

Michaela Fuchs, *Untersuchungen zur Ausstattung römischer Theater in Italien und den Westprovinzen des Imperium Romanum*. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz 1987. 228 Seiten, 78 Tafeln.

This is a most welcome investigation of the different types of furnishings in Roman theaters in Italy and the western provinces, which follows individual studies by the Author (Eine Musengruppe aus dem Pompeius-Theater. *Röm. Mitt.* 89, 1982, 69–80; Zu einigen Relieffragmenten aus dem Balbus-Theater und dem Nachleben des großen Frieses von Pergamon. *Jahrb. DAI* 99, 1984, 215–255; *Le sculture del teatro romano di Fiesole* [1986]), and supercedes previous considerations of the subject. The book is divided into two parts. Part I contains a detailed catalogue of sculptural and epigraphical finds in each theater, organized according to the eleven Augustan regions in Italy. Part II presents a discussion of furnishings in theaters in Italy and the western provinces, organized by type. Indices include: I. Index by Museum of finds from theaters; Ia. Index of decoration still found in theaters; Ib. Lost and no longer identifiable decoration;

II. Inscriptions: Concordance to Inscriptions in the Catalogue; Indices by publication; III. Index of subjects and key words; IV. Topographical Index of the most important comparisons and of monuments from different complexes (those certainly from theaters appear in the Museum Index). – The plates, which include 364 photographs and 3 drawings, are generally well reproduced. Selection was based on: 1. theaters with more numerous finds, which allow presentation of nearly all of a single decorative complex; and 2. finds previously published only in remote places or not at all. The quality of the photographs varies depending on the object's location and the possibility of attaining controlled lighting conditions, but all are legible. They furnish a valuable overview of the (primarily) sculptural decoration of Roman theaters. With its broad geographical and chronological scope and through the detailed inventories and bibliographies, this study will form a standard handbook on Roman theater decoration in the West.

The Introduction, which provides a brief history of scholarship on theaters and their decoration, revives Bulle's plea of 1928 that all, even the most insignificant, sculptures found in theaters be studied together and in the context of their architectural setting, when detectable. The difficulty of establishing such a setting is pronounced especially in theaters cleared in the last century from which few or inadequate excavation records survive. For early finds the problem of establishing the veracity of given provenances also exists. The different aims of early excavations have also eliminated traces of the original positions of sculptures, preventing the placement of Imperial galleries or programmatic groupings of Ideal Sculptures and Portraits in overall reconstructions. The loss of context is especially serious for Ideal Sculptures for which the meaning would depend in part on the association with the architecture and with other statuary, not just on the iconographical type. Although the findspots or the types of settings are detectable in many cases, it is rare that the positions of free-standing statuary on the *scaenae frons* can be visualized.

The distribution of furnishings throughout the theater is summarized. The pulpitum may be decorated with reliefs, stucco, or painting, with the addition of statuettes, fountain figures, altars, or candelabra. The middle of the orchestra, usually paved with marble, often has an altar. Reliefs are common and may also decorate socles on each level of the *scaenae frons*, where familiar support figures also appear. Herms are less frequent, and less evidence survives for their placement. The decoration of theater facades with paint rather than architecture is evidenced for theaters of the second and first centuries B. C. in mid- and southern Italy, later supplanted by the typical Roman architectural system. Among statues in the round, Portraits are the most abundant. In each newly-erected theater there is dedicated at least the portrait of the ruling emperor, which, in the Julio-Claudian period in Italy, is accompanied by statues of his family, manifesting the dynastic aspect. In North Africa such Imperial portrait galleries appear in the mid-second century A. D. Portraits of distinguished local citizens are also plentiful, as inscriptions, heads, and copious togati attest. Besides the restriction of the central niche over the *porta regia* for the emperor, no particular area can be recognized as reserved for Private versus Imperial Portraits. Throughout the life of the building additional statues continue to be set up, of both types. The purpose of Ideal Sculpture appears not so much to display famous art works as to bring together the 'Grand Repertoire' which includes all the major gods. Among mythological figures, Muses are prominent and references to plays moderate, a reminder of the theater's role not only as a place for performances, but also as a meeting place and a forum for political presentations and propaganda. Inscriptions fall into categories of building-dedications, sculptural dedications, and honorific, emphasizing the important place occupied by the theater in the public life of the Roman city.

