

Sabine Faust, *Fulcra: figürlicher und ornamentaler Schmuck an antiken Betten*. Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung, Ergänzungsheft 30. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz 1989. 248 Seiten, 11 Abbildungen im Text, 80 Tafeln, 2 Tabellen, 2 Karten, 1 Beilage.

This book brings together for the first time many examples of the single most important decorative element on Hellenistic and early Roman beds: the S-shaped cast bronze fixture which typically covered the flat outer face of the obliquely placed, curved wooden headrest, or fulcrum. The silhouette of each of these cast bronze objects naturally followed closely that of the fulcrum, to the edge of which – in its earliest, flat, solid-cast form – it was at first simply nailed, and later – cast with a perpendicular ledge like a frame – over which it was fitted and nailed from the sides. Major changes in the shape and massiveness of these fixtures reflect readjustments in the leaning headrest itself over the several centuries of its use. These morphological changes are documented here by Sabine Faust, who groups the fixtures into four principle types plus a composite type and a category of *Sonderformen*, and places them in closely dated chronologies.

Until sometime in the Imperial period when the invention of a new bed with supports on three sides like a modern sofa supplanted the traditional Hellenistic design (Faust's catalogue includes examples *in situ* in Herculaneum and Pompeii), the fulcrum rested, at one or at both ends of the bed, on the tops of the two round bronze legs as they protruded up through and above the horizontal bed surface. For balance, a circular area at the bottom rested on the bed horizontals, probably lying snugly beside the tops of the legs as in the reconstructed bed in the Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore (Faust's catalogue number 27). On the corresponding decorative bronze fixture, the medallion covering this lower area became a traditional format for a decorative bust, itself an early Hellenistic invention.

From the beginning, the curved terminal at the top was more elongated. On the earliest type of surviving cast fulcrum attachments (Faust's *Fulcrumform* I), this oval area was also filled with a decorative bust in high relief. On the fulcrum attachments of wider silhouette which eventually superceded these (*Fulcrumformen* II and III), such busts were replaced by fully modeled animal protomes, principally the heads and necks of horses and mules. These protomes, like those of the dogs, lions, and water fowl found less often in this place, turn their necks in varying degrees back towards the lower medallion, forming a decorative unit of balanced forms.

In the earliest cast attachments, which Faust dates to the late third to early second century B. C., the area in between the terminals was an oblique solid bronze field with a reclining relief figure. Later, Faust believes in the first half of the second century B. C., when the leaning headrest was apparently enlarged to allow greater support, its corresponding decorative attachment became a bronze frame. The middle field was eliminated and a projecting lip was added to fit over the fulcrum edge. Now there existed an open area for the decorative insertion of ivory or a piece of sheet bronze inlaid with copper or silver ornament. This kind of



fulcrum attachment, which Faust terms *Rahmenfulcrum*, became canonical, and continued to be produced throughout the second and first centuries B. C. into the first century A. D. It is this type, with a decorative bust at the lower end and, more often than not, a lively horse's or mule's head above, that forms the bulk of the bronze material extant today. While most of Faust's material is bronze, the book is much enriched by her inclusion of beds and bed parts of marble, stone, ivory, bone, silver, terracotta, and even wood (a single fulcrum attachment from the sea near Ladispoli, Faust's catalogue number 512A). Numerical references which follow are Faust's catalogue numbers unless designated pages.

Sometimes, but apparently not always, the opposite edge of the same fulcrum, on that side of the bed which in traditional Hellenistic dining arrangements would be placed toward the wall, was also decorated with a metal attachment. From Faust's assembled evidence, which indicates the correct reassembly of the bed in the Palazzo dei Conservatori, Rome, from Amiternum (355), and the one in the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, perhaps from Apulia (27 [Faust doubts the alleged provenience]), this fixture was less decoratively elaborate than its more prominently exhibited counterpart of identical silhouette, with less fully three-dimensional components. In the Rome and Baltimore examples the fixtures on the 'back' of the head-rest have prototypes of water fowl and plain shield-like medallions. On a bed in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale in Naples from Pompeii (casts in the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago: 231–232) and an unassembled bed in the British Museum (177–178), the lower circular areas are decorated with *Gorgoneia*.

