

of imperial portraits in *Pont.* 2.8, drawing on Marx's notion of *Warenfetischismus* to bridge the gap between representation and social relations. For Pandey, as much as Ovid might reproduce hegemonic forms of consumption, he also mobilises a shared image for ideological contestation and the creation of his own agency. Clare Rowan's interrogation of lead tokens and coinage makes a strong case for the way everyday, ubiquitous portraits of the emperor became a form of 'pre-mediation', the raw material through which other experiences and ways of being might be expressed and communicated.

But in a work concerned with the multiplicities of relational meaning-making and their social dimensions, it is striking that explicit discussions of semiotics are rare ('modern media studies', perhaps unfairly caricatured as privileging two-sided models of communication, are dismissed as too simplistic: 10). Every paper is concerned with the range of ways producers and consumers of imperial images might situate such signs in relation to particular referents — many of which may have had little to do explicitly with the emperor — and with how mediating individuals or groups might exploit (often, in the accounts put forward here, primarily in calculating and self-serving ways) the instability and indeterminacy of the sign–referent relationship. This is precisely the area with which contemporary semiotic studies are concerned, and these might well offer solutions to one of the central problems left unresolved in the volume: the implications of signification (rather than the signs themselves) for the reproduction of social inequalities.

Throughout the volume, the pairing of 'images *and* ideology' is a common refrain — perhaps because the relationship between the two (if they are ever actually separate entities!) is never fully expressed. Indeed, the existence of an independent imperial ideology is taken as a given in most chapters, drifting above its articulations as unmediated expectation (for example, of emperor-worship) or transmittable from the emperor as a kind of 'memo' (204). Each chapter may de-centre the emperor from imperial imagery, but 'ideology' grants him a back door through which he might sneakily return to the heart of power relationships.

The tensions exposed by the papers here — the decentralised centrality of the emperor, the multiple latent referents and potential divergent 'meanings' pulling in different directions, the localised instantiations of globalised images — ultimately expose what may be the central problem in Roman art and society: how modes of signification themselves recursively created the power structures of empire, distinguished between agentive producers and passive consumers, made subjects and objects. Anthropologists like Webb Keane have drawn attention to the roles that 'semiotic ideology' (an alternative to 'images and ideology') might play in determining historically specific structures of power (e.g. *Language & Communication* 23 (2003), 409–25); his work could offer a template for how to proceed from the foundations laid here. Closer to home, one might look to Jeremy Tanner's work (*JRS* 90 (2000), 18–50, perhaps ignored in the present volume for its focus on pre-imperial images) as a means of bridging the conceptual chasm between material representations and social power.

Still, the volume contributions collectively offer a powerful critique of many models that continue to shape accounts of Roman imagery and society. It will be a key point of reference for future work on the social history of art in the Roman Empire. And, perhaps like a *vicomagister*, African *flamen* or client-king, it will begin to pivot us from studies of signs to studies of signification.

University of British Columbia

matthew.mccarty@ubc.ca

doi:10.1017/S0075435822000909

MATTHEW M. MCCARTY

© The Author(s), 2022. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

ANNE WOLSFELD, *DIE BILDNISREPRÄSENTATION DES TITUS UND DES DOMITIAN* (Tübinger Archäologische Forschungen 32). Rahden: Verlag Marie Leidorf, 2021. Pp. x + 398, illus. ISBN 9783896468635. €69.80.

Anna Wolsfeld's adaptation of their 2015 dissertation brings together, for the first time since Max Wegner and Georg Daltrop's 1966 study, all the extant portraits of Titus and Domitian and proposes a new typological categorisation using the established *Kopienkritik* method. This is, however, not the sole aim of the work. W. also analyses the portraits of Titus and Domitian as

part of the development of Roman imperial representation at large – to find out how they were perceived in relationship to those of emperors that came before and after.

Around half of the work comprises actual text (1–220), with the other half devoted to a catalogue with detailed descriptions of the extant portraits (221–327), bibliographic references and indices (329–98), fifteen appendices and 111 plates. The analysis is divided into five parts. The first (3–10) discusses the production and dissemination of imperial portraits in the ancient world, contains a short theoretical discussion on the imperial portrait as a means of communication, and provides an overview of previous research on the subject. Part II (11–13) presents the reader with the aim and scope of the study, in which it is stipulated that the analysis will roughly adopt a top-down structure (literally), starting with the portrait head (Part III, 15–97), followed by the statue/bust body and context of display (Part IV, 100–210), and concluding with a discussion on Titus and Domitian's (self-)representation within the larger context of Roman imperial rule (Part V, 211–20).

