

Renate Bol, with the collaboration of Simone Frede and Patrick Schollmeyer, and contributions by Anke Ahle, Ute Bolender, Georg Breitner, Friederike Fless, Wolfgang Günther, Huberta Heres, Nike Meissner, S. Felicia Meynersen, Carsten Schneider and Berthold F. Weber, **Marmorskulpturen der römischen Kaiserzeit aus Milet. Aufstellungskontext und programmatische Aussage**. Milet, Volume V. Funde aus Milet, Part 2. Editor De Gruyter, Berlin and New York 2011. XX and 215 pages with 65 figures, 112 plates.

The latest addition to the Milet series is a multi-authored catalogue of all the marble sculpture of the Roman period found at the site since excavations began in Miletus more than a century ago. The volume has all the qualities that one expects from a publication from the German Archeological Institute: it is comprehensive in scope, well designed and well illustrated, with fine plans and reconstruction drawings, and high-quality black-and-white photographs. But this is by no means a conventional sculpture catalogue. This is apparent even from the title. »Marble sculpture of the Roman Imperial Period from Miletus. Display Context and Programmatic Message« at once signals the interpretative ambitions of this study, and also explains its unusual organization.

Arguably, what makes a comprehensive treatment of sculpture from a single site so valuable is first and foremost the precise findspots of a large proportion of the pieces. So the designers of the present volume have made a clear division at the very outset between works that have a useful archaeological context and those that do not. Part one (pp. 13–161), which comprises the bulk of the book, contains the first group; part two (pp. 163–190) the second. A rough count reveals that pieces with a useful context outnumber pieces that lack one by a ratio of approximately two to one (part one has entries for more than one-hundred and eighty pieces, including about thirty bases and inscriptions; part two contains some eighty-six entries).

The material without a useful context in part two is presented in the way that sculpture catalogues are traditionally organized – individual pieces are grouped typologically, into the familiar categories of Roman sculpture: portrait statues, ideal figures, architectural relief, herms and ornamental table legs, statuettes. But the sculpture in part one is grouped, in contrast, according to its archaeological context. So portrait statues, ideal figures, and figured reliefs are treated all together, as belonging to specific programmatic ensembles. Thus the title of part one is, »Statuary Displays and Figural Reliefs in their Architectural or Monumental Context«. Nine such »display contexts« within the city are treated, each in its own chapter, each written by one or more of the authors; and these are ordered chronologically. The sequence runs: I. The Great Harbour Monument, by Patrick Schollmeyer

(first century B. C.); II. The Monument in the Forecourt of the Bouleuterion, by Schollmeyer (late first century B. C. or early first century A. D.); III. The Nymphaeum, by Simone Frede (A. D. 79/80); IV. The Market Gate, by Renate Bol (A. D. 120–25); V. The Heroon, by Bol with Berthold Weber (early second century A. D.); VI. The Baths of Faustina, by R. Bol with Anke Ahle, Ute Bolender, Georg Breitner, Friederike Fless, Simone Frede, Nike Meissner, S. Felicia Meynersen, and Carsten Schneider (A. D. 150–70); VII. The Antonine Stage Building of the Theater, by Bol with Huberta Heres and Schollmeyer (A. D. 150–175); VIII. The Serapeion, by Schollmeyer (probably third century A. D.); IX. The Roman House on the Theater Hill, by Heres (ca. A. D. 200).

The decision to present all these »contexts« chronologically is not unreasonable; nor is it particularly surprising in the setting of a site catalogue. But it does tend to work against the otherwise explicitly synchronic goals of the study. Most of the sculpture included in part one has been published previously (whereas a lot of pieces in part two are unpublished); but these separate terse discussions bring us up to date with the latest research, and a number of new unpublished pieces are added. What is definitely new is the systematic treatment, and the comprehensive address to the monumental figural repertory of a single city.

