

mosaicata consente di avere solo una visione in filigrana delle sue fasi architettoniche, articolate tra le maglie della tarda antichità fino al medioevo. D'estremo interesse, il recinto della tomba del santo realizzato con transenne marmoree di riuso, iscritte, sormontate da un altare sul modello dei complessi urbani di V secolo d. C.

Non è superfluo sottolineare come l'impiego dei modelli architettonici urbani venne contrassegnato dall'uso privilegiato dei marmi, appositamente lavorati (come una coppia di pregevoli colonne in marmo di Aquitania sormontati da capitelli figurati realizzati *ex novo*) e altri di riuso, in particolare basi, colonne, capitelli, iscrizioni e lastre marmoree di rivestimento recuperate, sin dalle prime fasi edilizie, dai monumenti forensi e dalle necropoli di Nola. Un intero fregio in marmo con cataste di armi, pregiati rivestimenti con girali d'acanto e meandri, preziosi vasi e un'urna dovevano formare l'arredo e la suppellettile del nuovo tempio cristiano.

La fama, di cui il santuario di Cimitile godeva, dovette attirare molti fedeli ed autorità almeno fino al Cinquecento, come conferma la citazione del luogo di culto nel *De Nola* di Ambrogio Leone, edito nel 1514, in riferimento all'*ara magna quadrataque*, certamente l'altare medievale della chiesa di S. Felice.

Nei capitoli finali, sono particolarmente interessanti i riferimenti agli interventi di restauro sei-settecenteschi; per quanto a volte invasivi, confermano la venerazione dell'area in un periodo in cui era ormai andata totalmente perduta la memoria della tomba del santo.

Le prime ricerche sistematiche, iniziate con gli scavi diretti dal Chierici al principio del secolo scorso, hanno avuto quindi il merito di fare luce sulle conoscenze fino ad allora ferme ai contributi degli eruditi locali. Di un certo interesse è a questo proposito il capitolo VII, in cui si prova a ripercorrere l'intervento di scavo condotto dall'architetto tra il 1933 e il 1955 attraverso alcuni documenti, riprodotti in appendice insieme ad una serie di foto di archivio relative alla scoperta del sepolcro (come è noto il prezioso taccuino di appunti del Chierici fu trasferito in Germania e ad oggi è oggetto di studio nelle università locali).

Come si è detto, compito preliminare dell'autore è stato quello di ripercorrere gli scavi passati al fine di esaminare interamente la storia del monumento alla luce delle nuove indagini.

A questo proposito, per quanto a volte si evince un tono leggermente polemico dell'autore nei confronti di chi ancora detiene la documentazione di scavo, il testo riesce a riconnettere parte degli interventi operati nel sito con le nuove indagini. Ci si augura di avere presto la disponibilità dei vecchi documenti di scavo allo scopo di fornire ulteriori risposte ai problemi connessi alla complessa stratificazione del celebre monumento e della sua tomba.

Angela Palmentieri

La Lupa Capitolina. Nuove prospettive di studio. Incontro-dibattito in occasione della pubblicazione del volume di ANNA MARIA CARRUBA, La Lupa Capitolina: un bronzo medievale. A cura di GILDA BARTOLONI. Supplementi e Monografie della Rivista "Archeologia Classica" 5 – n.s. 2. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 2010. ISBN 978-88-8265-580-8. 206 pp. EUR 100.

MARIA R.-ALFÖLDI – EDILBERTO FORMIGLI – JOHANNES FRIED: *Die römische Wölfin / The Lupa Romana. Ein antikes Monument stürzt von seinem Sockel / An antique monument falls from her pedestal.* Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2011. ISBN 978-3-515-09876-2. 161 S., 43 s/w Abb., 4 farb. Abb. EUR 48.

In 2006, the Italian art historian Anna Maria Carruba challenged the traditional dating of the Capitoline Wolf, *Lupa Capitolina*. Carruba, supported by the etruscologist Adriano La Regina, claimed the bronze statue to be medieval, on the basis of the analysis of its casting technique. Since then, the debate about the dating has been vivacious.

The volume *La Lupa Capitolina, Nuove prospettive di studio*, edited by Gilda Bartoloni, is based on the academic conference held at the university "La Sapienza" in Rome on 28 February 2008. Experts on Roman history, Etruscan, Roman and medieval art history, geology, chemistry and conservation were invited in order to present and discuss their research on the Lupa. In the volume, there are 12 articles, some devoted to technical, and some to historical-iconographic analysis. In addition, there is an excellent introduction by Bartoloni.