In Part I, a history of theaters is given for each Region, with names of dedicators and dates, where known. For the better documented theaters an inventory is presented by category, followed by a discussion of building phases, dating, and the history of excavation and scholarship. This part of the book is the most thorough and, because of the order and clarity of presentation, the easiest to use. The Catalogue presents the material according to the following categories: Architectural Decoration in the form of Support Figures (A I), Reliefs (A II a), Stucco (A II b), Painting (A II c), Mosaics (A II d); Herms (A III); Masks (A IV a), Appliques (A IV b), Oscilla, Peltae and Marble Lamps (A IV c); Fountain Figures (A V); Altars (A VI a), Candelabra Bases (A VI b); Inscriptions: Building and Dedicatory (B I); Honorary Inscriptions (B II); Inscriptions on Rows of Seats (B III); Varia (B IV); Portraits and Portrait Statues with Heads: of the Imperial Family (C I); Private Portraits (C II); Portrait Statues without Heads: male: Cuirassed Statues (D m I); Toga Statues (D m II); Hip-mantle Statues (D III); Opera Nobilia (D IV); Undetermined (D V); female: Draped Statues (D w I); Opera nobilia (D w II); Undetermined (D f III); and Ideal Sculpture: the Olympic

Gods (E I); Other Mythological Beings (E II); Personifications (E III); Varia and Undetermined (E IV). Especially important as theaters with large complexes of figures are Herculaneum, Lupiae, Urbs Salvia, Caere, Ferentium, Volaterrae, Tergeste, Verona, Arelate, Augusta Emerita, Tarraco (some of the former amply illustrated), Minturnae, and Otriculum. Interesting as individual finds are: the Parapet from Verona with satyr crawling up one side, pl. 54, 1, and the Male statue with aegis from Falerio, in the Louvre, pl. 19. Here, as elsewhere, the interpretation is often in doubt, since the statue lacks its head or (elsewhere) attributes, and the identity not always certain, but the suggested interpretations seem reasonable. The reworking and reuse of sculptures (pp. 36, 183) is intriguing and seems inevitable in buildings used over such long periods.

Part II presents a Discussion of each type of decorative equipment, following the categories used in Part I, including theaters in Italy and the western provinces. The lack of an inventory for western theaters outside of Italy results in a less complete treatment, since not all objects from these theaters are included in the Discussion; the Indices, therefore, should form an essential supplement to the text. The Indices, however, are in some cases inconsistent, in others incomplete. If the book had been provided with a comprehensive index, it would be far easier to use. For instance, some eastern theaters, such as Delphi and Pergamon (p. 132) are not indexed, although other theaters in the Roman East are. Certain categories important to the catalogue and discussions, such as Herms and Altars, are not indexed at all, causing the reader unnecessary frustration. Both references to the herms from the pulpitum of the Odeion of Agrippa in the Athenian Agora, listed as female on p. 131, but correctly as both male and female on p. 147, should appear in Index I. Also, in Index I, Athens, Theater of Dionysos should read p. 130.

In addition to the west, some material from the eastern provinces is mentioned, in some detail the extensive reliefs from Hierapolis; more briefly, decorative sculptures from theaters in Athens, Corinth, Delos, Delphi, Ephesos, Mylasa, Pergamon, Perge (on new excavations cf. M. J. MELLINK, *Archaeology in Anatolia*. *Am. Journal Arch.* 91, 1987, 15–16), and Side (restoration now underway). To these could be added, for instance, Antioch on the Orontes, Aphrodisias, Aspendos, Iasos, Iznik-Nicaea (MELLINK, *Am. Journal Arch.* 89, 1985, 566), Letoon, Miletus, Myra, Nysa, Prusias ad Hypium, Sagalassos, Thasos, Tralles, and Troy, or the figured capitals from Balagrae in Kyrenaika (*Arch. Anz.* 1959, 330 fig. 92). – In the Catalogue note is not always taken of marble types by name or description, except, for instance, on p. 38. Colored marble is noted in some cases, for instance, at Verona, pp. 131, 137, Vienne, p. 138, and Tergeste, p. 139. An evaluation of the percentage of colored marbles used in theater decoration would be informative. Could it be said that white marble is generally preferred for theaters, colored for, for instance, baths and villas? Were stage buildings already too 'busy' with architecture, sculpture, and inscriptions for color to be considered appropriate, or was the civic nature of the building a factor? Evidence regarding the setting of sculptures in a colonnaded facade is not well preserved for theaters, but useful comparison could be drawn with other types of buildings, such as the Nymphaeum of Herodes Atticus at Olympia, where the statues are set on individual bases between double piers (R. BOL, *Das Statuenprogramm des Herodes-Atticus-Nymphaeums*. *Olymp. Forsch.* 15 [1984] Beilage 5), or the recently restored Library of Celsus at Ephesus (partially shown on the cover of E. AKURGAL, *Ancient Civilizations and Ruins of Turkey* [1985]).

