

GÜNTHER SCHÖRNER, **Römische Rankenfriese. Untersuchungen zur Baudekoration der späten Republik und der frühen und mittleren Kaiserzeit im Westen des Imperium Romanum.** Beiträge zur Erschließung hellenistischer und kaiserzeitlicher Skulptur und Architektur 15. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz 1995. XIII, 198 Seiten, 7 Tafeln mit 15 Zeichnungen, 87 Tafeln mit 448 Abbildungen und 5 Beilagen mit 28 Abbildungen.

Continuous scrolling plants sculpted on stone friezes above architraves of public buildings and private tombs comprise one of the most frequently found architectural decorations in ancient Roman Italy. Most are of historical or art historical significance; some are of great beauty. Scholars like W. von Sydow, G. Cavalieri Manasse, P. von Blanckenhagen, and T. Kraus have studied Roman scrollwork from limited periods or areas, and S. Diebner has photographed much scrollwork from regional Italy for the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Rome.

In his revised dissertation from Friedrich-Alexander-Universität in Erlangen, Günther Schörner has now detailed a broad history of scrollwork on stone friezes from Roman buildings in Italy from the first century B. C. to the Severan period. The author contributes more than a long needed chronological study of these friezes. He also investigates the artistic relation between friezes made in Rome and those made in regional Italy; the degree of Greek influence on these friezes; the social, political, and economic forces

that may have lain behind their production; and what the reliefs may have meant to their ancient viewers. His study includes 338 friezes, of which over three-quarters are from regional Italy; 121 are previously unpublished, many are under-published. Photographs of almost all are provided with the catalogue.

Confronted with many fragmentary reliefs lacking an archaeological context, the author establishes a chronological framework (p. 3) using friezes that are dated securely by historical means (e. g., inscriptions) or by other elements of the building they adorned (e. g., moldings). His fundamental point of comparison between dated and undated friezes is usually the bract, a particular leaf or leaves sheathing the stalk or volute. Bracts are preserved on most friezes (even some of the most fragmentary) and reflect changes in fashion better than other elements found in scrollwork (pp. 5–6, 127). The author refrains from dating his reliefs by comparisons with scrollwork in other media (p. 3); occasionally, however, he will do so with closely related genres (e. g., decorated soffits). He first dates friezes in Rome (p. 3), separating them from those in regional Italy in view of a possible chronological gap between the capital and the rest of Italy.

The author divides the history of scrollwork in Rome into traditional art historical periods, identifying styles and noting when certain motifs enter the genre. Acknowledging a paucity of evidence, he assigns a few friezes to the first period, 100–50 B. C., in part because they significantly differ from those in the better documented second half of the century (e. g., cat. 217 and 251 lack particular vegetal forms with acanthus-like characteristics; pp. 9–12, 15). He defines one frieze (cat. 226) as dry (“trocken”) in style. In the Second Triumvirate Style and Early Augustan period (50–20 B. C. and 30–10 B. C.; pp. 17–25, 38–45), the chronology is more precise since scrollwork appears on the Temple of Divus Julius, whose completion date is known, and Temple of Apollo in Circo, whose terminus post quem is also known. With some of the groundwork laid by T. KRAUS in his classic study, *Die Ranken der Ara Pacis* (1953), Schörner specifies how the details of plants became progressively more natural and more acanthus-like. New motifs of the Second Triumvirate Style include the oft-described pattern of triangles between touching apices, a flower-like bundle of leaves (“Blattbukett”), a calyx with a base of leaves, and half-palmettes ending the scrollwork (pp. 18–20, 39–40). In the Early Augustan period apices subdivide the bract’s folioles (“Abschnitte, Lappen”), and a small cuff of leaves (“Manschette”) grows at the bract’s base (pp. 22, 25, 41). The frieze in the Parco degli Scipioni (cat. 232), which the author dates to 20–10 B. C. (pp. 23–24), is enlivened with a series of flower-like leaf bundles and volutes enriched with sheathing leaves that are almost at the level of development of the scrollwork on the Ara Pacis.