In his article "La storia della tecnologia dei grandi bronzi" (pp. 15–24), Edilberto Formigli supports the medieval dating. According to Formigli, the finishing touch of the *Lupa Capitolina* is similar to medieval, not to ancient bronzes. Furthermore, as there are no known examples of lost-wax casting in one piece of sculptures of this size in Antiquity, the traditional dating seems improbable.

On the contrary, Claudio Giardino ("Aspetti archeometallurgici", pp. 25–36), discussing the evidence from an archaeometallurgic point of view, considers the sculpture to be ancient. Giardino offers comparative examples of ancient single-piece casting of the same size as the *Lupa*, proving that the knowledge and the technique existed already in the beginning of the 5th century BCE. Giardino also notes that it is easier to cast a quadruped animal with a simple geometrical composition than a human figure. The analysis of the bronze alloy indicates significant similarities with the alloy of Etruscan bronzes, where the amount of lead (5% in the *Lupa*) is higher than in the medieval bronze alloys. Giardino also presents the isotope analysis of the lead, concluding that its origin must be from the mine of Calabona, in northwestern Sardinia. The Calabona quarry went out of use already in Antiquity, which also supports the traditional dating of the Capitoline Wolf.

In their summaries, Gianni Lombardi ("Lo studio dei residui di terra di fusione", pp. 37–8) and Marco Martini ("La datazione della terra di fusione", pp. 39–41) conclude that the soil used in the casting originated from the valley of Tiber, between Rome and Orvieto, and that the thermoluminescence dating of the soil has given very contradictory results. However, the first results of the TL dating seem to rule out the traditional Etruscan dating.

Maurizio Sannibale ("Per un approccio calibrato all'esame tecnologico", pp. 43–63) closes the series of technically orientated articles, focusing mainly on the details of the surface of the sculpture. Even though some finishing techniques, such as filing, were uncommon for ancient bronzes, Sannibale assumes the *Lupa* to originate from Antiquity. However, he disagrees with the traditional dating to the early 5th century BCE. According to Sannibale, the *Lupa* was made in the end of the 4th century BCE, as a substitution for an archaic sculpture. As for this dating, it is worth remembering Livy's mention (Liv. 10,23,11) of the Ogulnii brothers erecting a statue of the she-wolf with Romulus and Remus near the cave of Lupercal in 296 BCE.

In the first article of the historical-iconographic part of the book, Andrea Carandini ("L'opinione di uno studioso di Roma antica", pp. 67–72) gives credit to Carruba for her essay that has compelled scholars to rethink their views. However, Carandini does not share Carruba's opinion about the dating. He points out that the limited material of the late archaic bronzes cannot be used as a solid argument for the absence of casting in one piece in Antiquity. Caran-

dini strongly objects to Carruba's view of the *Lupa* as an "unnatural" composition. He indicates irrefutable anatomic parallels with *Canis lupus* and the Capitoline wolf, basing his views on Nadia Canu's work *Le valenze del lupo nel mondo romano* (2006). As for the stylistic details, Carandini notes that there is little in common between the *Lupa* and the medieval bronzes.

Giovanni Colonna ("Un monumento romano dell'inizio della repubblica", pp. 73–110) makes an extensive stylistic analysis comparing the Capitoline Wolf with Etruscan and oriental sculptures. According to Colonna, the casting of the *Lupa* was technically possible already in Antiquity. The lock ornaments of the fur have striking similarities with objects of the 6th and 5th century BCE Etruscan and oriental art. Colonna's hypothesis is that the bronzist responsible for the casting was of Ionian origin, importing stylistic and technical influences via Sardinia to central Italy at the turn of the 5th century BCE, after the treaty between the Carthaginians (who ruled Sardinia) and the Romans in 509 BCE.

Lellia Cracco Ruggini ("L'opinione di uno storico", pp. 111–6) specifies two different traditions in the depicting of wolves in the ancient Rome: the maternal she-wolf and the ferocious totemic wolf. Cracco Ruggini meritoriously notes that both of these aspects can be seen in the *Lupa Capitolina*.

