

Si giunge poi alle seguenti conclusioni, che diamo in riassunto. Il Pauli nota innanzi tutto la mancanza di tombe nella Padana occidentale durante la fase di Polada e la media età del bronzo, fenomeno comune d'altronde a tutta l'alta Italia e alla Svizzera. Appare poi la fase di Cane-grate, coeva agli orizzonti di Peschiera e al Bronzo D dell'Europa centrale, caratterizzata dall'afflusso di nuove genti e dall'introduzione del nuovo rito dell'incinerazione. Contemporanea presumibilmente ad essa è la fase Monza-Scamozzina (Protogolasecca A) che rivela caratteri indigeni.

Nel Protogolasecca B si allentano i rapporti con le regioni transalpine, mentre si rafforzano quelli fra i due gruppi ormai in via di fusione. Nelle ceramiche la decorazione a finta cordicella soppianta quella a incisioni e a solcature.

Durante la fase tarda del Protogolasecca e per la maggior parte del G. I., si hanno tombe povere, ad eccezione di alcune poche (tomba con spada, tomba del carrettino, di Rondineto, di Castelletto Ticino con bacile etrusco di bronzo sbalzato). Noto è la mancanza di asce e rasoi.

Nel II periodo i rapporti con le vicine e coeve culture di Este e Bologna si intensificano, pur conservando la nostra area la sua individualità.

Si può affermare che la civiltà di Golasecca è nata in una area marginale della Cultura di Polada, in seguito ad un notevole apporto Nordalpino, concentrato cronologicamente in un breve periodo di tempo. Tale apporto poi si affievolisce, in concomitanza con la reazione del sostrato indigeno. Dopo l'influenza protovillanoviana, si intensificano i rapporti con Este, Bologna e la Slovenia, rimanendo tuttavia l'area di Golasecca piuttosto isolata fin verso il 600 a. Cr. L'apertura verso il resto dell'Italia non dura a lungo e viene interrotta dall'invasione dei Celti.

FERRANTE RITTATORE VONWILLER

GIOVANNANGELO CAMPOREALE, *Buccheri a cilindretto di fabbrica Orvietana*, Accademia Toscana di Scienze e Lettere «La Colombaria», «Studi» XXI, Leo S. Olschki Editore, Firenze 1972, pp. 139, tavv. 42.

The classification of Etruscan bucchero pottery has been overdue for some time. The importance of this task is as generally recognised as is the need to progress step by step, establishing those firm points which are then able to serve as the basis of further research. Such are in the first place bucchero pots decorated with figures. The book under review covers a group of these, that is a series of vases decorated by friezes made with cylinder stamps. This technique had earlier been considered a specialty of the Caere and Clusium workshops. What makes C.'s book particularly important is that he succeeded in proving beyond reasonable doubt that bucchero pots decorated «a cilindretto» were locally made in Orvieto workshops. This naturally also implies that bucchero production as such took place at Orvieto.

The catalogue of Orvieto «a cilindretto» decorated vases forms the backbone of this work. 104 vases are included, and the use of 43 cylinders can be established, 26 of them produced a figural decoration and 17 an

ornamental one. The description of the figures is followed by a thorough iconographic analysis, and, basing himself on available excavation data, as well as parallels in Etruscan art, occasionally Greek art as well, the author attempts to date each cylinder stamp. He concludes that Orvieto production lasted from the last quarter of the 7th century to the middle of the 6th.

The detailed work which aims to show what is peculiar to the cylinder stamps which produced the Orvieto friezes, the enumeration of the vase-shapes used, the list of cylinders sure to have been used in the same workshop, as well as that of those which can perhaps be attributed to the same master on the basis of stylistic evidence, are all of extraordinary importance, and so is the map showing the distribution of Orvieto vases with a rouletted frieze. In this way C. was able to establish not only that there was such a thing as an Orvieto production, but also a number of its characteristics which can serve as the basis for further research. The illustrative material supplementing detailed descriptions is of considerable help. This includes a print of every cylinder, — more than one being given for some — drawings of every vase-shape (pp. 110-111), a table showing the connections between certain shapes and cylinders (p. 113) as well as the map of the distribution of the Orvieto vases mentioned above (p. 119).