The vegetal designs from the Ara Pacis and the Forum of Augustus (cat. 202) are far more natural in detail than earlier scrollwork, and almost every enriched element fully adopts acanthus-like forms (pp. 46–49, 72). An important new motif, according to the author, now appears on the reliefs: distinctive leaves (“Blattscheiden”) that sheathe the stalks and volutes (pp. 47–48). On the bracts of the frieze of the Forum of Augustus, the main leaf is composed of four folioles with the last one bending over; four apices subdivide each foliole (p. 46).

These two monuments profoundly influence the history of scrollwork. In the Julio-Claudian period their forms become standardized, making the dating of individual works more difficult (pp. 49–56, 72–73). In the late Augustan-Tiberian period in Rome, elements of these works appear, for example, on the simplified scrollwork of the tomb of M. Artorius Geminus (cat. 216). Contemporaneously, a relief in the Vatican Museums (cat. 247) in part reflects the less full, more ornamental, and elegant reliefs on the Basilica Aemilia pilasters. The author (p. 51, see also p. 74) suggests that this alternative style was chosen because the relief may have been inside, not outside, the building. Extrapolating from a relief dated by inscription in Civita Castellana, the author (pp. 52–54) finds that Claudian scrollwork on friezes in Rome has bracts with an enlarged, separate first apex on each foliole, and pistils and spadices encompassed by drill channels. A relief in Bolsena dated in part by accompanying architectural elements provides the basis for the author’s (pp. 54–56) description of Neronian and early Flavian scrollwork in Rome: fuller, thicker stems and stalks; thick, fleshy leaves; and more apparent drill-work.

Building on P. H. von Blanckenhagen’s magisterial publication of the rather well dated Aula Regia (P. H. VON BLANCKENHAGEN, *Flavische Architektur und ihre Dekoration* [1940]) and mining the Castel Gandolfo theater’s scrollwork, whose style has hitherto not been analyzed in detail, Schörner (pp. 76–81, 84–85) offers an overall picture of Domitianic scrollwork in Rome and its surrounding area. Rich looking, often overlapping, its complex forms are shaped in part by extensive drilling. The sides of the calyx’s base turn up. Animals appear among flowers whose large pistils rest over their backs. Long leaves (“Blattscheiden”) now frequently sheath the stalk and volute, and large clumps of leaves envelope the stalk’s thin stems (“Zwickelsprößlinge”). The final apex on each foliole of a bract is enlarged, and the large penultimate apex can be subdivided so that five apices appear. Two tendencies emerge: a hard-to-discern overall pattern with sharp-edged leaves, as in the Aula Regia, and an easier-to-read overall pattern often with round-lobed leaves, as at Castel Gandolfo (pp. 79–80, 84). The author adds a beautiful, unpublished fragment to the former group and attributes it to the Forum Transitorium (pp. 80–81 cat. 206).

Few friezes with scrollwork come from second-century Rome, and, according to the author (p. 102), almost all are retrospective with eclectic borrowings from the past; there are no genuinely new vegetal forms. For instance, a typically Julio-Claudian flower and Flavian sheathing leaves ("Blattscheiden") appear in the scrollwork from the Forum of Trajan (p. 88 cat. 207); Julio-Claudian half-palmettes and Flavian rosettes with distinctive pistils decorate a frieze at Hadrian's Villa (p. 90 cat. 293). With the unhelpful exception of the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina (p. 92), friezes with scrollwork do not appear on Antonine buildings securely dated by history. Largely because of their ornamental molding, the author dates several unpublished and under-published friezes in San Lorenzo fuori le mura to this period (pp. 92–94 cat. 234–37). The friezes' fleshy leaves are cursorily worked ("eine Tendenz zur Vergröberung", p. 93). The author redates several reliefs, establishing that two in the Soane Collection (one, the calyx generally believed to be from the Ara Pietatis) are Hadrianic and a third in the Museo Archeologico, Venice, comes from Hadrian's Villa (pp. 90–91 cat. 105, 321). Rejecting S. Neu's Severan dating, he describes as Antonine the reliefs at Santa Maria in Trastevere and San Giorgio in Velabro (pp. 94–95 cat. 238, 233).

