

Journal of Roman Studies

<http://journals.cambridge.org/JRS>

Additional services for ***Journal of Roman Studies***:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



J. Böttcher-Ebers, *DER BOGEN ALS VISUELLES ZEICHEN IM RÖMISCHEN STADTBILD. ZUM BEDEUTUNGSWANDEL EINES ARCHITECTURELEMENTS IN DER SPÄTEN REPUBLIK.* Hamburg: Kovač, 2012. Pp. xiv + 322, 159 pls. isbn 9783830064701. €128.00.

Monika Trümper

Journal of Roman Studies / Volume 103 / November 2013, pp 300 - 301

DOI: 10.1017/S0075435813000397, Published online: 14 October 2013

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0075435813000397

How to cite this article:

Monika Trümper (2013). Journal of Roman Studies, 103, pp 300-301 doi:10.1017/S0075435813000397

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The concluding chapter is particularly interesting. R. convincingly demonstrates (ch. 6) that the cities used a disciplined and organized architectural language that had spread across the entire Roman world, but which was interpreted differently from city to city and from region to region. The shaping of public spaces is the result of a mix of Greek, Hellenistic, Roman and local traditions. The detailed synthesis and the comparisons of various groups of monuments show both the importance of these monuments for the regional identity of the cities, and the strictness of the architectural language. This book will be useful for any scholar of archaeology and for any student interested in the cities of the Roman East under the Empire.

Nantes University
eric.guerber@univ-nantes.fr
doi:10.1017/S0075435813000385

ERIC GUERBER

J. BÖTTCHER-EBERS, *DER BOGEN ALS VISUELLES ZEICHEN IM RÖMISCHEN STADTBILD. ZUM BEDEUTUNGSWANDEL EINES ARCHITECTURELEMENTS IN DER SPÄTEN REPUBLIK*. Hamburg: Kovač, 2012. Pp. xiv+322, 159 pls. ISBN 9783830064701. €128.00.

This book is Böttcher-Ebers' dissertation, submitted in 2006 and revised to partially include literature published until 2011. It aims to examine, beyond a typological approach, the development of the arch as an architectural element and as a distinct feature of façades, as well as its symbolic value in the urban landscape of Roman cities. The main argument is outlined in the introduction (1–16) by a comparative analysis of three monuments: the Stoa of Eumenes II at Athens (first half of second century B.C.), where a series of arches had only a technical function and was disguised by an ashlar wall; the Sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste (late second century B.C.), where arches were consciously employed, combining a technical and visual-decorative function — visible in the façade as the front of barrel vaults, they were flanked by half-columns (arch-in-order or 'fornix' motif); and the Tabularium at Rome (78 B.C.), where the façade with a series of arches no longer had a technical function, but served solely as a decorative veneer of the supporting inner core of the building. Thus, the deliberate use of the arch as a symbol of power and conquest of nature, as an emblem of expertise, progress, and expense in construction, and as an aesthetic, highly decorated and decorative element would, in the Late Hellenistic period, not have been developed and exploited in the eastern Mediterranean, as commonly argued in the literature, but only in Italy. The introduction fails to outline clearly B.-E.'s definition of 'the arch', however, which is obviously very broad because she includes in her study freestanding arches ('Bogenmonumente'), arched entrances and city gates, series of supporting arches, and vaults ending in arches. The main characteristic of this heterogeneous group seems to be the visibility of the arch as such and its opening or permeability, because, strangely enough, the highly decorative feature of the blind arch, which would seemingly be the culmination of B.-E.'s developmental model, is not addressed as a distinct element.

The main argument is discussed, sometimes redundantly, in two main chapters ('II: Arch in Greek-Hellenistic Architecture', 17–30; 'III: Arch in Late Republican Roman Architecture', 31–78, investigating in sub-chapters functional, formal, and decorative features of arches; freestanding arches; urban context and patrons of arches; and depictions of arches on Etruscan urns, coins, and Second Style wall painting), followed by brief conclusions (IV: 79–82) and perspectives (V: 83). The major part of the book constitutes a catalogue with text and illustrations (85–483), whose precise purpose and structure are not sufficiently explained (cf. the brief remarks on p. 15). While the analytical assessment in ch. III is organized according to different building types and features, the catalogue is organized geographically, presenting all sufficiently preserved arched monuments of ten cities in Italy, two cities in Gallia Narbonensis, and one each in Hispania Ulterior Lusitania and Hispania Tarraconensis. Thus, the main text and the catalogue do not obviously complement each other and cannot easily be used together; furthermore, references to catalogue numbers are missing in the captions of the abundant illustrations. The catalogue includes much well-known information, and it is difficult to clearly identify and fully appreciate B.-E.'s own contributions and new insights. Since it does not discuss one clearly defined building type or category (such as bridges, temples, baths), it can also not serve as an obvious, quickly usable reference tool. Most interesting in the catalogue is the brief final assessment for each city ('urban context'), treating the use of arches in the local context. This could often have been more

detailed, integrating in greater depth the respective socio-historical context; local assessments could then have been compared more comprehensively for a broader regional perspective and reconstruction of the potential competition between different cities (cf. the brief comparison on pp. 72–3).

