

occasionally repeated without providing further interconnections to the overall narrative and the text contains occasional errors such as a translation of 'Rotten Bridge' for the Ponte Rotto (116) which serve to mar an otherwise flawless production. None of these criticisms, however, is enough to take away from the important and uniquely valuable achievement of this work.

The authors successfully unite geology, history, and archaeology into a long-term historical approach to the city by tracing relationships between geological developments millions of years ago and their historical benefits and consequences. The result is a useful and practical approach to a variety of different aspects of ancient, medieval, early modern, and contemporary life that emphasizes the remarkable interconnectedness of continuing life along the banks of the Tiber. Much more than a geological tour, it is a rewarding and useful example of geology as long-term archaeology and history.

*San Francisco State University*

MICHAEL ANDERSON

F. FULMINANTE, *LE 'SEPOLTURE PRINCIPESCHE' NEL LATIUM VETUS TRA LA FINE DELLA PRIMA ET À DEL FERRO E L'INIZIO DELL'ET À ORIENTALIZZANTE*. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 2003. Pp. xiii + 267, illus. ISBN 8-8826-5253-X. €200.00.

At the heart of this volume is a reconsideration of the data from the tombs of Latium, which have been entered into a database and presented here within an argument about both the long history of élite representation and its significance within Latin society. In essence, Fulminante is concerned with the alleged non-existence of élite activity before the princely tombs and the alleged chronological gap between the appearance of such activity in Latium and Etruria. This reviewer starts from a similar position and therefore finds the argument persuasive, even though the presentation of the evidence is not easy to follow.

The volume begins with a substantial chapter on archaeological theory and mortuary evidence. The lines of this debate are now reasonably clear. From Durkheim one gains a model of the funeral as a social act, and thereafter various questions arise in relation to the accuracy of the mapping one can make from the funeral reality to the life of the deceased — how good is the reflection of the one in the other. One of the great difficulties is that for Latium, with no literary evidence, one can do little more than note the problem, and thereby avoid making a definitive statement of how close the linkages are between mortuary evidence and social reality. It would seem reasonable to suppose that the linkage is not utterly absent — that there is no strangely counterfactual world in which the funeral is a reversal of reality, or an unconnected reality, but this does not get us too far from our baseline, and the problem is compounded by the next stage for F.'s project which is in effect to define what we mean by princely tombs, and therefore to delimit the nature of luxury. If one believes that necropoleis are representative of all society, then one's answer will be different from one based on a view that burial which leaves an archaeological trace is itself — in Tainter's phrase — a sign of extraordinary 'energy expenditure', and there are all stages available in between.

F.'s data is presented in a series of descriptions and tables, without illustrations of the objects; these tables constitute the majority of the book, with over sixty pages of tables for instance on Osteria dell'Osa itself. For the uninitiated, Bietti-Sestieri's *The Iron Age Community of Osteria dell'Osa* (1992) remains more accessible and helpful, and F. is disappointingly uninformative about the relationship between the necropolis and the whole community at this site. One of the more positive statements is about the under-representation of children in Latin burials, and there is undoubtedly something rather interesting going on in the choices which are made here, and in relation to the burials within houses or by sanctuaries, and F. raises again the interesting but terribly difficult case of what may be remains of human sacrifice (238).

F.'s conclusions on the nature of the society we are observing and the interaction between signs of luxury in burials and the development of urban society are helpful and challenging. F. speaks not of an early egalitarianism but of an élite which emphasized characteristics of equality and parity, and which returned to that in the later period when ostentatious burials cease. She sees signs of social differentiation at least in the early eighth century, or Latial IIA and IIB in Osteria dell'Osa, and would reduce the gap between the development of hierarchy and proto-urban developments in Etruria and Latium substantially. I think that many of the terms which are used in the latter pages of the book (urban development, or *organizzazione gentilizio-clientelare*, 245) are more problematic than F. does, but, as with A. Zaccaria Ruggiu, *More regio vivere: il banchetto aristocratico e la casa romana di età arcaica* (2003), the problem is that we give

concrete reality to a set of terms which demand a much more rigorous re-examination. F. ends by posing two questions: can one produce an identikit of a princely burial to differentiate true dynasts from aristocrats; and can one identify the time from which genuine archaeological indicators of social stratification begin? The latter is and will remain a matter of debate and interpretation, but whilst F. thinks this is the most urgent, I think that the first question, to which I suspect the answer is 'no', nevertheless reflects sets of assumptions and definitions in the study of early Roman and Latin society which are of profound urgency and interest. It is the merit of this book to present the material in a different but coherent way, which will underpin that activity.