A more rigorous use of the drill at the expense of natural forms characterizes Severan scrollwork in Rome (p. 103). The friezes either continue Antonine traditions (e.g., the Arch of the Argentarii, cat. 196) or go back directly to Flavian forms (e.g., Caracalla's Baths, Severan parts of the Domus Augustana, pp. 96–97). The author redates as Severan a Palatine fragment (p. 97) regarded by P. von Blanckenhagen as Flavian (cat. 228), another Palatine fragment dated by S. Neu to the Flavian period (cat. 229), and the Serapis Temple fragments, which S. Neu, W.-D. Heilmeyer, and K. Freyberger dated earlier in the second century (p. 98).

What influence did foreign artists or their art have on scrollwork in Rome? According to the author (p. 16), between 100 and 50 B.C., Greek artists worked in Rome, and local artists learned from their friezes or from luxurious imported Greek furniture in marble (e.g., table supports). The author sees no Etruscan or South Italian influence (pp. 2, 9–11, 16; also 19). In the second half of the century, the scrollwork and its development is far more Roman. Local craftsmen must have been involved in the increased number of private and public commissions since there were too few Greek artists to complete them (p. 41). If Greek artists worked on the Temple of Divus Julius or Apollo in Circo, the evolution of the scrollwork's forms took place in Rome (pp. 43–44). Only with the reliefs from Caracalla's Temple of Serapis does a foreign influence (from Aphrodisias) reappear (pp. 98–99, 103–4).

Regional Italian friezes with scrollwork outnumber those in Rome by more than three to one. The author publishes many overlooked examples, especially from Lucera, Benevento, Aquino, Santa Maria Capua Vetere, Verona, Aquileia, and Pula. He redates a few, for example shifting G. Cavalieri Manasse's 20–10 B.C. date for the west frieze of the Temple of Augustus and Roma at Pula to Late Augustan (pp. 64–65 cat. 181). Through careful dating a pattern arises. From 100 to 50 B.C. the friezes are few and mostly from Campania, but in the following decades they dramatically increase in number and appear from Polla to Aquileia. The number rapidly declines after the Julio-Claudian period.

Few reliefs are both of high quality and close reflections of contemporary Roman models (cat. 116, 117 in Montecastrilli and cat. 286 in Spoleto, pp. 41 n. 400, 136 n. 1364; cat. 17 in Aquileia and cat. 93 in Grado, p. 66; cat. 111 in Milan, p. 82). The great majority of reliefs are simpler and a bit cruder than their counterparts in Rome (pp. 26, 45, 59, 104). Some forms are the result of the artist's inexperience (e.g., p. 29 cat. 130, Ostia) or misunderstanding of models in Rome (e.g., p. 31 cat. 38, Benevento; p. 56 cat. 131, Ostia). The author perceives limited creativity in the works of provincial artists (e.g., p. 127) and sometimes sees a lag between the creation of a style or motif in Rome and its use in regional Italy (e.g., p. 26; note, however, the Porta Aurea in Ravenna, p. 63). Only Regio X (Venetia et Histria) develops its own style in the first century A.D. with its cursorily subdivided margins of bracts (pp. 69–72, 75–76; note also 83, 85). Oddly enough, while Umbria and Picenum have the typical Second Triumvirate Style triangular forms between apices of bracts or calyxes, these are not found south of Rome except at Sperlonga (p. 45 cat. 283).