A striking omission in such a comprehensive undertaking is some form of statistical analysis. It should not be necessary for the reader to keep his own tally sheet in order to ascertain the number of theaters presented in Italy (at least 129; 52 with inventories and 77 in the introduction to each region, in addition to the wooden theaters attested for Rome). In addition, 5 theaters (according to the Indices) are included in the Discussion in Sicily, 7 in Gaul, 10 in Spain, and 11 in North Africa; hence 33 in the western provinces and an overall total of 162. (To France can be added Lillebonne [Juliobona]: O. NAVARRE, *Le théâtre romain de Lillebonne*. *Revue Et. Anciens* 15, 1913, 428; A. GRENIER, *Le Théâtre de Lillebonne* [1956] and the Theater at Lyon [Lugdunum]: P. WUILLEUMIER, *Fouilles de Fourvière à Lyon*. *Gallia*, Suppl. 4 [1951] 39, pl. 14, nos. 6, 7). These numbers, especially in Italy, are impressive and underscore the importance of the theater as a civic building as well as the encyclopedic nature of this study. In addition, given the large number of theaters attested for these areas, the small number preserved in certain categories of finds (e.g., Altars and Herms) becomes even more striking. This difference is a reminder of the enormous quantity of objects that have been lost since antiquity and, hence, a warning that the apparent preference for certain types of decoration may be altered by the chance of survival.

Furthermore, with the author's cataloging system, which provides continuous numbers in each category only for each theater and not, in addition, running numbers for the category as a whole, it falls upon the reader, again, to calculate the number of objects in order to ascertain, in fact, how the quantity of Imperial Portraits (C I: 36) compares with Non-imperial (C II: 36) and others (D: 63) and all of the latter (135), for instance, with Ideal Sculptures (E: 118, of which 22 are Muses), Herms (16), or Altars (17). Calling Ideal Sculptures a vastly smaller component, p. 185, seems, in this light, an overstatement. In addition, it would be useful to know if the balance between different types of decoration differs from one geographical area to another or across time. Conclusions of this sort are brought out for some categories (Imperial Portrait Galleries), but a chart could have dealt readily with questions of distribution for the rest.

The difference of scale is striking, especially for Ideal Sculpture (cf. in brief p. 192). At Tergeste (p. 111), for instance, most figures are relatively small (about a meter high), whereas the group from Lupiae is over life-size, and the Muses from the Theater of Pompeii in Rome stand nearly four meters in height. The wealth of the patron certainly plays a role, but so also could propaganda, in addition to location, or the importance of the subject.