*University of St Andrews*

CHRISTOPHER SMITH

M. CASCIANELLI, *LA TOMBA GIULIMONDI DI CERVETERI* (Cataloghi / Musei Vaticani, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco 8). Città del Vaticano: Musei Vaticani, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, 2003. Pp. 205, illus. €90.00.

G. PAOLUCCI, *DOCUMENTI E MEMORIE SULLE ANTICHITÀ E IL MUSEO DI CHIUSI* (Biblioteca di Studi Etruschi/Istituto Nazionale di Studi Etruschi ed Italici 39). Pisa: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 2005. Pp. 227, 3 pls, 13 illus. ISBN 8-8814-7380-1 (bound); 8-8814-7379-8 (paper). €360.00 (bound); €240.00 (paper).

Cascianelli's book presents a reinvestigation and compilation of the Tomba Giulimondi from the Sorbo Necropolis, Cerveteri. It was discovered by G. Pinza in 1906 while work was being conducted on the nearby Tomba Regolini Galassi. The permission for excavation was received from one Pio Giulimondi, a government minister and director of the Palatine excavations, hence the name of the tomb. The excavated goods and the documentation have been held at the Vatican Museums ever since, however some of the grave goods from the two tombs have been confused.

C. cites two main reasons for the new investigation: first, to properly identify the materials from Tomba Giulimondi, which were later mixed with those from the Tomba Regolini Galassi during the initial recovery in 1906; second, to distinguish the objects associated with the two depositions within the Tomba Giulimondi. This was done with the help of the original photographs, plan drawings, and documentation from 1906, illustrating the positions of the goods at the time of discovery. The tumulus containing Tomba Giulimondi also holds another chamber tomb. The other, unfortunately, has been robbed.

The introduction is divided into: the excavation and acquisition of the materials; history of the post-excavation work; and the architecture of the tomb. The background to the excavation is painstakingly retold, and supported by the appendix of archival materials. The amount of detail is impressive, and includes notable insights, such as the costs of the initial investigation and transportation of the material. The history of the publications reveals that this tomb has often been marginalized in favour of Tomba Regolini Galassi. The dating of the tombs has been the topic of a long-standing debate. Pinza and Pareti believed that the grave goods, particularly the late geometric and early Orientalizing goods, make the Tomba Giulimondi contemporary with the right niche of Regolini Galassi. More recently, work on the ceramics, including the Proto-Corinthian ware and bucchero, has helped refine the dating. There now exists a long list of publications re-dating the tomb, ranging from 675 to 600 B.C., depending on the author. Architecturally, the tomb is placed in the context of 'Prayon B1 type', and Period Three of Lington's classification, which dates the tumulus to the end of the second quarter of the seventh century B.C. Also discussed is the unusual orientation of the tomb, facing east.

The catalogue of the grave goods is divided by location: each bed, the central space between the beds; and by quality of information: uncertain position, and uncertain provenance. The grave goods consist of ceramics (Proto-Corinthian, Etrusco-Corinthian, Italo-geometric, Rhodian, bucchero, impasto bruno, impasto with red slip), as well as bronze and iron goods. The left bed held fifty-eight goods; the area in-between the beds contained forty-two goods; the right bed held just three goods. One item has an unknown position, and three items have an unknown provenance. Each catalogue item is thoroughly described as to physical dimensions, decoration, and chronology, and includes citations of corresponding items, profile drawings and photographs (often of multiple views, and some in colour). An iron buckle, two fibulae, and a pendant are also shown in x-ray form, to illustrate production techniques (items 49–51, 100).

The distribution of the grave goods, by function and fabric, is briefly discussed. In relation to personal adornment, five of seven aryballo were on the left bed. Storage vessels were present in