Eugenio La Rocca ("Una questione di stile", pp. 117–50) shares Colonna's opinion about the oriental influences on the style of the *Lupa Capitolina*. He considers the results of the technical analyses to be too contradictory. La Rocca observes ornamental similarities of the sculpture with Etruscan, Greek and oriental art, and notes that analogous elements cannot be found in medieval ornamentation. He concludes that the Capitoline Wolf is stylistically late archaic, supporting the traditional dating of the work (480–470 BCE).

The article by Anna Mura Sommella ("Contributo alla lettura dell'opera", pp. 151–74) examines some stylistic elements of the sculpture (composition, fur ornamentation, eyes) in comparison with the 7th to 5th century BCE Etruscan and Magno-Greek art. She regards the sculpture as a masterpiece of the early 5th century, assuming the work to be an *agalma* for some sanctuary (Lupercal, one might suggest) of the newly born Roman Republic.

Claudio Parisi Presicce, the director of the Capitoline Museums, was the editor of the comprehensive study and exhibition catalog *La Lupa Capitolina* in 2000. Now ("Un'opera bronzea di stile severo", pp. 175–98) he gives a detailed overview on the structure of the *Lupa* and compares the stylistic aspects of the sculpture with some ancient parallels. The outcome of the analysis can be seen in the heading, as Parisi Presicce plausibly connects the *Lupa* with the Etruscan bronze tradition of the early 5th century. Technically, as both thermoluminescence and radiocarbon analyses have given contradictory, and partially even impossible, results (the TL dating ranging between 7th century BCE and 15th century CE; the radiocarbon dating between 100 and 1155 CE), and as the casting technique was not unknown in Antiquity, there is no need to rule out the traditional dating. As for the later history of the sculpture, Parisi Presicce offers a hypothesis that Pope Gelasius I removed the *Lupa* from the Lupercal into the Lateran Palace in the late 5th century CE, when he suppressed the cult of the Lupercalia.

The book is concluded by Francesco Roncalli's article "Volontà d'arte, stile e *téchne*" (pp. 199–206), where the author emphasizes the individual role and the freedom of the artist, and regards the Capitoline Wolf as a unique masterpiece.

As for the ultimate question, whether the Capitoline Wolf is ancient or medieval, the book does not give a certain answer. Scholars disagree about the existence of lost-wax casting in one piece during Antiquity. Carruba's theory of the medieval dating was based chiefly on

the absence of the Etruscan parallels of the same size. However, as Mura Sommella notes, this is an unsatisfactory *argumentum ex silentio*, and as claimed by Colonna and Parisi Presicce, contemporaneous parallels can be found in Greece and in the Middle East.

The results of the thermoluminescence and radiocarbon testing seem to favor the medieval dating, even though, as remarked by, e.g., Martini, their use in the dating of a bronze sculpture (analyzing the soil used in the casting) is much more complex than for ceramics, for example. On the other hand, the chemical analysis of the metal, reported by Giardino, supports the traditional ancient dating.

In the iconographic analysis, the medieval origin gets little support. The *Lupa Capitolina* seems to have firm connections with the Etruscan bronze traditions of the 6th and 5th centuries BCE, spiced with oriental influences. As an interesting hypothesis to combine the ancient art tradition with the contradictory results of technical analysis, La Rocca wonders whether the Capitoline Wolf could be a pedantic medieval copy of an archaic sculpture. However, even La Rocca himself is very dubious of the idea, questioning whether someone could have had all the technical and artistic skills to create a facsimile.

Giving no certain answer for the question about the *Lupa's* dating does not mean in the slightest that *La Lupa Capitolina, Nuove prospettive di studio* has failed in its purpose. The volume gives a great example of a fruitful interdisciplinary discussion, being a solid base for further interpretations of the enchanting icon of Rome.

The discussion goes on in the bilingual volume *Die römische Wölfin / The Lupa Romana*. The book comprises three articles, all supporting the theory of the medieval dating of the Capitoline Wolf.

Edilberto Formigli's article "Die Lupa Capitolina: zur Geschichte der Großbronzen / The Lupa Capitolina: On the History of Techniques of Monumental Bronze Sculptures" (S. 15–25 / pp. 27–33) is mostly based on the author's aforementioned article in *La Lupa Capitolina*.