It can be deduced from this book that far fewer rouletted bucchero vases were produced in Orvieto workshops than either at Caere or Clusium, and roughly the same quantity as can be shown to have been produced at Tarquinia, but Tarquinian production, as far as we are aware today, lasted for a much shorter period than production at Orvieto. C. rightly draws attention to the fact that there must necessarily be gaps in the first attempt to collect this material and that it is likely that, as a result of the publication of this work, it will prove possible to find other vases that can be attributed to the Orvieto workshop. This is however hardly likely to produce sufficient evidence to alter the view that Orvieto bucchero workshops had a smaller capacity than those at Caere, Vulci or Tarquinia. What will certainly be necessary in order to establish this capacity is an examination, taking those vases that can certainly be established as stemming from Orvieto on the basis of their rouletted decoration as a starting point, designed to show which undecorated bucchero vases can be considered as Orvieto work. It is obvious that those decorated with a frieze are merely a small part of the production of the Orvieto workshops.

One of the most essential points of C.'s work is the establishment of those criteria which allow one to attribute this or that rouletted vase to Orvieto with a high degree of certainty. Of the five characteristic features which he mentions, two only appear to be genuinely peculiar to Orvieto (p. 108): the «cornice» framing the frieze, and the placing of the frieze on the vase. Low relief work, clearly defined figures, and chiefly the one-directional orientation of the figures are present in the rouletted relief work on the bucceros of the other Etruscan workshops at that time as well. The first mentioned two criteria are however pretty important in themselves, and so is their recognition. It adds to the importance of the first that C. is able to show in a manner that carries conviction that changes in the «cornices» permit the reconstruction of a certain chronological

development. The importance of the second lies in the fact that there is no doubt that there are vase-shapes which are peculiar to the Orvieto workshops. These include the « boccale con coperchio », the « olletta biansata » and the various forms of the « bicchiere » in the first place. It is certainly worthy of notice that the 43 friezes appear on 17 different vase-shapes (a low-stem variant of the chalice, such as *CVA, Gotha 1*, pl. 16,3 ought to be added to C.'s list), which is totally unlike the position in the Caere or Tarquinia workshops. The overwhelming proportion of friezes are found on only two shapes each in Caere and Clusium, and on one in Tarquinia. This suggests that rouletted decoration on Orvieto bucchero vases was more of an occasional and improvised nature than was the case in the other three workshops.

Individual cylinder-stamps can in the overwhelming majority of the cases only be dated on the basis of comparison with pieces belonging to other genres. The legitimacy of this method is beyond doubt on principle, but the result can only convince if the similarities are truly clear to the eye. In more than one case this cannot be said about C.'s comparisons, particularly regarding the most frequently cited Etrusco-Corinthian vases. The Etrusco-Corinthian parallels mentioned in connection with friezes 1., 3., 4., 10., 12. and 14. are contingent, and not stylistic ones: neither the vases of the « polychrome » masters, nor those of the Bearded Sphinx Painter or of the Cycle of *Olpai* are close enough to the Orvieto friezes to allow the relationship to serve as a basis for dating. The relationship with the « miniaturist » branch of the « Anforoni Squamati » Group is much closer: of all the Etrusco-Corinthian vases these are most like the Orvieto friezes (cfr. for example E. POTTIER, *Vases antiques du Louvre II*, Paris 1901, pl. 55, E 744; *CVA, Roma, Musei Capitolini 2*, tav. 10, 1-2; *Finarte*, Milano, Catal. 1970, no. 25, tav. 7; *Handbook of the Collections in the W. Rockhill Nelson Gallery of Art and M. Atkins Museum of Fine Arts*, Kansas City 1959, p. 27). The vases of the « Anforoni Squamati » Group were made in a Caere workshop at the close of the 7th and early in the 6th centuries. This suggests that the dating proposed by C. is sound, though on occasion perhaps a little too late. It is important to remember however that the Orvieto friezes are far more closely related stylistically to Caere than to Vulci vases. It seems that the Orvieto masters showed little sympathy for the qualities of the Vulci vase painting of their time; in addition to the already mentioned relationship to the Caere vases, they are much closer to the Tarquinia vases which are more provincial variants of those of Vulci. The disk-shaped filling ornament on the back of the animals on frieze 12 for instance is a typically Tarquinian peculiarity. It is certainly clear that the Orvieto friezes do not form a school or trend that can be clearly set apart from those of other major Etruscan centres. The style of friezes considered to be contemporary is not uniform, though the majority are inclined to a certain extent to simplify the depicted figures, as well as to a more rigid and angular presentation of types taken from the orientaling style, which at times become abstracted in a linear way (Frieze 24 is an extreme example). This trend was apparently strengthened in the course of time, so that Orvieto friezes, around the middle of the 6th century, came close to that splinter-like and angular manner of presentation which