According to the author, Rome is the center of distribution of all motifs and styles in regional Italy. With the exception of some very early scrollwork (Greeks made the marble frieze of the Tomb of the Garlands at Pompeii and local artists copied it in tufa, pp. 12–14 cat. 153), there are no direct Greek influences, and Etruscan or south Italian scrollwork plays no role in the creation of local friezes (p. 33 n. 319 cat. 46; p. 34 cat. 280; pp. 37–38 cat. 8; p. 45 nn. 441–42; pp. 64–65 cat. 181). The author believes that artists from Rome sculpted some reliefs outside the city (e.g., the Early Augustan Nazzano frieze [pp. 24–25 cat. 118–20]), but finds difficulties in distinguishing reliefs made by artists from Rome and those carved by local sculptors after the first century B.C. (pp. 61 n. 596, 75). Few extant reliefs are by a single provincial workshop (p. 45; see also pp. 67, 83), and the author only occasionally raises the topic of "wandering workshops" as for example, a Campanian atelier that may well have made an Early Augustan frieze in Lucera (p. 58 cat. 109; also pp. 75, 132). Regional artists could influence one another:

according to the author (p. 33), a relief in Bevagna (cat. 46) may have been the inspiration for another by artists in Sarsina (cat. 279).

The author (pp. 122–32) relies on the reliefs themselves to determine how they were produced in Rome and regional Italy. He distinguishes two or more craftsmen carving each of several reliefs (pp. 122–24, 129–31) and finds that individuals sculpting the same frieze had some artistic freedom in completing details (since the Late Augustan period, however, the reliefs tend to appear more uniform, p. 124). It is clear that on a few friezes the better artists used more progressive motifs (p. 129 cat. 116–17) and that the richest decoration sometimes appeared on the most visible parts of the relief (p. 131 cat. 280). According to the author, local artists often planned scrollwork with the help of sketchbooks, especially those containing images of individual plant forms (pp. 124–29).

He believes that the reliefs were not merely decorative; they generally communicated the concept of abundance and prosperity (pp. 118–21). The Eroses and grapes in the scrollwork that predates the Ara Pacis lent the reliefs a Bacchic character that conveyed the idea of bounty. Dionysian motifs were eschewed on Julio-Claudian public buildings where scrollwork represented the *Aurea Aetas*, and the increased naturalism of the individual forms helped suggest its abundance. Flavian artists emphasized this theme in scrollwork, but no longer needing to avoid Dionysian motifs, populated their scrolls with this imagery. The theme of prosperity continued into the second century.

According to the author (pp. 133–41), function and social forces help account for the history of the friezes in Rome. In the early first century B. C., the upper class introduced scrollwork on tombs in Rome partially because of the glamour of the marble out of which it was usually carved. Marble was rarely used in the city then, and it had strong Greek cultural associations (p. 133). In the second half of the century, several creative artists experimented with different forms as their clients competed among themselves, commissioning structures that vied in artistic merit (p. 45 n. 440). Less wealthy individuals in Rome also constructed tombs with scrollwork to show themselves as cultivated and Hellenized as the aristocracy, but not all the craftsmen whom they employed were talented (p. 134). Julio-Claudian scrollwork appears in Rome mostly on tombs, but also on the frieze of the Forum of Augustus as Imperial propaganda (pp. 137–39). In the Flavian period and second century A. D., the number of friezes with scrollwork declined in the city because the tomb type changed; scrollwork continued, however, to appear on public buildings and now even in a palace and bath complex (pp. 140–41).

As for regional Italy, stone scrollwork on friezes appeared on tombs in wealthy Campania after the Social Wars because of the Romanization of the local elite (p. 133). In the time of the Second Triumvirate Style and the Early Augustan period friezes with scrollwork spread throughout Italy as local aristocrats (and also a middle class, “Mittelschicht”) sought to outdo each other and integrated themselves into the Roman world (pp. 134–35). South Italy, poor and dominated by latifundia, lacked the right circumstances for the introduction of stone scrollwork (p. 136). An economic decline and a different funerary tradition precluded the use of stone scrollwork in Etruria (p. 136). During the Julio-Claudian period scrollwork on friezes appeared throughout much of Italy on both public buildings and tombs. The use of scrollwork on public buildings showed the donor to be wealthy, cultured, and connected with Rome and its imperial propaganda (pp. 137–39). Even Etruria had scrollwork then (p. 140). The numerous friezes with scrollwork from tombs and public buildings in Regio X reflected strong competition among the local elite (p. 140). The many commissions led to the development of a local formal tradition (pp. 75–76). A decline in the use of scrollwork in Flavian and second-century A. D. regional Italy resulted from a change in tomb type, declining local economies, and a move by many local aristocrats to Rome (p. 141). Friezes with scrollwork continued to appear frequently in northern Italy (especially Regio X), where the elite stayed, competing through the commissions of large public buildings (p. 141).