On p. 132 it is indicated that in regard to the frieze from Pergamon the author (Corinth IX 2) did not distinguish between the entablature frieze and socle reliefs, although it is clearly stated on p. 125 that the Pergamon frieze is assigned to the entablature. The author seems to set up this confusion in the mind of the reader as part of a procedure to eliminate the Pergamon reliefs from having any bearing on the development of Roman theater reliefs. It seems ill-advised to throw away the earliest dated example from the consideration of the origins and development of Roman theater decoration when it attests to the introduction of carved figural reliefs into theaters by the second century B. C. This serves to deny its possible influence on later decorative friezes of the same size, which may have been used in entablatures (its non-socle use being irrelevant, so far as we know, to the architecture), and to ignore the possibility of other Hellenistic theater reliefs which have not survived: note the relatively small amount of sculptures preserved from the large number of theaters in this book. The evidence seems, rather, to suggest that two directions of influence are involved: from Asia Minor to Rome in the 2nd century B. C., when the kingdom of Pergamon was, in fact, deeded to Rome, and from Rome back to the East in Early Imperial times: both the building type and the decoration devised for it. More emphasis could be given to the place of origin of the Roman *scenae frons* and to the effect the new building type had on its sculptural decoration, which becomes quickly attached to suitable positions. Differences of opinion as to whether Greece or Italy provided the source for components of Roman art are not unusual and could be more profitably cast in that light. Furthermore, elsewhere in the discussion, the lines of chronological development are not always clarified, as great jumps are made chronologically and geographically, and dates are not always specified.

Some additions: As the author points out, bibliographical references were made up to 1982/83. To be added are, for instance: On Delphi: M. C. STURGEON, A New Monument to Herakles at Delphi. *Am. Journal Arch.* 82, 1978, 226–235; A. JACQUEMIN, Note sur la frise du théâtre de Delphes. *Bull. Corr. Hellénique* 109, 1985, 585–587. – On Ephesos: W. OBERLEITNER *et. al.*, Funde aus Ephesos und Samothrake. *Kat. d. Antikenslg.* 2 (1978); K. HARTSWICK, The So-Called 'Ephesos Amazon'. A New Identification. *Jahrb. DAI* 101, 1986, 127–136. – On Hierapolis: T. RITTI, Hierapolis, scavi e ricerche 1 (1985); F. D'ANDRIA – T. RITTI, Fonti letterarie ed epigrafiche 2 (1985); F. D'ANDRIA – T. RITTI, Le sculture del teatro, I rilievi con i cicli di Apollo e Artemide (1985); M. FUCHS, Gnomon 59, 1987, 252–257; P. CHUVIN, Observations sur les reliefs du théâtre de Hierapolis. *Thèmes agonistiques et légendes locales. Revue Arch.* 1987, 1, 97–107. – On the history of support figures: E. SCHMIDT, Geschichte der Karyatide. Funktion und Bedeutung der menschlichen Träger- und Stützfigur in der Baukunst (1982); J. R. MARSZAL, An Architectural Function for the Lyons Kore. *Hesperia* 57, 1988, 203–206; M. VICKERS, Persepolis, Vitruvius and the Erechtheum Caryatids. The Iconography of Medism and Servitude. *Revue Arch.* 1985, 3–28. – On sculptural arrangements in other contexts: J. RAEDER, Die statuarische Ausstattung der Villa Hadriana bei Tivoli (1983); E. BARTMAN, Decor et Duplicatio: Pendants in Roman Sculptural Display. *Am. Journal Arch.* 92, 1988, 211–225. – In addition: R. FÖRTSCH, Ein Fassadenzitat aus dem Theater von Syrakus. *Röm. Mitt.* 94, 1987, 309–324; H. P. ISLER, Grabungen auf dem Monte Iato 1987. *Ant. Kunst* 31, 1988, 21, pl. 4.4, for a new satyr-atlante; W. JOHANNOWSKI, Appunti sul teatro di Nuceria Alfaterna: Rassegna storica Salernitana n. s. 3, 2, 1986, 105–107; E. RAWSON, Discrimina ordinum: The Lex Julia Theatralis. *Papers Brit. School Rome* 55, 1987, 85–114; L. RICHARDSON, A Note on the Architecture of the Theatrum Pompeii in Rome.

Am. Journal Arch. 91, 1987, 123–126; C. C. VERMEULE, Figural Pillars: From Asia Minor to Corinth to Rome, in: M. A. DEL CHIARO (ed.), *Corinthiaca*, Studies in Honor of D. A. Amyx (1986).

In summary, M. Fuchs has done a great service for the study of Roman art by pulling together a large amount of disparate material from various theaters, and by presenting information from obscure sources unavailable in many libraries. What emerges is a multi-faceted history of a single building across a broad span of space and time, with its diverse types of decorative furnishings, benefactors, and renovations.

Chapel Hill

Mary C. Sturgeon