On beds which appear to have had two headrests, one at each end, head and foot, the corresponding outer bronze attachments seem most often to have been designed as a pair, decorative elements presented in mirror, or near mirror, symmetry. The shoulders of the decorative busts and their details of dress and attributes are usually identical while the heads are reversed in direction of gaze. Besides the above named beds, in Rome from Amiternum and in Baltimore (355 and 27), both of which are restored with two fulcra to accommodate four S-shaped bronze attachments (one of the outer fixtures of the Walters Art Gallery bed has been missing since 1910), matching pairs of outer decorative fulcrum attachments can be found on a bed from the Esquiline in the Palazzo dei Conservatori (353–354), and in the Antikenmuseum in Basel (30) and the British Museum (177–178). There are also surviving pairs in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale in Naples, and elsewhere, but they are rare. Matching decorations for beds made of bone with fulcra at both head and foot also survive (e. g., 66 and 244–246).

The book is divided into eight chapters. After introductory material describing the predecessors to and the development of the bronze bed with rounded legs (with acknowledgement to H. KYRIEIS' *Thronen und Klinsen*. Jahrb. DAI Ergh. 24 [1969]), and a brief discussion of the representations of some unadorned fulcra in the Hellenistic period, Faust presents the surviving figurative and ornamental material. Her catalogue (pp. 155–227) contains 529 entries. It comprises the few complete (or almost complete) surviving beds, fulcrum attachments with complete or partially surviving ornamentation as well as those which have lost their ornamentation, fragments of solid-cast fulcrum attachments, unattached decorative busts and prototypes of animals and water fowl, plain medallions, bed legs (some found alone), and other bed remains. Of these entries, about half have known proveniences, including some objects which were excavated and published but have disappeared. Two helpful maps (*Karte 1* and *Karte 2*) indicate find spots by material and form. Almost a hundred objects in the catalogue are (or were) in the hands of dealers or in private collections; of these, about a third have alleged proveniences (including sixteen terracottas said to be from Lomello, stolen from a private collector). Museums (and Faust) are more cautious, adding a mere eighteen alleged origins. Faust includes one acknowledged fake decorative bust (282), and correctly questions a second (63).

Faust's Type I is the solid-cast relief fulcrum attachment. She believes this type continued to be made from its inception in the late third to early second centuries B. C. until into the early first century B. C., a lengthy survival which she hypothesizes on stylistic analysis alone (p. 38) and is open to question.

Faust's Types II and III are the two sub-groups of 'frame'-type fulcrum attachments of which many examples survive. The two types are differentiated by the silhouette of the lower 'corner' on their bottom edge, where the lower, slightly concavely curved horizontal element meets the upward convex curve. This transitional 'corner' is either squared off (Type II), or designed with sharp points or 'spurs' projecting both outwards as well as inwards into the (now usually empty) field within the frame (Type III, which Faust terms



'Doppelsporn' or double-spur fulcra). Type II begins in the first half of the second century B. C., overlapping with Type III at the end of that century and into the early first century B. C. Type III begins in the late second to early first centuries B. C. and terminates sometime in the first half of the first century A. D.