The author has a remarkable eye for detail, is thorough in research, and is willing to broach large issues in art history and history. I paused with questions precisely where more facts were desirable but unobtainable, specifically, the issue of whether the artists who sculpted particular friezes found in regional Italy were local or came from Rome. I was a little wary of the author’s almost blanket denial of direct foreign influences in regional Italy, but his theory remains possible. I also wondered whether he over-emphasized the theory of sketchbook copies of individual plants. I add below a few fragments in Rome that have only now become readily accessible and comment on some early material.

The author (p. 9 Beilage 1,1) writes that the earliest stone scrollwork in Rome (late second–early first century B. C.) is a reused fragmentary marble slab in the Largo Argentina. A partially preserved fourteenth-century funerary inscription is cut on one of its broad sides. On the other is a relief in which three stalks burgeon from each side of a calyx and sprout thin stems and blossoms. The piece is usually attributed to the curved frieze of Temple B in the Largo Argentina, but the author is uncertain of this, especially since the top four stalks seem to turn not to the sides, as in a typical frieze, but upwards.

The delicately rendered forms, some in very low relief, could belong to an architectural element high

off the ground, but to me they suggest something near the viewer, such as a barrier (K. WALLAT, *Arch. Anz.* 1995, 352) or the support of a table belonging to a sanctuary. The iconography is similar to that on a Late Hellenistic table support in S. Tommaso ai Cenci, Rome (R. COHON, *Greek and Roman Stone Table Supports* [1984] cat. 85), and the wiry stems reappear in a Late Hellenistic table support from Pergamon and an Augustan support in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (M. KUNZE et al., *Die Antikensammlung Berlin* [1992] 191; G. RICHTER, *The Furniture of the Greeks, Etruscans, and Romans* [1966] fig. 579). The curving surface that helped lead F. Coarelli to attribute the relief to Temple B's round frieze could be the type of bulge found at the center vertical axis of the New York support and of a support in the Galleria Doria Pamphili, Rome (P. ZANKER, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* [1988] 269 fig. 211 and R. COHON, *Table Supports*, cat. 100, 281). The size of the slab's elements suits a table support; for example, the height of the base and its original depth, assuming that the support was cut evenly in half, are very close to the measurements of the Doria Pamphili support. The original height of the support, to the limited degree that it can be estimated, might, however, be slightly greater than expected. (Extrapolating from the height of the calyx, I estimate a bit over 1 m; see further R. COHON, *Mitt. DAI Rom* 101, 1994, 90.) Also, since the eighteenth century (and possibly earlier), some supports have been sawed lengthwise in half to display both decorated sides on a wall, but none have been sawed to display one side for a new inscription, leaving the other turned away from the viewer (COHON, *Table Supports*, *op. cit.*, cat. 47, 187, 282; see further a reused relief in the Palazzo dei Conservatori: SCHÖRNER p. 53 n. 513). Nevertheless, the possibility that this was a support remains.

