

Langer and Pfanner) establishes which parts of the relief are ancient; its connection with the pediment showing the *lupa romana*, Mars, and Rhea Silvia in the Museo delle Terme; a likely reconstruction of the relief as a sacrifice in front of this temple; and a Claudian date, which rules out the majority of previous interpretations. The authors point to the extraordinary size and quality of workmanship of the relief, while emphasizing the impossibility of identifying the temple and event with any certainty; they tentatively suggest that it may refer to the *ludi saeculares* of A.D. 47, celebrating the 800th anniversary of Rome's foundation in front of the Pantheon.

The centrepiece of the catalogue is the Cancelleria reliefs, discussed over some seventy pages and documented in twenty-eight in-text illustrations and fifty-two plates (Langer and Pfanner). Despite the extraordinary attention these reliefs have attracted, this is their first full publication since Magi's initial 1940 monograph, with important corrections on measurements and technical details that impact on their interpretation. The reliefs were set into the façade of a building or monument (for which M. Wolf offers some tentative suggestions); they were executed on the building; and the entire building must have been destroyed at the time they were removed, with no re-use intended. It is now beyond doubt not only that the head of Nerva was reworked from a portrait of Domitian, but also that Vespasian's head was secondary, excluding the identification of the togate man opposite Vespasian as Domitian. As the authors convincingly argue, he is rather a generic figure, and should be seen as the representative of a group of people or a personification. The extensive discussion of possible interpretations does not arrive at any firm conclusions, beyond the general observation that relief A depicts a *profectio* in a military context and relief B an *adventus* in a civic context. Yet the authors stress the fact that Nerva is here referring back to Vespasian as his predecessor, in a legitimising strategy that is otherwise unattested.

Against this background, it is unfortunate that the same attention has not been given to the 'Ara of the Vicomagistri' (1, Liverani). Its fragments were found together with the 'Cancelleria reliefs' and are therefore discussed outside the otherwise chronological sequence of entries. Yet Liverani's very competent discussion is extremely compact, and makes no reference to the discussion of the archaeological context described in Cat. 2 (which also shows that the traditional Hadrianic date for the reliefs' deposition is unlikely). Liverani confirms that the two relief fragments cannot be linked directly, and possibly featured on two opposite sides of a larger monument (an altar like the one inside the Ara Pacis?). So why, then, does pl. 1 show the two reliefs combined? An up-to-date documentation of measurements and technical details as provided for other monuments in the volume would also have been appreciated.

Some readers may be disappointed that many discussions end in *aporia* when it comes to the identification of specific events and/or locations depicted in these reliefs. After all, our very definition of this category of 'historical reliefs' begs the question. Their original contexts are lost, and their iconographies are often unique, depriving us of our most powerful interpretive tools. The authors of this volume err on the side of caution, and expose uncertainties and contradictions in previous scholarship. Yet their discussions are models of how scrutiny of details, whether technical or iconographical, can achieve results even in the most difficult circumstances. Moreover, dating as they do predominantly to the first centuries B.C. and A.D., the reliefs demonstrate the quantity of such works being produced at this period, as well as their enormous variability and innovative character.

University of Exeter
B.E.Borg@exeter.ac.uk

BARBARA E. BORG

doi:10.1017/S0075435820000982

NATHANIEL B. JONES, *PAINTING, ETHICS, AND AESTHETICS IN ROME* (Greek culture in the Roman world). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019. Pp. xviii + 291, illus. ISBN 9781108420129. £75.00.

Despite the rich scholarship on Roman replications of Greek sculpture, painting poses a problem. Roman frescoes may have looked to Greek panel paintings for inspiration, but there are few if any straightforward 'copies', and the discrepancy between archaeological evidence and literary sources gapes more widely than for other artistic media. Into this scholarly dilemma steps Nathaniel Jones,

with a subtle analysis of the myriad ways in which Roman mural painting incorporated, reflected and elaborated upon Greek painting traditions during the late republican and early imperial periods.