was characteristic of Clusium friezes made in the second half of the 6th century. The style of the latest Orvieto friezes in fact more or less merges into that of the Clusium rouletted friezes in their prime. It is truly not easy to differentiate between them in the absence of other characteristics; one might in fact attribute frieze 25 to Clusium, though the vases were found at Orvieto, and it is pretty hard to differentiate between Clusium friezes and frieze 23 as well, on a stylistic basis.

Though the basis of dating is not clear in certain cases, such as for friezes 20 and 24-26 in addition to those already mentioned, there is no doubt that C.'s ultimate conclusion is sound: the overwhelming majority of the Orvieto friezes must have been produced in the first half of the 6th century. Their provincial character when compared with the products of the three major centres explains why they were exported to a relatively small area. C. insists on emphasizing that nothing produced in an Orvieto workshop was found in Caere, Tarquinia or Vulci, and one can understand the reason why. The distribution map on page 119 shows however that the relationship of the three centres to Orvieto production was not entirely identical. Places where Orvieto vases were found, other than in the Orvieto territory itself, are all in that of Vulci (Saturnia, Sovana, Pitigliano, Poggio Buco, and Castro). This seems to indicate that there was a market for Orvieto pottery in the Vulci area, even if not in Vulci itself. The explanation can perhaps be sought in the fact that Vulci produced no rouletted bucchero pots as far as we know, whereas the workshops of Caere and Tarquinia did.

The author shows himself to be on home ground when discussing the iconography of the friezes. One might perhaps add two possibilities to the wealth of material collected by him. The «elemento» hanging out of the lion's mouth on frieze 6. is perhaps identical with that on an *oinochoe* by the Bearded Sphinx Painter in the Vatican (C. ALBIZZATI, *Vasi antichi dipinti del Vaticano*, Roma 1924, no 86, tav. 8), that is the head and neck of a wild goat. The «running male figure» on frieze 24, next to the boxers, appears to be a dancer, and, if one can judge on the basis of the reproduction, he is wearing a pointed cap. It is possible that his role on the frieze is identical with that of the dancing *persu* figure on the fresco of the left-hand wall of the «Tomba degli Auguri», which also appears next to a pair of boxers («Monumenti della Pittura Antica Scoperti in Italia», *Tarquinia* III-IV, tav. 10).

None of this affects the basic quality of C.'s book in the least. Both the methods employed and the results obtained are most convincing, it is certainly an important step forward towards a proper knowledge of Etruscan bucchero pottery.

JÁNOS GYÖRGY SZILÁGYI

JEAN et LAURENCE JEHASSE, *La nécropole préromaine d'Aléria (1960-1968), avec une étude des graffites par Jacques Heurgon de l'Institut (XXV<sup>e</sup> supplément à Gallia)*, Paris 1973, pp. 632, tavv. f. t. a colori 5, in bianco e nero 184.

Dopo una numerosa serie di pubblicazioni sia parziali che di sintesi