It would be prudent at this point to say that I find Faust's chronology of the fulcrum attachment fully convincing in its general outlines. With the exception of the dates of some decorative busts unassociated with fulcrum attachments and without dated contexts, which can only be dated stylistically, and some hesitations concerning the inflexibility of the Type III shape chronology as it is presented in this book, I am in agreement with Faust's relative dates. In my book "The Hellenistic and Early Imperial Decorative Bust" (1987) a brief appendix (Appendix II, pp. 163-165, Pls. 77-79 and 81) is devoted to a very preliminary study of the chronology of the fulcrum attachment. This was elaborated in an article: *The Bronze Fulcrum Attachment: Some Clarifications in the Chronology of Solutions to this Problematic Format*. In: *Griechische und römische Statuetten und Großbronzen. Akten der 9. Tagung über antike Bronzen 1986 in Wien* (1988) 279-284. In both book (p. 8, n. 24) and article (p. 284, n. 24) I announced the forthcoming publication of Faust's book as the definitive study of the fulcrum attachment, which, in its bronze form (only), was one of the three major formats for decorative busts in the Hellenistic and early Roman Imperial periods. My tentative chronology of Faust's Types I, II, and III (I did not deal with Type IV because it does not bear a decorative bust) began earlier in the third century B. C. than Faust's, as I still believe it may for the historical reasons discussed in my article (pp. 279-280), though perhaps not as early as the second quarter of the century. In my 1988 publication I suggested that the adjustment "for correspondence to a structural change in the fulcrum itself, which was larger, with a more pleasing balance of forms" (p. 280) and its "framing aspect" (Faust's Type II) had been achieved "by the end of the first quarter of the second century B. C., at the latest", and that "a radical modification of the (fulcrum) shape" (p. 282) with the "lengthening of the corner of the lower horizontal edge" (Faust's Type III) had been achieved by the middle of the first century B. C. I terminated Type III "sometime before the end of the Julio-Claudian period", leaving a more exact determination to Faust. CH. BOUBE-PICCOT had already distinguished important differences in types (*Les lits de bronze de Maurétanie Tingitane. Bull. Arch. Marocaine* 4, 1960, 189 ff.; *Les bronzes antique du Maroc 2. Le mobilier* [1975]), and the *terminus ante quem* of 49 B. C. for a bronze fulcrum attachment with a pronounced single point from Azaila in the Museo arqueológico, Madrid (192), suggested an approximate date for consideration of the development of Type III. (As Faust's comparative material makes clear, however, this is an unusual piece, a *Sonderform*, perhaps because it was produced in an area somewhat removed from a principal center of bed production where the canonical form would have been established.) The *terminus ante quem* of 80-60 B. C. for the two Type III fulcrum attachments found recently off the coast of Golfe-Juan in southern France (196-200), determined by the current dating of amphorae found in the shipwreck, raises the beginning of the Type III chronology (Nice-Cimiez. *Le Musée d'archéologie* [no date]; *Archéologie sous-marine* [no date] 57-58).

The proportions of Type III examples vary more from one to another than do those of Type II. Faust dates most of the beds from Pompeii and Herculaneum (all Type III), of various sizes, to within the second half of the first century B.C. in a closely sequential chronology. Faust's belief in a line of morphological development of this shape from most slim to most voluminous and "bellied out" (*bauchiger*, p. 51), is generally evident. However, there is little support from dated contexts for the tight, undeviating sequence presented in this book. Indeed, the fact that the two Type III fulcrum attachments found in the Golfe-Juan shipwreck (196-200) are different in shape (they are also different in size) argues against too rigid a chronology. (These bronzes were presumably goods being shipped to a buyer and might be expected to have been new at the time of the shipwreck.) Further, a bed from Amiternum in Chieti (80-81) with fulcra at head and foot, bears fulcrum attachments very similar to each other in style, but, somewhat surprisingly, the two fulcra and their attachments have different silhouettes. (That the busts are different in subject is less surprising.) These were apparently together on the bed in antiquity, and the bronze ornaments are manifestly from the same workshop. While their juxtaposition on the same bed is unusual, it suggests the perfectly plausible contemporary creation not only of varying sizes of Type III fulcra (which is apparent throughout their chronology), but also shapes with slight deviations in proportions: somewhat fatter or thinner, longer or shorter, etc., always with the canonical double points.

But Faust separates the two Golfe-Juan fulcrum attachments in date by from twenty-five to as many as fifty years, dating the larger one with Artemis bust and horse's head to the late second to early first century



B. C., the smaller one with Silenus and mule's head to before the middle of the first century B. C. (p. 51). Faust separates the Amiternum bronzes in Chieti by almost the same time span, dating the fulcrum attachment with mule protome and winged genius bust (which Faust identifies as a genius of the seasons [p. 81]) to the beginning of the first century B. C., the only slightly wider one with mule protome and bearded male bust (identified as an Indian associated with Dionysos [p. 114]) to just before the middle of the first century B. C. While Faust finds the mules on the pair of identically-shaped fulcrum attachments with winged genii in the Conservatori Museum, also from Amiternum (355), close enough in details to the two Chieti examples to assign them all to the same workshop, she dates the Conservatori pair later than both Chieti attachments, to the middle of the first century B. C., on the basis of their somewhat greater width, as that place in sequence is dictated by her chronology of Type III double-spur shapes. Her three separate dates for material from Amiternum: the beginning of the first century B. C., before the middle of the first century B. C., and the middle of the first century B. C. suggest differences as great as fifty years. Given the obvious demand from the market for different sizes, could the tendency towards a wider and more swollen form have been so mechanically relentless in development that no simultaneous variations occurred, even in the same workshop? Variations from different workshops seem even more likely.

