

Half of the book comprises actual text (1–220) and substantial endnotes (223–77), with the other half a detailed catalogue of the material evidence used in the text, often with further discussion of details (279–390), tables of depictions of wreaths and of Jupiter on Republican coinage (based on *RRC*) and of Jupiter on non-numismatic evidence (based on *LIMC*) (391–473), and indices of images, textual and epigraphic evidence, names, places, and monuments (475–515). The analysis, in short, is based upon painstakingly assembled source material. This analysis, in turn, is divided into four parts. A fairly short first chapter (5–35) deals with the wreath in cult, followed by a longer one (37–108) analysing the rôle of wreaths during triumphs. By far the longest chapter (109–83) looks at the function of the *corona graminea* (112–34) and the *corona civica* (135–83) in a military context, after which B. discusses (185–205) how the *corona civica* became an important symbol for the princeps outside of its original military context.

The very evidence-based approach of this book works well. B. rightly observes that in a ritual context there was no general regulation about wearing wreaths, and that depictions of wreathed participants could therefore be used to indicate status, as she shows by a fresh reading of the *Ara Pacis* (18–35). Likewise, meticulous attention to the evidence concerning the laurel and gold wreath worn by the triumphator leads to suggestive views on the Boscoreale Cup and Trajan's Palestrina relief (98–108). Unfortunately, however, B. has not made use of Mary Beard's important observations in *The Roman Triumph* (2007) about the reliability of triumphal accounts and depictions in this section, nor of Ida Östenberg's thorough analysis of depictions of Roman triumphal processions in *Staging the World* (2009). B.'s suggestion, in her valuable third chapter, that Caesar is shown wearing the *corona graminea* on coinage from 44 B.C., convinces again through the systematic combination of all literary and material (numismatic) evidence (114–31). Finally, a detailed account of the development of the use of the *corona graminea* and *corona civica* by individuals in late Republican times makes clear how Octavian consciously made the former a '*corona non grata*' (202) as a result of the specific historical development of that particular wreath. He instead chose the latter as the wreath with which he was to be depicted post 27 B.C. The *civica*, as B. shows, was less 'tainted' than the *graminea* by Caesar and the civil wars.

There is, then, much of value in this book. More importantly, the clear way in which the evidence is assembled, made accessible and interpreted will make this solid work of great use for a long time to come, especially for scholars interested in the construction of the image of the first princeps. It is, however, not always easy to read, especially as some of the detailed discussions do not seem to lead to a development of argument, but are rather tangential. Still, they are always interesting, and through its methodical eye for detail the book shows how much can be learned from systematic study of one symbol. One can only hope that an analysis of the ways in which wreaths changed meaning in the post-Augustan period will follow soon.

Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen
o.hekster@let.ru.nl

OLIVIER HEKSTER

doi:10.1017/S0075435812000196

C. MAZZONI, *SHE-WOLF: THE STORY OF A ROMAN ICON*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Pp. xiv + 282, 19 illus. ISBN 9780521145664. £17.99.

In 296 B.C. the curule aediles Cn. Ogulnius and Q. Ogulnius set up at the Ficus Ruminalis 'images of the city's infant founders under the she-wolf's teats' (Livy 10.23.11–12); a 'bronze group of old-fashioned workmanship' showing the wolf suckling the twins was still to be seen in the Augustan age, in a precinct close to the Lupercal 'on the street leading to the Circus Maximus' (Dion. Hal., *Ant. Rom.* 1.79.8). The reverse of an early didrachm issue (*RRC* 20.1), often dated to Q. Ogulnius' consulship in 269 B.C., presumably reproduces the form of the statue-group, and other coin issues from the late third and second centuries B.C. (*RRC* 39.3, 183.1–6, 235.1, 287.1) show the same iconography: the wolf is standing, but turning her head back and down to attend to the twins.

There was another such statue-group on the Capitol, which in 65 B.C. was struck by lightning and thrown down from its pedestal in a portentous storm (Cic., *Cat.* 3.19; *Div.* 1.19–20; 2.45 and 47; Dio 37.9.1; *Obsequens* 61). Since Cicero says the wolf 'left her torn-off footprints' (*De consulatu suo* 46 Courtney), we may infer that there too she was represented standing. Virgil (*Aen.* 8.631), however, offers the more realistic scene of the she-wolf lying down to feed the twins, and that is how we see her in the earliest visual evidence, a fourth-century B.C. bronze mirror, probably from Praeneste, showing

twin sucklings who may or may not be Romulus and Remus (illustrated and discussed in T. P. Wiseman, *Remus* (1995), 65–71).