Maria R.-Alföldi, in her article "Die Schicksale der Lupa Romana: ihr möglicher Weg nach Konstantinopel und ihr Ende 1204 / The Fate of the Lupa Romana: Its Possible Route to Constantinople and Its End in 1204" (S. 35–75 / pp. 77–104) attempts to reconstruct the phases of the Roman bronze wolf-figure mentioned by Cicero and Livy. In her hypothesis, the she-wolf statue was taken to Carthage by the Vandals in 455 and transported to Constantinople by Belisarius in 533 to be erected on the hippodrome. The alleged traces of the *Lupa Romana* end with the siege of Constantinople in 1204. However, as we know that there was more than one statue of the she-wolf in Rome, as admitted by R.-Alföldi herself, it remains only weakly proven that the sculpture mentioned by the Constantinopolitan author Niketas Choniates in 1204 is identical with the one mentioned by Livy a dozen centuries earlier. The suggestion made by R.-Alföldi is possible, but quite conjectural.

Johannes Fried "Die Rückkehr der Wölfin: Hypothesen zur Lupa Capitolina im Mittelalter / The She-Wolf Comes Back: Hypotheses on the Lupa Capitolina in the Middle Ages" (S. 107–37 / pp. 139–61) has a common starting point with R.-Alföldi. The author univocally rules out the Etruscan origin of the *Lupa Capitolina* and discusses the birth of the statue in 12th century Rome. According to his hypothesis, the sculpture was ordered by the counts of Tusculum, a group of noblemen who identified themselves with the noble families of ancient Rome.

Die römische Wölfin / The Lupa Romana introduces interesting theories. However, they are (with the exception of the article of Formigli) fundamentally tied with Carruba's assumption of the medieval origin of the *Lupa*. Because of this, the book does not come close to the

more conversational and open-minded spirit of *La Lupa Capitolina*. The debate about the dating and the context of the *Lupa* does not seem to be closed.

Mika Rissanen

MARGARETA STAUB GIEROW: *Pompejanische Kopien aus Dänemark*. Studi della Soprintendenza Archeologica di Pompei 24. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 2008. ISBN 978-88-8265-440-5. 308 pp. EUR 230.

This is an important catalogue of the copies of Pompeian wall paintings in the collection of the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts (Det Kongelige Danske Kunstakademi). Many other Pompeian themes are also included: mosaics, street views, furniture, plans of individual houses and larger areas etc. It was architects who made the copies and donated them to the academy's collection. The only certain exception was Georg Hilker, who was a decorator and one of the academy's teachers. The number of these drawings is astonishingly large. The published copies can be studied in the "Danmarks Kunstbibliotek" and ordered through its database, but the details of the collection are not clearly mentioned in the book. In Denmark, there are also other Pompeian copies that are not included in this publication.

The general introduction discusses the copying of Pompeian wall paintings, e.g., how it was officially controlled and prohibited, and later done extensively by artists and architects of the 19th century. There is also some background information on the modern interest towards the drawings, water colours and sketch books the architects drew during these study trips: some exhibitions and publications of the 1980's and 1990's are mentioned. Staub Gierow also discusses the methods and sources she has used. She mentions the problems that a modern scholar with deficient or even false information faces when studying these copies. She gives basic information on the artists mainly by using the *Dansk kunstnerleksikon*, but has also herself looked for some information, e.g., on O. Levinsen and L. Winstrup.

The main body of the study is the catalogue of drawings. The numbers go up to 386 items but some sketches are also indicated by using the letters a and b. The descriptions are easy to follow, the basic publications for additional information, e.g., *Pompei. Pitture e Mosaici*, are listed. In many cases the author has written at length about wall paintings, other discussions are sometimes quite short. To give an example, Nr. 279 in the catalogue (IX 3, 5.24, House of Marcus Lucretius) is a drawing with a view towards the garden with statues: the description of the statues is quoted from old sources (A. Mau's *Pompeji in Leben und Kunst* and A. Maiuri's guidebook of 1958) where not all the statues are listed.

The greatest value of the book comes from the condition of the wall paintings in Pompeii today. For scholars it is important to see wall paintings as they looked in the 19th century. Staub Gierow has been able locate many copies herself. In Pompeii today, some walls have completely lost their paintings and all the information has to be collected from old publications. E.g., the wall painting copied by H. Holm (Nr. 1 in the catalogue) has now almost completely vanished. It had almost vanished even in 1979 when the photograph published in *Pompei. Pitture e Mosaici* was taken, so the identification of the origin of the painting must be done by using descriptions by W. Helbig and Mau. In this case, the caption in the drawing does not give a more exact location than "Pompeii". On the other hand, some drawings indicate a vague loca-