Faust dates the final examples of Type III to the first half of the first century A. D., ending the chronology with two of the double-spur fulcrum attachments with more swollen forms from the Esquiline in the Palazzo Conservatori (353–354). The silhouettes of these two bulge outward under the protome and above the bust. The silhouette of the lower element in a so-called 'composite' fulcrum on a marble monument in Baiae, dated by other criteria to the Claudian period (p. 52 and pl. 31), is similar to the Esquiline examples, but is flat on the bottom. On top of it is a short vertical element suggesting an erect protome, which in turn is topped by a larger, shallowly S-shaped vertical. Such 'composite' fulcra, or leaning headrests combined with vertical elements on top to add height (and decorated on the edges with appropriate bronze fittings), were created with headrest shapes of varying fullness within Type III: e. g., a bed in the Casa del Menandro (300–301), another in Naples (223). These are dated by Faust strictly by the degree of fullness of the lower, headrest part (the first to before the middle of the first century B. C., the second to after the middle of the first century B. C.). The invention of these composite fulcra suggests the adaptation of a known form to a new concept. These fulcra have every appearance of being an intermediate structural step towards the higher three-sided bed, which apparently existed by the Augustan period and suggests new habits of dining without reclining. One wonders if these composite fulcra span as long a time as Faust's dates would suggest, determined, as they are, strictly by relative fullness of the lower element.

Evidence for Faust's type IV, the upright variety which concludes her chronology, exists as early as the second half of the first century B. C. on a bed depicted on an Arretine bowl with a potter's stamp which has been dated to 25–10 B. C. (p. 55). Like the other types, it exists in ivory and bone as well as bronze. The fulcrum now sat directly on the horizontal bed frame. Faust asks whether this form may go back to earlier Greek forms in wood, seen in vase painting, where they also often have no decorative element. Composite fulcra were also constructed with Type IV headrests, as documented by an Augustan marble kline monument in the Terme Museum (pl. 29). The undecorated fulcrum goes around three sides of the bed.

Given the paucity of reliably fixed chronological points of reference for this material (pp. 147–150), as well as the notorious difficulty, and frequent disagreements, in dating Hellenistic sculpture stylistically, it would be pointless to list here those unattached, 'loose' decorative busts, dissociated from their format – though at least some perhaps originally produced for Type III fulcra – for which my dates still differ from those suggested by Faust. I certainly do not agree that the Silenus busts in Alesia (2), Baltimore (25), Cleveland (83), and New York (250) are from the same workshop, though they are probably similar in date, nor that the bust in Zurich from Edliswil (405) and another in Naples (241) are from the same workshop. Further, whether all of these, and the fulcrum attachment with Silenus bust in the Terme Museum (344) to which Faust compares them, are to be dated to the second half of the first century B. C. based on the Terme attachment's shape (Faust says it represents a step beyond the Golfe Juan attachment which she dates to before the middle of the century), or are later in date, is very much open to question.

It is by no means certain that all, or even any, of the Silenus busts listed above were once on beds. Despite the fact that at least one of them reveals the possibility of another use (only presumed earlier) by its obvious conversion into a steelyard weight, these busts could as well have been intended, and used, to decorate iron or wooden chests, some other article of furniture, or, perhaps most likely, wagons. Can we assume



that Silenus busts found in what is now Switzerland, for example, are as early as the second half of the first century B. C. and come from beds when no other remains of bronze beds have been found there? Parts of the frames and legs of two bronze beds, now in Lyon (190–191), were found in 1858 in Bourgoin-Jallieu (Isère) and a fulcrum attachment in Trier (381), but they are a rare examples in the Roman provinces north of the Alps. (Italy presents an altogether different picture.)