The denarius issue of P. Satrienus in 77 B.C. (RRC 388.1) shows a she-wolf standing and looking forward, with one foreleg raised and no suckling infants beneath her. She is a fierce maternal beast, but what does she represent? Given that the turned head ('tereti ceruice reflexa', Virg., *Aen.* 8.633) and the act of licking the twins (Livy 1.4.6; Virg., *Aen.* 8.634; Dion. Hal., *Ant. Rom.* 1.79.6; Ovid, *Fasti* 2.418; *Origo gentis Romanae* 20.3) seem to be essential to the suckling scene, one might even doubt whether Satrienus' she-wolf refers to the founders' myth at all.

There is a reason why these details matter, and for more than five centuries it has been on display at the Palazzo dei Conservatori on the Campidoglio in Rome. The wonderful bronze *lupa Capitolina* was a gift to the city from Pope Sixtus IV in 1471; the twins beneath her are a fifteenth-century addition, attributed to Antonio Pollaiuolo (c. 1426–1496). She is first attested in a chronicler of about A.D. 995, reporting a ninth-century verdict at the pontifical judgement-seat at the Lateran, which was called *ad lupam* after 'the mother of the Romans' (MGH *Scriptores* 3.712); at some point she was placed high on the wall of the Torre degli Annibaldi on the north side of the Lateran piazza, as illustrated in the drawing of a lost fresco of 1438–40 that was in the right transept of the Lateran basilica. Standing, with her head only half turned and not looking down, she has much more in common with the she-wolf of the Satrienus denarii than with what we know of the Ogulnian suckling-twins group.

All this, and more, can be found in an excellent book by the Director of the Capitoline Museums (Claudio Parisi Presicce, *La lupa Capitolina* (2000)), written for a Millennium exhibition welcoming the she-wolf back to public view after a detailed restoration programme. That work revealed that the clay of the original model, some of which survives inside, came from the Tiber valley between Orvieto and Rome, while the metal itself contained lead mined in Sardinia. That is consistent with the scholarly *communis opinio*, that the *lupa* is an archaic Etruscan masterpiece. But the opportunity was also taken to apply radiocarbon testing to the surviving material inside, and though Presicce is evasive about the results, the technical director of the programme insists that they suggest the piece was cast in the eighth century A.D. (Anna Maria Carruba, *La lupa Capitolina: un bronzo medioevale* (2006)). So who is right, the scientists or the connoisseurs?

This, surely, is a moment for 'cultural studies'. The talisman of Rome, a symbol universally recognized, is being fought over by two apparently irreconcilable intellectual traditions. What is at stake in this contest? What difference will the outcome make?

It has to be said that Cristina Mazzoni's new book does not rise to the occasion: for her, the dating dispute is just a dinner-party discussion topic (38–9). The book itself is intelligent, well written, very wide-ranging, and fashionably reluctant to privilege the significant over the banal (Presicce gets less attention than *The Lonely Planet Guide to Rome*). Readers who are taken aback to find ancient texts referred to by the page numbers of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century translations must be content with the author's declaration that 'the eclectic style of my criticism comes from training in comparative literature' (xiii). But what strikes one most is the absence of an identifiable argument: 'Although scholars eventually may agree on one detail or another of the she-wolf's significance, the beast's full meaning is and will likely remain inscrutable. One would do well to suspect at this point in our interpretive journey that there may be no single, complete, and ultimate meaning to be discovered' (172). Well, of course — but in that case, is the purpose of the book merely to show what we already knew, that the she-wolf symbolizes Rome, and Rome means different things to different people?

University of Exeter
T.P.Wiseman@exeter.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435812000202

T. P. WISEMAN

S. DYSON, *ROME: A LIVING PORTRAIT OF AN ANCIENT CITY*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010. Pp. xv + 467, illus. ISBN 9780801892530 (bound); 9780801892547 (paper). £39.00 (bound); £18.00 (paper).

Dyson states at the outset that his aim was to write a book designed as 'an introduction to the ancient city for the student or tourist who wants an overview rather than a detailed consideration of individual sites and remains'. One of the problems with the standard tourist image of ancient Rome is that it never changes. Rome is the eternal city of the Colosseum, the Pantheon and the