J. focuses upon the Roman predilection for ‘meta-painting’—the ‘painting of painting’ that began in murals of the Second Style, permitting genres such as mythological narrative, landscape, erotica and ‘still life’ to be framed within architectural perspectives. Drawing on studies of meta-pictoriality by W. J. T. Mitchell, Louis Marin and Victor Stoichita, J. demonstrates that devices seen as typical of early modernity have a complex prehistory that is worthy of attention in its own right. In his opening chapter, he peels back the layers of historiographical reception that have shaped modern assumptions about the Roman *pinacotheca* style, parsing the scholarly gymnastics of Winckelmann and others as they sought to reconcile the ‘Greek’ content of fictive panel paintings with the ‘Romanitas’ of the frescoed walls from which they had been literally and virtually excised. Key to this enduring tension is the idea of fictionality—the dizzying duality of a hypothetical ‘as-if’ in which Hellenising panels can operate as second-order fictions within the first-order fiction of mural schemes. In their use of meta-pictorial framing elements, Roman paintings of paintings are both ‘doubling and disrupting’, illusionistic and recursively self-disclosing. As such, they are compelling visual agents that perform both theory and history, existing in a complicated relationship to both place and time.

In his second chapter, J. outlines antiquity’s longer tradition of meta-pictoriality whilst nodding to broader theories of framing, from Kant’s problematic notion of the *parergon* to Derrida’s deconstructive response and Stoichita’s analysis of the ‘self-aware’ image’s play between surface and aperture. His approach aligns with the 2017 volume on *The Frame in Classical Art* edited by Michael Squire and myself, but extends the debate by putting Roman pictorial fictiveness into conversation with epigraphic evidence for the Greek lexicon of painted panels. The rich vocabulary applied to *pinakes* in Hellenistic inventories from Delos provides precise precedents for panel types depicted in Roman fresco painting (whether shuttered, pierced, suspended or embedded), suggesting that they corresponded to well-known classes of objects. These were creatively incorporated into mural compositions that depended on the material ‘independence’ of their second-order fictions while subsuming them within their own material surfaces. Importantly, J. observes, Roman frescoes rarely ‘break’ their internal frames in overt disruptions of their own fictiveness (unlike Attic vase-paintings), but prefer to emphasise the painted panel’s material and ontological autonomy.

Why this should be is explored in ch. 3, which contextualises the use of meta-painting in first-century B.C.E. houses on the Palatine (the so-called Houses of Augustus and Livia) within Roman attitudes to the collection and display of Greek art. Here J. distances himself from overtly programmatic readings, looking instead to broader Roman debates over the appropriate incorporation of Greek *spolia* into the public and private realms. Fictive panel paintings, he argues, traffic in ‘both specificity and vagueness’ (112), engaging in ‘deeply complex layering of fictions, games of mediation, and articulations of history’ (113) that are inextricable from the ‘bifurcated’ value ascribed to art in a culture that, as Cicero proclaimed, ‘loved public munificence but abhorred private luxury’ (116, citing *Mur.* 76). They could import the aesthetics of Greek painting whilst distancing their material referents, which were more morally acceptable (and politically effective) when displayed in the public setting of portico or temple. This process required complex acts of remediation, which J. explores in ch. 4 (on ‘Medium and Materiality’), the book’s most original contribution to the field. Drawing on Bolter and Grusin’s analysis of the play between ‘immediacy’ and ‘hypermediacy’ in the visual arts, J. explores how the Villa della Farnesina frescoes simultaneously reify and destabilise acts of illusionistic representation, particularly through their use of monochrome grounds, which operate as both opaque material surface and transparent ‘atmosphere’ (thus evoking Aristotle’s notion of the medium as diaphanous *metaxu*). In ch. 5 (‘Paradigms, Ensembles, and Anachronisms’), this ‘dual logic’ is extended to a broader (albeit familiar) range of fictive collections. Rather than casting these as virtual *pinacothecae* that advance a triumphalist narrative of Roman appropriation through replication (dependent upon a teleological and encyclopaedic model of art history), J. suggests that their fictive panels should be understood according to a model of ‘paradigmatic participation’ that operates according to ‘open-ended relations of exemplarity’ (179). Remediation liberates the painted wall to participate in a more creative, flexible and even ironic relationship of ‘anachronicity’, whereby Roman art can participate in the history of Greek painting on its own terms, celebrating its own virtuosity in the process.

