

## III. ART AND ARCHAEOLOGY

J. BORCHHARDT, *DER FRIES VOM KENOTAPH FÜR GAIUS CAESAR IN LIMYRA* (Forschungen in Limyra 2). Vienna: Phoibos, 2002. Pp. 152, 94 pls. ISBN 978-3-90123-225-1. €69.00.

In 1966, the cenotaph of Gaius Caesar was discovered by Borchhardt in a swamp at the foot of the hill of Limyra's famous heroon. Ancient Limyra is known as the place where the designated successor of Augustus died in 4 B.C., but the sources say that his body was brought back to Rome and do not mention the construction of a memorial on site. Still, a combination of architectural and epigraphic evidence, already presented in a first volume (J. Ganzert, *Der Kenotaph für Gaius Caesar in Limyra. Architektur und Bauornamentik* (1984)) makes a strong case for an identification as the cenotaph of Gaius.

The sizeable monument (16 by 16 m ground plan) had a marble frieze running all around the square podium. This would make some 63 m of frieze, consisting of 68 upright panels just over 2 m high (fig. 2; pls 1–5). The cenotaph has been praised as 'das qualitative bedeutendste Monument Kleinasiens aus augusteischer Zeit' (Ganzert (1984), 193). But the proof of the pudding is the present volume, which B. and his colleagues have dedicated exclusively to the frieze fragments, dealing with technical questions (15–24), iconography (25–66), style (67–76), and interpretations (77–90), followed by a catalogue (108–41, 84 entries).

Despite its outstanding artistic quality, the monument is unlikely to enter the canon of great Roman state monuments from the Greek East, on a level with the Antonine monument in Ephesos. Too little of the frieze survives, only some 5 per cent or less. The few fragments that remain were all smashed to bits to be burned or reused in the Byzantine city walls. The imaginative reconstruction drawing of all four sides (Beilage 1) illustrates the poor state of affairs especially well. It is only on a second glance that one notices the tiny shaded bits, which represent those fragments actually recovered.

B. suggests (15) that the panels were pre-fabricated in the workshop, then mounted on the monument. This would be a cumbersome and impractical method. Research on other state reliefs (M. Pfanner, 'Technische Beobachtungen an den Cancellariareliefs', *AA* (1981), 514–18; idem, *Der Titusbogen* (1983)) leaves no doubt that the sculpting was usually done on site. The frieze of Limyra seems to confirm this. The back of the large fragment, no. 1, is not flat, but follows the irregular outline of the core blocks (18–19); *contra* B., one can hardly imagine the finely finished marble slabs being fitted on, measured, taken off and cut to size again, especially considering that the reliefs also needed to have a perfect sideways fit with the continuation of the depictions. Moreover, the horizontal connections one sees between the panels (dents and bosses) would be very difficult to co-ordinate with pre-worked blocks. The easiest explanation is that the podium core was enveloped with plain marble panels, and then chiselled.

As for iconography, Gaius' short career offered few episodes that could be propagated with matching images from the limited standard repertoire of themes in Roman state art. B. rightly points out that one would expect to find reliefs with Gaius' appointment as *princeps iuventutis*, scenes of sacrifice and diplomatic dealings with barbarians, among others (47–66). The Ara Pacis, Prima Porta Statue, Gemma Augustea, and the Boscoreale cups offer attractive models, and indeed, frieze fragments of fasces, an axe, a *vexillum* (?), and a *mulleus* (of a divinity or personification) generally point in the right direction. But it is impossible to see how one could identify any particular scene from fragments that typically show half a face or minute parts of a foot. Portraits are entirely absent, meaning that none of the protagonists is among the preserved heads. Despite one head fragment (cat. 2) being identified as Gaius, all the faces are in fact idealized pseudo-portraits with voluminous versions of Julio-Claudian hairstyles. The prime witness for all questions on style, iconography and technique is one exceptional panel with complete width and almost complete height (cat. 1) found in 1992, several years after the excavations. It is discussed in great detail (18–21, 54–8, 108–12) and gets its own Beilage with drawings of all sides. The panel seems to depict a *transvectio equitum*, with two (headless) horsemen followed by attendants holding up sticks with olive wreaths over the heads of the honorands. These may be the festivities marking the appointment of Gaius and Lucius Caesar as *principes iuventutis*.