Few friezes have been preserved from first-century B. C. Rome; the friezes from regional Italy hint at the richness of their Rome models. Perhaps a key work in the early history of Roman friezes was Caesar's Temple of Venus Genetrix. Tentatively assigning the lush scrollwork friezes (cat. 203, 204, 243) on the rebuilt temple to the Trajanic period, the author notes that the near parallel alignment of the stalks and volutes ("stengelparallel") typifies Late Republican and Augustan scrollwork but rarely appears afterwards (p. 86; see also pp. 38, 41). According to him, it functions to create an especially dense vegetal net on the temple's frieze. He adds (p. 87) that only rosettes appear in the external frieze's volutes (cat. 203, 243). This contrasts with the Forum of Trajan frieze (p. 88), but typifies Early Augustan public buildings (pp. 22–23, 42). I wonder whether the archaizing parallel structure and selection of rosettes deliberately reflect a frieze on Caesar's temple. According to R. ULRICH (*The Temple of Venus Genetrix* [1984] 108, 209–210), scrollwork would suit the original temple dedicated to a generative deity; indeed, many of the temple's lines appear in the later rebuilding. If scrollwork decorated the original temple, and much of it was completed in the still early history of scrollwork in Rome before Caesar's death (ULRICH, *op. cit.* 39–42), perhaps it helped stimulate the use of scrollwork and determine its character for the next two decades.

Previous scholars have only touched on the important fragmentary reliefs in front of the Temple of Caesar, dating them to the time the temple was built (SCHÖRNER p. 24 n. 244 Beilage 2; inv. nos 408312–15). Without providing documentation, M. PASQUINUCCI (*Mon. Ant.* 48, 1973, 278) includes the fragments among those that came from the excavation of the temple area but not necessarily from the temple itself. Schörner, who has found an additional fragment next to the others (inv. no. 408310), dates the reliefs to the Early Augustan period essentially by comparing the calyx's leaves with those on the interior soffit of the Temple of Apollo in Circo (pp. 24–25 Beilagen 1, 4–5; 2). He notes what everyone else has failed to record: one fragment was carved on two sides. He concludes that the scrollwork framed a quadrilateral structure, possibly the rostra of the Temple of Caesar or the attic of the Parthian Arch. The exclusive use of rosettes in the volutes contrasts with the diversity of flower types on private tombs (p. 42 n. 407). More recently, A. VISCOGLIOSI (*Il Tempio di Apollo "in Circo"* [1996] 129–30) has noted the similarities among the acanthus leaves on the Forum reliefs, the Temple of Apollo in Circo, and some contemporary capitals.

I find that the reliefs are first recognizable, located where they are today, in two photographs, one taken possibly in 1904 and the other sometime in the early twentieth century (Ministero per i Beni Culturali e Ambientali, *Archeologia in Posa* [1993] figs 115, 108). In two photographs taken at long distance in spring 1899 and between 1902 and 1904, fragments are visible in the same spot, but are too indistinct to identify (*ibid.* figs 4, 102). The four photographs were taken at the time of, or up to a few years after, the major excavations of the temple area when architectural elements were uncovered there (PASQUINUCCI, *op. cit.* 262). This increases the likelihood that the author's fragments came from this zone.

Recently I found another fragment next to these reliefs (inv. no. 408309) and eight more in a pile of marble fragments near the second easternmost column before the Basilica Julia (inv. nos 408302–8, 408311). The iconography of most and the size, style, and marble type (Carrara) of all match the author's reliefs. Measuring from 20.9 cm to 49.5 cm long, the new fragments confirm that the scrollwork was from a large structure and that rosettes alone appear in the volutes.

The iconography of fragments 408308 (here illustration p. 554) and 408311 strengthens the connection with the Temple of Apollo in Circo. A palmette unites converging stalks on each of two adjacent



Scrollwork from the Forum Romanum;  
Magazzino della Basilica di Constantio, Rome, inv. no. 408308.

sides of each fragment. The sharp-edged, almost metallic quality, the composition, and the details – fronds, bands joining the volutes, and small leaves between the latter – reappear on the more elaborate palmette of the temple's interior soffit and recall to a lesser degree the temple's internal capitals and external soffit (VISCIOGLIOSI, *op. cit.* figs 46, 116–122). The San Pietro in Vincoli throne (R. COHON, *Boreas* 8, 1985, 92–104) and two capitals in the Giardino Caffarelli and Forum Antiquarium (VISCIOGLIOSI, *op. cit.* 129 fig. 156) offer parallels, but the majority of similarities is with the interior soffit.

