

at least ‘intellectual authority’) when standing alone, but when a married couple is represented it is always held by the man, and whereas he may be characterized as a philosopher, she is more likely to be his Muse. But particularly intriguing is the surprisingly large number of cross-gendered images: female portrait heads on male bodies and vice versa, resulting in female lion hunters and men appearing with breasts and drapery slipping off one shoulder. I am still not convinced that these cannot be explained as workshop pieces poorly adapted to their clients’ needs, or reused, but B. suggests that these images were deliberately chosen to express the cross-gendered attributes of the person, and that ‘the binary gender system was not the only, or even predominant, way of understanding gender in Roman society’.

B. also comments on the chronological development of the imagery and the changing attitudes it represents. While portraits can be found on sarcophagi as early as the mid-second century, the fashion for them is seen as a third-century phenomenon, especially in the form of the ‘learned figures’. B. sees this as related to a new mental climate in which concepts of the self were being re-negotiated, and perception of female rôles was changing.

The organization of the material, both in the text and in the catalogue, is rather unclear, and the discussion tends to go off at unexpected tangents without concluding the current issue. There are also too many glib and sweeping statements without supporting evidence, especially when discussing funerary symbolism. The expression is at times clumsy to the point of obscurity, and is characterized by the use of ill-defined jargon, such as ‘the negotiation of identity’, ‘role models’ (e.g. ‘the same role models were used for constructing men’s and women’s identities’), or ‘virtues and qualities’ (which the patron wished to be remembered for). Throughout there is a tendency towards incomplete referencing (works cited without page numbers), and there are also some other slips, such as the suggestion that *univira* refers to a wool-working woman, or the apparent mis-identification of a *stola*. There are also rather too many uncorrected typographical errors (e.g. martial for marital).

University of Edinburgh
G.M.Davies@ed.ac.uk

GLENYS DAVIES

doi:10.1017/S007543581400029X

M. GALINIER and F. BARATTE (EDS), *ICONOGRAPHIE FUNÉRAIRE ET SOCIÉTÉ: CORPUS ANTIQUE, APPROCHES NOUVELLES?* Perpignan: Presses Universitaires de Perpignan, 2013. Pp. 271, illus. ISBN 9782354121754. €28.00.

Study of scenes and motifs on Roman sarcophagi has a long history, in which aesthetic forms and inner meaning have been the main interest. But in the ‘cultural turn’ in later twentieth-century scholarship, with its emphasis on social and material factors in the shaping of visual imagery, it moved to consider the contexts in which the images (and the sarcophagi themselves, long neglected) were made, used and viewed. This has opened up rich opportunities for fresh interpretative approaches to sarcophagi and their images, and for exploring their potential as historical source material: social contexts, the polyvalent images and viewers’ responses thus become major considerations.

Such opportunities inspired the colloquium at Perpignan in 2010 from which this volume derives. No introduction sets the agenda for readers, but the final contribution by Robert Turcan relates the fourteen papers to the key themes of society and funerary iconography. Information on the back cover adds that the event was also intended to honour Turcan and Franz Cumont. Despite inevitable variations in quality and innovation, the papers fulfil these aims using many different approaches (although viewer-response is not much involved). Space only permits comment on one paper from each of the two sections, and (in more detail) on the first paper which stands alone.

In this discussion on ‘Franz Cumont et l’interprétation symbolique des sarcophages romains’, Jean-Charles Balty addresses an important need. Published sixty years ago, Cumont’s influential *Recherches sur le symbolisme funéraire des Romains* is undoubtedly due for re-evaluation. Radical changes in approaching Roman funerary art make it seem outmoded, yet there is also a growing sense that if we accept images as polyvalent, then they were also likely to involve symbolism of the kind that Cumont discussed. Balty’s response is largely based on a detailed record of how subsequent scholarship has reacted to the *Recherches*, and what he sees as recurrent concerns or misunderstandings. This paper was abbreviated from his longer study of the topic, which may