Many of the authors' suggestions are hypothetical, but they are put forward with the right degree of caution. The quality of the photographs is generally high, and the line drawings in the text help in following the authors' arguments. Only occasionally does the style slip into

subjective, non-factual speech ('mit feinen Gesichtszügen, die hellwache Intelligenz verraten', 110). Despite some unnecessary fillers (full quotes of all sources mentioning C. Caesar, 91–106), the authors of this well-researched book make the best of an ungrateful subject. The frieze of Limyra offers some limited insight into matters of style, such as depth, perspective, and the rendering of human bodies. But it does not provide what one would have hoped for, the expansion of our knowledge of Julio-Claudian iconography.

*University of Nottingham*

ANDREAS J. M. KROPP

K. E. WELCH, *THE ROMAN AMPHITHEATRE: FROM ITS ORIGINS TO THE COLOSSEUM*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. Pp. xxii + 355, 16 pls, illus. ISBN 978-0-521-809443. £55.00/US\$85.00.

Katherine Welch's contributions to the study of Roman architecture, and especially to that of entertainment venues, are well known and now her long-awaited book on amphitheatre architecture has arrived. This text challenges traditional interpretations and offers new ones on the origins and place of amphitheatres in Roman society, and will force scholars to reconsider the suppositions upon which so much of our understanding of gladiatorial spectacles and their venues has been based.

The book's introduction is an historiographic examination of arena games and amphitheatres. W. cogently argues that there is no good evidence that arena games were more common in the imperial period, even if better attested by literary sources of that period, and that study of the Republican period is essential for understanding their development. Ch. 1, 'Arena Games during the Republic', begins with a synthesis and critique of the 'Osco-Samnite hypothesis' and the 'Etruscan hypothesis' on the origin of gladiatorial combat (11–18). W. observes that the Romans themselves had no clear understanding of where the games originated and that the search for an outside source may well have begun with the political agendas of nineteenth-century scholars (17–18). She then moves into a discussion of the nature of gladiatorial games during the Republic (18–22), criticizing the common view that gladiatorial combats became popular in the first century A.D. only after they started to be separated from their funerary associations and were exploited for political ends. In fact the games were popular in the city of Rome from at least the mid- to late third century B.C. Also in this chapter, W. begins to expound one of her underlying themes: arena games and amphitheatres grew out of a military context in the Republic. She associates the beginning of regular gladiatorial combat in Rome with a period of active military expansion and also makes a connection between animal spectacles, including *damnatio ad bestias*, and military activity.

In the second chapter, 'Origins of Amphitheatre Architecture', W. moves to the venues themselves. W. views the temporary wooden amphitheatres, regularly erected in the Forum Romanum, as the prototypical form upon which other wooden and stone Republican amphitheatres would be based. The literary and material evidence for these structures and the spectacles they hosted is evaluated in detail and some different reconstructions are suggested. W. contextualizes this structure within the militaristic Forum-topography of the middle to late Republic. The chapter also contains discussion of other attested wooden amphitheatres and theatres. The third chapter discusses 'Stone Amphitheatres in the Republican Period', relating their mundane appearance to the functional temporary structures. W. criticizes the view that stone amphitheatre architecture originated in Campania, which is based on the circular assumption that most Republican amphitheatres are located there and tomb paintings from hundreds of years before seem to show gladiatorial combats. Instead, W. sees a prevalence of permanent amphitheatres in Latin, maritime, and veteran colonies and *municipia* (88–91). Veterans would have been accustomed to arena spectacles and the amphitheatre became a way for them to assert Roman identity in areas otherwise inhabited by non-Romans. Similarly, towns that wished to curry favour with Rome might build this quintessentially Roman-style building. She notes the similarities between the architectural form of some Republican amphitheatres and military architecture, as demonstrated at Pompeii where the external staircases resemble the double *ascensus* in Roman military camps (94). The construction of this amphitheatre may well have been conducted under the supervision of military engineers. Taking a closer look at Pompeii, W. also discusses the palaestra and posits a date of construction roughly contemporaneous with the amphitheatre. She interprets it as a training- or exercise-ground of the sort commonly found in Republican military camps, built in conjunction with the amphitheatre.