From left to right, the second, third, seventh, and ninth bracts that sheathe 408314's main stalk (Beilage 2.1, bottom fragments; Beilage 2.4) have folioles subdivided into smaller lobes in a way that clearly recalls those on the main stalk of the temple's interior soffit (Beilage 1.4–5). The position of the bracts on the volute and stalk finds parallels on the temple's soffit. Both characteristics of the bracts are echoed on a slightly later relief in Rome (cat. 232). Almost all bracts of the Forum fragments have a main leaf ending in a decorative curl. Similar curls reappear on two fanciful plants on the temple's interior cornice (VISCIOGLIOSI, *op. cit.* fig. 166), but also on other Augustan bracts: the Horti Sallustiani reliefs (*ibid.* figs 163, 164), a frieze in Cagliari (SCHÖRNER p. 31), and a table support in Pompeii (COHON, *Table Supports* cat. 237).

Parallels to the Temple of Caesar are fewer, perhaps because little remains of the temple and much of its frieze was left unfinished. On both monuments the relief and relief ground are balanced. The empty forms created on the relief ground by the surrounding vegetal elements, the so-called negative spaces, are fundamental to the beauty of the overall designs. The richly three-dimensional way that the secondary leaf of the bract on the new Forum fragment 408302 turns into the relief ground is neatly paralleled on the Temple of Caesar's scrollwork. Less significantly, rosettes are the most prominent floral ornament on the two monuments' friezes, and the central veins of two leaves on the Forum reliefs (408312; Beilage 2.2) are like those on the acanthus of the temple's Victories (such leaves also appear on friezes cat. 232 in Rome and cat. 298 in Treia and the Horti Sallustiani reliefs: see E. TALAMO in: M. CIMA [ed.], *Restauro nei Musei Capitolini* [1995] fig. 8).

The precise chronological relation of the Forum reliefs to the two great temples remains uncertain as does the exact origin of the fragments. We now see, however, a deeper relation among all three works made within a relatively brief period. Also, the increased quantity of scrollwork on a public building of this time attests to how Early Augustan propaganda emphasized the idea of the bountiful earth (SCHÖRNER p. 120).

A little-known frieze near Rome in Torre Nuova (cat. 296) is closely related to the Forum fragments. According to the author, they share similar bracts and are roughly contemporary (p. 24). I find that both works have somewhat similar rosettes and, more importantly, reveal a refined elegance, interest in negative space, and balanced use of relief ground and relief. Future finds might establish that one atelier made both reliefs.

The author dates a relief in the Terme Museum (p. 12 cat. 217) to before the mid-first century B. C. in part because the ribbon-like form with raised edges that scrolls out of the calyx around the main stalk

finds an approximate parallel on the pseudomonopteros at Termessos, which he dates to the first third of the first century B. C. The author's date for the Terme relief may be correct, but the frieze may come from the third quarter of the century. The comparison with the Termessos relief is not fully satisfactory since the latter's ribbon apparently lacks raised edges. If we accept the comparison, however, it should be noted that F. RUMSCHEID (*Untersuchungen zur kleinasiatischen Bauornamentik des Hellenismus*. Katalog [1994] 87–88 cat. 359) calls the Termessos relief Augustan. A large, framed funerary relief with scrollwork in S. Martino ai Monti, Rome, offers a better parallel (unpublished; ca. 136 cm long, ca. 38 cm high, 33.5 cm deep). Similar ribbon-like forms with comparably raised edges rise from a calyx and wind similarly through the plant's stalks. This relief's flat, dry character and the multiple triangular forms in the calyx are in the Second Triumvirate Style. The genres of the relief and frieze are so close that the former may help date the latter. Further, on the Early Augustan relief in Nazzano (Schörner cat. 118), the ribbon-like stem of a small flower has raised edges like those on cat. 217.

