

Si tratta evidentemente di un importantissimo strumento di lavoro. Per questo gli studiosi devono esprimere la loro gratitudine ai colleghi bolognesi e, perché no, anche un po’ d’invidia. Magari altre regioni dell’Italia ricevessero simili utili repertori!

Heikki Solin


All those interested in Pompeian studies as well as in ancient art will be pleased to receive the recently-published corpus of First Style decorations in Pompeii which the author is known to have patiently been preparing for several years. The book is, as stated in the introduction (p. 1) “a record of approximately 400 examples of First Style mural decoration in Pompeii, based on a study of 180 buildings that have or once had, such decoration.” The descriptions and reconstructions of the First Style decorations are the main content presented in the catalogue which thus understandably occupies the largest part of the work (pp. 45—329). The catalogue is organized topographically, separating private and public buildings and tombs, and, as is stated in the introduction, “Each entry includes the following:
dates of excavation; dimensions of the atrium (if there is one) to give some idea of the original size and importance of the house; a description of the structure of the facade and atrium, and of the structure, preservation, pattern, and dimensions of each often very fragmentary First Style decoration in that house; and a bibliography for the building as a whole.” (The bibliographies are not aimed to be complete.)

The catalogue is preceded by chapter 1, which contains a definition and a description of state of scholarship on the subject, chapter 2, which contains technical and stylistic consideration, and chapter 3, which contains chronological considerations (pp. 15—46), which, of course, are based on the subsequent catalogue. In the introduction a concise but useful commentary on the bibliography is also given. Very useful and comprehensive are also the several lists of illustrations with sources, and the glossary in which the technical terms are not only defined, but also given in Italian, French, German and (modern) Greek (pp. XXVII—XLVI). The appendices include lists of characteristic elements of First Style patterns, listed by location, topographical indices, concordance of names and locations, and a list of catalogued buildings with dates of excavation. No work remains without remarks: in my opinion the term “garland” should be used only of subjects that actually represent one, and not as Laidlaw does, e.g. of the scroll in the painted fascia in the oecus n. 44 in the Casa del Fauno. This widespread subject is in literature called “peopled scroll” or “inhabited scroll”. In general the work seems to have been diligently and accurately executed, and as a record of the respective material it is very useful as it stands.

However, it could have been even more useful with a wider discussion and a deeper analysis. The very brief conclusions on p. 330 point out the problems in First Style decoration which, according to the author, are the most significant ones (definition, typology, relation to the Second Style, comparison with Delian patterns, chronology). We learn that “the term First Style refers to a type of mural decoration, not to a period of time”, as has misleadingly been the practice since Mau. The First Style “generally went out of vogue in Central Italy about 70 B.C.”, but “In Pompeii, however, the First Style continued to be used on exteriors of many public buildings and tombs, and was occasionally renewed or copied in the private houses even after the earthquake of A.D. 62.” this is noteworthy as is the observation that “there is reason to believe that throughout the life of Pompeii the First Style always retained an association with old-fashioned values.” In the discussion (p. 45—46), however, it is only stated that the First Style “creates rather severe and grandiose effects” and is associated with concepts “that the Romans especially valued, such as gravitas and mos maiorum.” On p. 17 the author suggests that the First Style decorations later than 80 B.C. (which has been the usual terminus ante quem for Pompeii) were made “for people with old-fashioned tastes, or perhaps for Roman colonists who wanted to seem to belong to the old establishment in Pompeii”. Unfortunately the author does not present any further evidence or a discussion of the questions bearing on this interesting statement, which obviously would deserve more detailed discussion. Why and how did the First Style decoration, so clearly part of the Hellenistic artistic koine, become associated with old-fashioned Roman values? If this is the case, can the absence of evidence in places such as the capital be only a question of preservation? Of whose maiores and of what kind of Romanity are we, in fact, dealing?

On p. 37 we read: “Thus, the Delian and Pompeian examples of First Style decorations
typify one of the basic differences between Greek and Roman perceptions of decorative design: the Greek artist saw the First Style pattern as an individual decorative unit on a single wall, whereas the Roman saw it as the boundary of a continuous enclosed space.” The implications of this interesting observation would also have deserved a discussion in a wider context. I also missed a discussion of the possibilities of interpreting and identifying the few figurative representations which are mentioned on pp. 31—34.

A remark of purely practical character concerns the numeration of the houses, for which the author has used only Arabic numerals instead of the usual combination of Roman numerals for indicating the Region and Arabic for indicating the houses. Even if the Arabic numerals may be more practical than the Roman ones, this new practice is most irritating and confusing because the old tradition is so deeply rooted.

With the above reservations I find this work very useful. It is to be hoped that we could test the work in practise in the immediate future: this can be done with the publication of the so far unpublished findings at Fregellae in July 1987 of which Mr. T. Sironen kindly informs me: in the so-called Villa Opia 2 a rather large fragment of a First Style painting dated around the end of the 3rd or beginning of the 2nd c. B.C. has been found. As far as I know this would be the earliest example of First Style painting preserved on Italian soil.

Antero Tammisto


In the present volume Charlotte Scheffer describes nine marble cinerary urns from five different Stockholm collections. Most of the objects, which date from the first two centuries A.D., have already been known for a long time (among the more recent acquisitions mention can be made to nr. 1 = MM 1966:2, nr. 4 [without inv.nr.] and nr. 8 = MM 1958:13). The scope of the volume is to analyse the urns themselves and their decoration and not so much the inscriptions, of which some are already included in CIL VI (nr. 3 = 27029, nr. 5 = 22805, nr. 6 = 29237, nr. 7 = 11793). The descriptions are in general reliable, though some self-evident matters could have been left unsaid. This concerns above all the chapter on the possible meaning of the decoration (59ff.). As for the marine motifs and their alleged relation to the Islands of the Blessed, I cannot find any reference to B. Andreae’s Studien zur römischen Grabkunst (1963), 131ff., where these and related questions have already been dealt with.

The chapter beginning on p. 64 deals with the people and their names on the inscriptions. Again, all this could have been said much more briefly. What is especially striking here, is the interpretation of some of the names, like “Brytto is possibly a derivation from Brutus, stupid, and if this is so, the only pejorative in the names” (66f. with note 143). The name is rather a graphic variant of Britto (Kajanto, LC 201). And one should be more cautious with such statements as “Crispus, the curly-haired, gives us an idea of what the person looked like. Agrippina is derived from Agrippa — what could be more Roman than