The editor, Renate Bol, justifies this organization of the catalogue with reference to the current scholarly consensus on what is important about sculpture in the Roman period; this is well summarized and explained in her programmatic introduction (pp. 1–12). The various Roman statues deployed in public spaces and civic buildings – whether honorific portraits or mythological figures – derive their significance, their local meaning, not so much from their individual form and appearance as from the larger architectural frames into which they are inserted, and from the rich sculptural programs of which they form a part. Accordingly if we wish to discover what these statues have to tell us about the society which set them up, so the argument runs, we must not separate them from the civic architecture they once adorned – their ancient display contexts. For it is only when they are viewed in their intended setting that we can see them as they were meant to be seen and understood: as symbols that helped to define and fashion the cultural identity of the ancient city and its inhabitants. This emphasis on getting at the larger meaning, the »programmatic messages«, of Roman sculpture is what underlies this manner of presentation.

This approach immediately necessitates a series of changes to conventional practice. When one is intent on establishing the »display context« of a work of ancient sculpture then one must first give a detailed account of the building or complex in which it was set up; and the text contains a significant number of figures with reconstruction drawings. One must also incorporate inscriptions, statue bases, and a number of other things not tradi-

tionally included as part of a sculpture catalogue (see, for example, the catalogue of twenty-one statue bases from the Nymphaeum, p. 61–68 pls. 26–27). This volume is not by any means the first catalogue to move in this direction (see e. g. R. R. R. Smith [ed.], *Roman Portrait Statuary from Aphrodisias* [Mainz 2006]; A. Filges, *Skulpturen und Statuenbasen von der klassischen Epoche bis in die Kaiserzeit* [Mainz 2007]); but arguably in some ways it goes a little further than others have up to now. And the inclusion of inscribed statue bases has the further welcome feature of allowing statues from Miletus that have not survived, including lost bronzes, to be taken into account. (See e. g. the portrait of Lucius Egnatius Victor Lollianus, three times proconsul of Asia, whose statue was evidently one of the bronze figures incorporated into the Flavian Nymphaeum in the mid-third century; pp. 31, 65, III.2.17, pl. 27 d–e.). And the book includes a useful index of all references to inscriptions from Miletus and Didyma that occur in the text (pp. 206–08). It should be noted, however, that not all statue bases from Miletus are taken account of; just the ones connected with the nine »display contexts« treated in part one. This is a pity, because some kind of systematic presentation of the statue bases – even those without a good context – would have permitted a much fuller discussion of the entire »statuary landscape« that existed in Roman Miletus. It would also give the reader a much better sense of how representative the surviving sculpture in this study is of what was once to be seen in the city.

The emphasis on context also brings new acknowledgment of the long lives of ancient monuments; and the recognition that what one necessarily discovers in excavation is actually only the very last »display context« that any particular statue had. Miletus evidently remained an important and prosperous port city well into Late Antiquity. Inscriptions from the Baths of Faustina, for example, show that this was certainly still in use in the late fourth or early fifth century (p. 80); it seems to have been remodeled several times over the centuries, and some alterations to the building are actually dated by the excavators to the early sixth century. Accordingly the reuse, repair, and re-setting of sculpture is given considerable weight in this catalogue (a concise summary of the most important of these is given on pp. 11 f.; including a useful list of the remarkably systematic mutilation of nude figures by Christians).

Inscriptions inform us that important buildings at Miletus were renovated at various points (one tells us, for example, that the Flavian Nymphaeum was refurbished under Gordian III; pp. 30–31); and the authors sometimes take the admirable approach of presenting the last phase first. This is especially notable in the treatment of the Milesian theater (pp. 118–52), which received its last major remodeling in the Antonine period. The theater at Miletus had apparently existed since about 300 B. C., and was modified several times in the Hellenistic period. A large dedicatory inscription still on the central tabernacle of the scaenae frons

testifies that the stage building was first dedicated to the emperor Nero (along with Apollo Didymeus, and the Milesian Demos). The Neronian facade is thought to have been a two-story structure; and a number of elements from this earlier building are clearly reused in the three-storey Antonine one, including some pieces of sculpture. In particular a series of Archaistic caryatids, identified by their attributes as Muses, and which had formerly been thought to be Hellenistic, are here dated to the Neronian period. Whereas two Triton-Telamones, discovered with them, are interpreted as Antonine additions to this series, made when the old Neronian stage building was enlarged and replaced.

