcome.

The papers mentioned here are intended to show that interesting results are found even behind unassuming titles. The three volumes on the Second Etruscology Congress are indeed well worth consulting also for scholars outside the discipline.

Christer Bruun


We have here a versatile guide to the archaeological history of Etruscan Italy in 1200-400 BC. The authors have, to use their own words, attempted to map out the patterns of human existence and written essentials of Etruscan life. The first two chapters give a clear picture of the physical environment as well as settlement. They cover nearly one third of the actual text, reflecting thus their importance in the work as a hole. The practicality of the book is also reflected in the division of the rest of the chapters: such themes as technology, trade, the process of cultural change, ritual, warfare and social organization are stimulatingly discussed. The authors quite rightly did not want to include any explicit survey on art as we already have a number of good recent studies. Indeed, they have an enviably clear picture of the spheres of archaeology and art, citing Oscar Wilde's "where archaeology begins, art ceases". This is quite a supportable attitude if one is content to see art only as an object of aesthetic excursus. The idea and actual contents of the book is interesting and rewarding. It is aimed at the general reader, who can gain something more than the basic information about the Etruscans through this book, and who may afterwards wish to visit the sites and museums. At the end of the book some practical advice and a glossary - useful, but meagre - are provided.