Painting, Ethics, and Aesthetics in Rome is an exciting and important contribution to the field of ancient painting that should be read by anyone working on Roman art and Roman receptions of Greek culture. Theoretically sophisticated, clearly written and carefully historicised, it skilfully employs visual and literary evidence to illustrate complex arguments about representation, mediation and cultural translation. In many respects, J. brings to compelling conclusion a set of questions about illusion, pictorialism and representation that have dominated the field of ancient painting studies for some time. Where questions remain, they pertain to that continuous material surface that is the Roman fresco itself. Although J. is alive to the medial complexities at work in fictive panels, he tends to pass over the self-effacing media of plaster and pigment that made such first- and second-order fictions possible in the first place. The fiction of a dematerialised category of the 'aesthetic' is itself dependent upon the material conditions in which such fictionality plays out; we would do well to remember that the fantasy of remediation is inseparable from those abstract, non-figural components of the painted wall that enable, exceed and defy the seductions of representation.

Cornell University
vjp33@cornell.edu

VERITY PLATT

doi:10.1017/S0075435820001057

ROSEMARY J. BARROW, *GENDER, IDENTITY AND THE BODY IN GREEK AND ROMAN SCULPTURE*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018. Pp. xvii + 225, illus. ISBN 9781107039544. £75.00.

GLENYS DAVIES, *GENDER AND BODY LANGUAGE IN ROMAN ART*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018. Pp. xii + 357, illus. ISBN 9780521842730. £90.00.

That the fields of Greek and Roman sculpture have been reinvigorated by studies of gender, the body and identity is an understatement. These concerns have reshaped the contours of these fields by enriching and sharpening the more traditional focus on aesthetic appreciation, historical development and social contexts of cult and funerary ritual or institutional power. Of course, ancient sculpture's primary subject of representation, the body, provokes questions of gender and sexuality head on. In recent years, scholarship has been produced at a prodigious pace on a widening variety of topics, from familiar territory to the rather esoteric. Both volumes under review provide clarification and reassessment of common goals and methods to varying degrees.

Rosemary Barrow's book, which was prepared for publication after her premature death by Michael Silk with the assistance of Jaś Elsner, Sebastian Matzner and Michael Squire, offers ten case studies of works of sculpture chosen to illustrate a specific category of body. Most of the case studies focus on major monuments of the canon: the Doryphoros, Aphrodite of Knidos, the Drunken Old Woman, the Sleeping Hermaphrodite and the Augustus of Prima Porta. Lesser-known works, such as the Tanagra figurines, a Roman portrait of a matron as Venus, a relief depicting female gladiators and a statuette of Pan and a she-goat, are also included in the volume and arranged in chronological order (except for the gladiator relief, which can only be assigned a date in the first two centuries C.E., and the Pan and she-goat statuette from Herculaneum, probably dating to the first century C.E., that bring up the rear of the volume).

The volume begins with a valuable introduction, 'Approaching Gender' (1–20), that assesses the advances of women's studies in the 1970s through the '90s, beginning with attempts to define the experiences of women in antiquity and then exploring a more dynamic system of gender construction. Definitions of sexual identity have also moved away from the anachronistic modern notion that it is determined by biological sex; in antiquity, the sexual act itself mattered more, as did, in particular, the power wielded by the dominant partner. Social construction is given its due through Judith Butler's theory of the performative function of gender. Visual culture analyses the experience of viewing, but formulates it as a series of polar opposites: male/female, active/passive, watching/being watched (6). Laura Mulvey's theory of the gaze (although now corrected to the 'look' in contemporary feminist film theory) makes its inevitable appearance in this discussion of the spectacle of the body. It is to B.'s credit that she dispatches the theoretical approaches with clear, straightforward language that tethers abstractions to ancient social practices and works of