A mediocre but interesting relief in the Antiquarium Comunale adds to the few examples of Second Triumvirate Style scrollwork in Rome (no inv. number; 110.5 cm long, 32.9 cm high, 28.2 cm deep). The large fragment consists of the lower two-thirds of a central calyx, a fruit and flower arcing to the sides of it, and a stalk and almost parallel volute. The dry workmanship, shape of the calyx's folioles, and similarity of the flower to that on cat. 217 date the relief. Although the author is reluctant to differentiate between pomegranates and poppy capsules on friezes (p. 118 n. 1197), the fruit on this relief is clearly a pomegranate with its large, smooth, spherical body and small contracted top; the poppy capsule is far smaller, often ribbed, and has a flat stigma (as on cat. 337, 338). Since so many friezes with scrollwork from approximately 50–10 B. C. come from tombs (p. 134), probably this frieze decorated a sepulcher and its pomegranate had a specifically funerary meaning (see also cat. 319; S. DIEBNER, *Aesernia-Venafrum* [1979] 282).

The author (pp. 18–19, 41) cites M. Pfanner's argument (*M. PFANNER*, *Jahrb. DAI* 104, 1989, 166–68) that one of the most prominent characteristics of the Second Triumvirate Style, touching apices forming triangles over each other or triangles over ovals, may have been dictated by a need for a quick, simple production technique. I wonder if the eyelets set above each other in the acanthus folioles of a statue support from the Antikythera shipwreck represent the kind of formula that may have been a significant precursor of this design (*P. BOL*, *Die Skulpturen des Schiffsfundes von Antikythera*. *Mitt. DAI Athen*, Beih. 2 [1972] 87–88 pl. 53).

Schörner joins two fragments of a funerary relief (p. 26), one in Aquino, the other in the Terme Museum (cat. 32, 213). The inscription, which records that it belonged to a *libertus* who was a *sevir*, helps the author date the relief to the Late Augustan period. He believes (p. 135) that the relief is marble (here following A. AMBROGI in: A. GIULIANO [ed.], *Museo Nazionale Romano. Le sculture I* 7,2 [1984] 402) and thus reflects a certain posturing by the provincial *libertus*. According to Schörner (p. 26), the relief's "Kerbschnitt-Stil" is old-fashioned and the artist's technique, sculpting without the aid of a drill, is out-of-date. The relief, however, is of travertine (limestone, according to A. BIANCHI, *Miscellanea greca e romana* 14 [1989] 215 and T. SCHÄFER, *Imperii Insignia*. *Mitt. DAI Rom*, Ergh. 29 [1989] 399); this weakens his social interpretation and may help explain the technique and style.

A long, recut frieze of Carrara marble in Rome's Antiquarium Comunale may supplement the author's list of Claudian reliefs (inv. no. 29239; 114.8 cm long [some years ago 150 cm], 17.5 cm high, 28 cm deep). The stalk produces four volutes with flowers and ends in a half-palmette. The closest parallels for the drill-work, the bracts' apices, and the cuff of leaves below the last bract are to be found on a pair of beautiful reliefs in the Palazzo dei Conservatori (cat. 211). The division of only three folioles on each bract also appears on the Villa Medici relief (cat. 261).

The author (pp. 55–56) proves through size and design that a published fragment in the Terme Museum and a magnificent unpublished work in San Lorenzo fuori le mura come from the same Neronian-early Flavian building. I believe that an unpublished fragment in Rome's Antiquarium Comunale most likely belongs with them (inv. no. 28157; 38.4 cm long, 66.7 cm high, ca. 28.5 cm deep). The battered scrollwork and marble type (Carrara) match its counterparts; the heights of the three reliefs are similar (ca. 28.3 cm on the Antiquarium's; 28 cm on the others). Their elaborate moldings are the same with only a slight discrepancy in the proportion of the strip between the Antiquarium's *cymatia*.

Although other fragments in Italy require publication, a thorough investigation of the relationships of the author's reliefs to friezes with scrollwork outside Italy and to other genres with scrollwork is more pressing. I doubt anyone is more qualified than G. Schörner to write such a study.