Although B.-E.'s topic and argument are highly relevant for the recent significant increase in scholarly interest in the (Late) Republican period, she engages very little with current intellectual debates, particularly those discussed in Anglophone scholarship. Thus, she never critically assesses what Greek versus Roman meant in the Late Hellenistic/Republican period, with, for example, Greek architects working in Rome; or the much debated rôle and supposed model function of Rome in the development of innovative features and building types, and the 'Hellenization' versus 'Romanization' of cities in Italy. The simultaneous development of arch-architecture in Praeneste and Rome, repeatedly emphasized but not really exploited by B.-E., challenges the idea of Rome's all-encompassing pioneering rôle, at least for the second century B.C. This is further confirmed by P. L. Tucci's important reassessment of the so-called Porticus Aemilia at Rome ('Navalia', *ArchCl* 57, 7 (2006), 173–202), unfortunately missed by B.-E. He argues convincingly that this building served as the Navalia, moving its construction date from the early to the second half of the second century B.C.; while Hermodorus of Salamis may have designed the Navalia after Greek models, the *opus incertum* structure would suggest Roman craftsmanship. Consequently, none of the buildings with arches in Rome that B.-E. includes in her catalogue can safely be dated to the first half of the second century B.C. Intriguing potential 'hybrid' constructions like the Navalia at Rome encourage reinvestigation of the question of agents and the socio-cultural context of design and building processes beyond the patrons of buildings, on whom B.-E. focuses (8, 64–73) and who, unsurprisingly, belonged to local élites; such buildings may have been more numerous in the Late Hellenistic period than suggested by B.-E.'s clear-cut distinction between eastern versus western Mediterranean architecture. How would the monolithic marble arches with mouldings and rosettes, which decorated doorways in several buildings in Delos after 167/166 B.C., fit into her model (see M.-Chr. Hellmann, *L'architecture grecque* vol. 1 (2002), 275, fig. 370, unfortunately not cited in B.-E.'s ch. II)?

Due to the lack of space, critical remarks may have prevailed unduly in this review. B.-E. discusses a fascinating topic, has successfully studied an impressive amount of monuments, and presents an overall convincing argument. Her book would have profited from a more rigorous revision, however, transforming a dissertation into a succinct, focused study.

Freie Universität Berlin
monika.truemper@fu-berlin.de
doi:10.1017/S0075435813000397

MONIKA TRÜMPER

F. YEGÜL, *BATHING IN THE ROMAN WORLD*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Pp. xiii + 256, illus. ISBN 9780521840323 (bound); 9780521549622 (paper). £64.00 (bound); £18.99 (paper).

In his preface Fikret Yegül describes his book as a general, yet generous, review of bathing in the Roman world. His finished product, however, exceeds all such stated parameters in terms of breadth of material, chronological span and sophistication of analysis. From the outset Y. launches into an energetic, informative, and clearly indulgent, social exploration of the habit of Roman bathing; a ritual which was, by nature, integrally harnessed to the architectural framework of the bathhouse.

The framework of the book follows a geographic, thematic and chronological progress, building to an informative appraisal of legacy and influence beyond Roman parameters. The book's twelve chapters can be grouped into three loose thematic categories: chs 1–4 constitute social reviews of the bathing practice; chs 5–7 address the development of the Roman bath in terms of architecture and technology; while chs 10–12 explore the legacy of the Roman bath and its survival beyond the cultural circumstances governing its conception.

In chs 1–4 bathing is presented as a daily ritual practised by all classes, thereby prompting an investigation into social behaviour in a range of facilities, from imperial and opulent to small urban institutions. In ch. 3 Y. dispenses with the traditionally strictly-ordered sequence of bathing in keeping with its loose adherence in antiquity. Instead, a more convivial atmosphere is conveyed through abundant reference to Martial, inscriptions in Asia Minor and graffiti at Herculaneum,