Faust's chronology of Type II fulcrum attachments also follows a development in profile from sleek and slim to more voluminous. However, as there is considerably less variety of shape among the examples of this type than among those of Type III (the Mahdia Type II fulcrum attachment [382–385] being a cautionary exception), Faust is more dependent on stylistic analysis for dating purposes. Generally speaking, this results in a less forced and more credible sequential development than that of her Type III chronology. She perceives increasingly shorter, less flowing and more ornamental manes on the horses's heads which dominate as subjects of the upper protomes on Type II fulcrum attachments (p. 71–77), as well as greater plasticity in the panther skins around their necks. She also finds a chronologically increasing volume in the double-arched transitional element at the base of the animal head protome. She groups the examples of Type II bronzes stylistically in this linear fashion within the second century B. C. to the early first century B. C. with almost no help from archaeologically contextually determined dates.

The mid-first century B. C. date of the ceramics found with the Antikythera shipwreck and its fulcrum attachments of Type II informs us only of the existence of Type II at that time, and Faust suggests the furniture was not new. Because it is wider and more voluminous, she dates the fulcrum attachment with female bust and lion's head from the Antikythera wreck (14–15) somewhat later than the two fulcrum attachments from Pella with Dionysos busts and mules' heads (16 and 293), which she dates to the second half of the second century or early first century B. C. by stylistic comparison to the Pergamene Small Gaul dedication. Like most German scholars, Faust dates the dedication to the reign of Attalos II. Those who might agree with her comparison, but date the Small Gauls to around 200 B. C. when Attalos I made his triumphant visit to Athens (POLYB. 16,25–26), like many English and American scholars do, might date these bronze attachments considerably earlier. There can be little doubt as to the reasonable proximity of these bronzes in date, but an absolute date cannot really be supported by any securely dated evidence.

Faust's belief that Type III, the *Doppelsporn* fulcra, probably developed during the second half of the second century B. C., seems reasonable given the development of the Roman market. Indeed, find spots for attachments of this type (ivory and bone as well as bronze) are centered in Italy. Faust begins her chronology with the narrowest extant example of this type, in Naples (233), which she dates to the late second to early first century B. C. She asserts the dominance of Type III over Type II from the early first century B. C. on. Overlapping of these two frame-type forms during the late second and early first centuries B. C. is suggested by the date of the Mahdia shipwreck (a reassessment of the amphorae has lowered the former *communis opinio* of about 100 B. C. to a date between 80 and 70 B. C. [Das Wrack. Der antike Schiffsfund von Mahdia, 1994]). Faust suggests here that at least a bust of Artemis and a horse's head protome are from the same workshop as the Artemis and horse's head fixture from the Golfe-Juan shipwreck (196–200). (In her recent article on the Mahdia klinai [in: Das Wrack, pp. 573–606], Faust convincingly argues for a common workshop for all the klinai from both shipwrecks.)

Faust discusses the mules' heads which dominate Type III fulcrum attachments as the preferred protome, but it is clear that the chronological framework for the discussion of their stylistic differences and perceived development are the shapes of those fulcrum attachments on which such protomes remain attached (p. 77). After a discussion of the earlier mules' heads on Type II attachments, she compares the mule's head on a Type III fulcrum attachment from Naples (233) to the Mahdia example and although there are some notable differences (e. g., the ears), finds them similar enough in attributes and general style to substantiate a late second – early first century B. C. date for the Naples bronze, as the earliest in the Type III series. She believes the Golfe-Juan mule's head (paired with the Silenus bust) must represent a later development because of its wider fulcrum shape, dating it before the middle of the first century B. C. There is considerably more volume in the rendering of the hair of the panther skin it wears around its neck than in the Mahdia and Naples example, while the triangular (apparently leather) harness over the panther skin is richly decorated, features which suggest development in details. Problems arise with those fixtures with mules' heads which are very similar to the Golfe-Juan example in attributes and enriched details but are



placed in narrow chronological sequence based on volume of shape, again, for example, the two fulcrum attachments from Amiternum in Chieti.

With the caveats about the restrictive aspects of Faust's Type III chronology, and the dates of some of the bronze material unattached to fulcrum attachments, I can certainly recommend this useful book to scholars of the Hellenistic and early Imperial minor arts, as well as to scholars and connoisseurs of bronzes.

New York

Beryl Barr-Sharrar