Perhaps the most interesting single element in this remarkably complex building history, however, centers on the celebrated »Torso of Miletus« – a Late Archaic-Early fifth century B. C. statue, now in the Louvre. Bol's detailed study of this piece suggests that it is a figure of Apollo Termintheus of Myous, that was brought to Miletus from the Archaic temple there, given a new base, and then set up somewhere in the Antonine Theater (pp. 131–137 VII.1.12 figs. 52–55). The torso was reportedly found on the stage; the newly made marble base was later discovered in the orchestra (pp. 134–137 VII.1.13); and the head of the Apollo is perhaps still in Miletus, figs. 53 a–b). Given that the torso lacks its lower legs and plinth, it can probably never be proved that it belongs with the base. But the scale and cutting for the plinth seems right; the late Archaic torso shows clear evidence of Roman reworking and repair (as reportedly does the head) – including a large dowel hole for the reattachment or replacement of the left arm; and the Antonine stage building actually contains a number of Archaic architectural elements from the temple at Myous that have been reused – some carved into a relief frieze depicting hunting Eros (pp. 148–152). This all fits very well with what Pausanias tells us: that when Myous was abandoned, the inhabitants brought all the city's images of the gods to Miletus (Paus. 7, 2, 11); and afterwards the Milesians used its buildings as a stone quarry (Paus. 1, 16, 3; 8, 46, 3). Bol's case for the origin and reuse of this statue, though conjectural, thus seems a strong one.

So what are the results of this extensive rethinking of the site-catalogue? And what are the »programmatic messages« of all these display contexts? The answers may be very briefly stated, and in fact are well summarized by the editor herself in her excellent introduction (pp. 4–6). The sculptural decoration of the most important public buildings of Miletus is conceived of primarily as an exercise in collective self-representation (Selbstdarstellung); and the results are a kind of collaboration between the leading citizens of the city, cast as the patrons (Mäzene) of the public sphere (pp. 7–11). It is accordingly they who construct the city's civic and cultural identity through their gifts of buildings and monuments.

On the basis of the surviving sculpture the most important symbols of Miletus were the local gods: first and foremost Apollo Didymeus, the god of nearby Didyma. He was the patron god of the city. The Hellenistic Bouleuterion was explicitly dedicated to him (as well as to Hestia Bouleia and the Demos). As such he is found on the city's coins, and everywhere in the public sphere, pictured in relief and fashioned in the round. He is sometimes even depicted in the distinctive and memorable form of the celebrated cult image of the god, a bronze Archaic kouros-figure, holding a bow and a deer, made by the sixth century B. C. sculptor Kanachos. The statue is shown standing on its base twice in the Hunting Eros reliefs from the Theater (VII.2.2 pl. 69 c; VII.2.25 pl. 75 d), and again in the coffer reliefs of the Serapeion (VIII.9 pl. 81 a). Even when he is himself not represented, his attributes sometimes are: tripods, griffins, laurel crowns. The Milesian Harbor Monument takes the form of a giant tripod, seven and a half meters in height; and marble tripods are also set up in the Bouleuterion.