explain its particular tack, and why some passages seem over-endowed with supporting references (for instance: 9–12). The first concern is straightforward: B. offers a salutary reminder that Cumont expressly stated that he was not proposing a global (and especially Pythagorean) interpretation as critics often imply. Instead the *Recherches* was ‘la défense et l’illustration’ (9) of the concept of astral immortality, which Cumont had long worked on from a starting-point that was essentially philological. B. then engages with criticisms (16–19) that Cumont’s readings were too sophisticated for the average patron of sarcophagi, and that there are mismatches between the visual representations and the literary and philosophical traditions he attributed to them. These are core issues and could usefully have been given more space. B. gives a measured evaluation of interpretative changes that have happened since, and shows where Cumont may have over-stated his claims. Finally, he rejects criticisms of the integrity of Cumont’s scholarship. It is hard to deny the importance of Cumont’s work, or the need to reconsider its worth, especially in arguing for multiple responses to the imagery; this paper’s focus on criticisms goes some way in doing this, but a different standpoint might have taken it further.

The first part of the book covers archaeological and iconographical contexts. Five papers (Stilp on themes of self-representation, Linant de Bellefonds on images of Phaedra, Janine Balty on Achilles on Scyros, Grassinger on Pelops and Koortbojian on the mythology of everyday life) consider how (mythological) imagery shapes and reflects concerns of ‘real’ life, while Galinier (on the clients of sarcophagi) and Meinecke (on associated cult) address contexts of use and production. Meinecke’s paper exemplifies current work on the physical placement of sarcophagi, but also explores associated funerary rites. It clearly shows the detailed and careful evaluation of different kinds of evidence that is needed before useful conclusions can be reached — and that even then they throw up many questions (some unanswerable from current evidence). Thus she ends (45) with speculations about the rôle played by sarcophagi, and their visibility, before their final installation in the tomb.

‘Provincial contexts and Christianity’ are discussed in the second part, with papers on interactions between different localities of the Empire, as indicated by iconographic models and copies. Baratte considers North African uses of metropolitan imagery, Rodà produces a useful list of Christian sarcophagi of local Carthaginian stone imported to Tarraco, while Gaggadis-Robin poses methodological questions on the iconography of sarcophagi in Gallia Narbonensis. Two further papers explore the influence of early Christian patrons: Studer-Karlen examines how Christian images of the dead differed from those of pagans, while Dresken-Weiland assesses the social basis of subjects chosen for fourth-century sarcophagi (in a resumé of her study of sarcophagi with Christian inscriptions, 248). She shows that they differ from those chosen for Christian catacombs where Old Testament scenes predominate (249), and links this to the higher social status of Christian patrons of sarcophagi. Images of Peter baptizing soldiers (missing in catacombs) may represent the process by which they had embraced Christianity, while several genre scenes from the contemporary repertory of symbolic figures show how Christians developed them for their own ideological purposes. Both these papers make interesting points so far as they go, but apparently suffer from limitations of space: inevitably relations between Christian imagery and its predecessors are particularly nuanced. Ending ‘En somme, et sans vraiment conclure’, Turcan recalls the sheer richness of the material, in terms of what sarcophagi offer in Rome’s plural and changing society, especially when examined from different standpoints. As a collection, the papers in this well-produced book bring a strong and useful focus to these exciting possibilities.

The Open University

Janet.Huskinson@open.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S0075435814000306

JANET HUSKINSON

J. RICHARD, *WATER FOR THE CITY, FOUNTAINS FOR THE PEOPLE: MONUMENTAL FOUNTAINS IN THE ROMAN EAST* (SEMA 9). Turnhout: Brepols, 2012. Pp. xvi + 307, illus. ISBN 9782503534497. €95.00.

This monograph, which stems from Richard’s doctoral thesis, will be of interest to anyone with an interest in fountain studies. R. uses a systems approach to analyse how monumental fountains in Asia Minor, Greece and the Levant functioned within larger urban hydraulic landscapes. Noting that the supply, distribution and drainage of water form a system that can be influenced by