Another important part of the local repertory is constituted by representations of Apollo's mother, Leto, and her twin children, Apollo and Artemis. For it was believed locally that Leto gave birth to them – not in Delos, or at Ephesus – but at Didyma. Leto appears prominently in the reliefs on the altar-like monument in the forecourt of the Bouleuterion (II, figs. 4–5); and a copy of a famous early Classical statue of her with her two children (VII.1.11 pl. 62) was set up in the theater, and also depicted on the city's coins. There are also numerous representations of the Nymphs, who were worshipped at Miletus from the earliest times, and were also linked with the story of Leto; the Nymphs of Mycale having reportedly welcomed her in her wandering. The Nymphs appear on the monument in the forecourt of the Bouleuterion; and they naturally figure prominently in the Flavian Nymphaeum (III.1.1–3 fig. 9 pls. 5–7). Finally, we are informed that the mythical founder of Miletus, Neileus, had his tomb directly in front of the Sacred Gate of the city, and was probably the recipient of cult as a hero; we know too that he received at least one statue dedication, in front of the Nymphaeum, for its base survives (III.4.1 fig. 31 pl. 27 h). These are the specifically local myths that are conspicuously celebrated in the public sculptural displays of the city; rather in the same way that the lions of the Harbour Monument are used, as heraldic icons of Milesian identity.

As one might expect Apollo also appears in his other well known roles and imagery too. He was quite possibly to be seen playing the Cithara in the stage building of the theater (VII.1.8 pl. 59) – another building that was explicitly dedicated to Apollo Didymeus – accompanied by Archaistic caryatids bearing the attributes of the Muses; and a great apsidal hall of the Baths of Faustina was certainly decorated with an Apollo Citharoedus (VI.7 pl. 32 g) and six Muses (VI.1–6 pl. 32 a–f). In addition, after the abandon-

ment of nearby Myous, as already mentioned, the Milesian Theater acquired a Late Archaic image of Apollo of its own, perhaps set on the stage – and seemingly displayed here as a holy relic (VII.1.12 figs. 52–55).

All this sacred imagery, honoring the divine patron and patrons of the city, evidently served as a focus of local patriotic pride. And it is the implicit argument of this study that, by placing such images on the lavish marble buildings and monuments with which Miletus came to be furnished, the local elite sharpened feelings of a shared identity among the citizens, and fueled the city's eagerness to compete for prestige and status with its Ionian rivals: Pergamon, Ephesus, and Smyrna. In its outline, this phenomenon is well known in the cities of the Greek East under the Roman Empire, especially in the period of the Second Sophistic. What the present study of the sculpture of Miletus enables us to do very effectively – more effectively perhaps than in any other such sculpture catalogue – is to trace the ramifications of this local patriotism down into the very details of the excavated public monuments, so that we can see the process in action; close up, and in sharp focus.

Given this picture of Miletus' total sculptural output there are two – rather surprising – negative observations that one can make on the basis of this study. The first is the relative paucity of surviving honorific portraiture from the site (though much more is known from inscribed bases than is presented here); and the second is how little we know about sculpture from the private realm in Miletus – for the obvious reason that almost no houses have so far been excavated at the site. There is very little here to compare, for example, with the Hanghäuser at Ephesus. There is also rather less systematic comparison with the sculpture and monuments of the other cities of Asia Minor – Pergamon, Ephesus, Aphrodisias – than one might have expected in a project of this kind.

Still, these criticisms do nothing to diminish the achievement of the authors. This is a book that will be warmly welcomed by all scholars of Roman sculpture. Such an in-depth account of the excavated public buildings and the sculptural finds from a single city is wholly in accord with the new aims of scholarship on the Greek East under the Roman Empire; and it advances that enterprise considerably. The study of local sculpture in this way becomes more about the symbols of important local cults, the patronage of the local elite, and competition with other cities of the province. The organization of the volume itself is exemplary too in the way in which it signals and makes explicit at every point the larger value of studying all this material for the historian of ancient society. With all this emphasis on the iconography and meaning of Roman sculpture, of course, one inevitably starts to wonder whether we are giving enough weight to other aspects of the surviving material, like scale and materials, skill and expenditure, beauty and visibility, intricacy and legibility, conspicuousness and subordination. But

even here one must acknowledge that the authors' meticulous catalogue descriptions of all the pieces (however fragmentary), and the book's first-class photographic illustrations will enable its readers to weigh all these other qualities of the sculpture for themselves.

Berkeley

Christopher H. Hallett