The comprehensiveness of this book is praiseworthy. W. provides detailed descriptions and discussions of the various portraits of Titus and Domitian (19–97), their statuary format (104–85), material (185–91), headgear (191–5) and presence in group displays (195–203). The book's diachronic interest is not limited to Part V, but resonates throughout, particularly when it comes to positioning the portraits of Titus and Domitian in relation with those of their Julio-Claudian predecessors. For example, W. shows that the Neronian trend to portray the emperor in military guise intensified under the Flavians in order to convey their military achievements, and, as such, this practice built on a recognisable (and by then acceptable) mode of representation. Similarly, W. demonstrates that the portraits of Titus and especially Domitian presented their viewers with luxurious hairstyles and youthful facial features, both characteristics of Nero's later portraits, while maintaining their typical Flavian physiognomy. Despite similarities, W. argues that these features could not have been meant to evoke Nero's memory (87–8, 216). Instead, the luxurious hairstyles followed a 'Zeittrend' (216) and were meant to convey the notions of *otium* and *luxuria* (86–7, 90–95). However, this raises a larger question. If we only look elsewhere to explain similarities between portraits of 'good' and 'bad' emperors, do we not merely reinforce the good/bad emperor narrative? If so, there is a risk that this narrative becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. E. Varner's chapter on the Flavian response to Nero's imagery in S. Bartsch *et al.* (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Nero* (2017), which W. unfortunately does not mention, provides an alternative view on this subject.

The majority of the entries in W.'s catalogue (Part VI) are concerned with freestanding portraits of Titus and Domitian. The remaining entries include cameos and relief sculptures depicting Titus or Domitian, and headless statue bodies that are reasonably certain once to have depicted Titus or Domitian. As such, it provides a commendable overview of the available source material, which will undoubtedly be valuable to many researchers. Readers may be surprised to find portraits of Augustus (D80), Vespasian (D66b), Nerva (D2, 33, 51, 59, 66a, U1, DM2–7), Trajan (D9, 14, 50, 54, 60–61, 71, 73, U10, U18, DM8–18) and some late antique emperors (D47, U8) listed as 'Bildnisse des Domitian' or 'Unsichere Bildnisse des Titus und des Domitian'. These are included in the catalogue because they reveal traces of recarving that allow W. to establish Domitian as their original subject. Although each of these portraits gives us important insights into Domitian's representation, they should probably have been listed as a separate category as they do not represent Domitian in their current state.

Most of the individual entries in the catalogue are described using a standardised format: provenance, material, size, state of preservation, reworking (if applicable), costume and attributes (*idem*), date and bibliography. Unfortunately, the entries have not been made available in a digital format, nor are tables and maps provided to the reader. W.'s comprehensive corpus may therefore be less accessible to historians interested in larger chronological developments and/or geographical trends. The bibliography is up to date, though with some noteworthy exceptions. In addition to the above-mentioned *Cambridge Companion to the Age of Nero* (2017), which includes contributions by E. Varner and C. Vout on Nero's portraiture and the Flavians' response to it, W. has not made use of M. Bradley's article in *PBSR* 79 (2011) on the iconography of under/overweight body types in Roman art – a defining feature of imperial representation in the period under discussion.

All in all, these criticisms should not detract from the many strengths of the book. The structured way in which the evidence is assembled and interpreted will make this work of great use to scholars

interested in Titus and Domitian's visual representation and/or Roman imperial representation at large.

Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
s.j.m.heijnen@vu.nl

SAM J.M. HEIJNEN

doi:10.1017/S0075435823000047

© The Author(s), 2023. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

OLYMPIA BOBOU, JESPER VESTERGAARD JENSEN, NATHALIA BREINTOFT KRISTENSEN, RUBINA RAJA and RIKKE RANDERIS THOMSEN (EDS), *STUDIES ON PALMYRENE SCULPTURE: A TRANSLATION OF HARALD INGHOLT'S STUDIER OVER PALMYRENSK SKULPTUR: EDITED AND WITH COMMENTARY* (Studies in Palmyrene archaeology and history 1). Turnhout: Brepols, 2021. Pp. xxii + 562, illus. ISBN 9782503591247. €115.00.

MAURA HEYN and RUBINA RAJA (EDS), *INDIVIDUALIZING THE DEAD: ATTRIBUTES IN PALMYRENE FUNERARY SCULPTURE* (Studies in Palmyrene archaeology and history 3). Turnhout: Brepols, 2021. Pp. xiii + 139, illus. ISBN 9782503591261. €65.00.

Studies on Palmyrene Sculpture is the first volume in a new series devoted to Palmyra, which, at the time of this review, includes seven volumes. It is also flagship publication for the Palmyra Portrait Project, which has for the last decade aimed to compile a single corpus of the thousands of scattered pieces of Palmyrene funerary portraiture and bring the attention of the English-speaking world to this important aspect of Palmyrene scholarship. Indeed, the Palmyra Portrait Project was itself founded by Rubina Raja based on the work done by Harald Ingholt in his lifetime.

Ingholt's influential 1928 *Studier over Palmyrensk Skulptur* is a pillar on which Palmyrene studies, more broadly, and Palmyrene iconography, more specifically, are based. Yet, until the publication of this new volume, Ingholt's work had been inaccessible to those unable to read Danish. The translation constitutes the backbone of the volume. Readers of the *Loeb Classical Library* will recognise the layout of the work, with the original Danish text on the left-hand page and the English translation on the right, enabling the reader to compare the text easily. While the English translation of Ingholt's *Studier* is a valuable resource in and of itself, the supplementary material adds further distinction. The volume opens with an introduction by Rubina Raja, who provides useful contextual information on Palmyra, the Danish connection to the city and Harald Ingholt himself, allowing the reader to get a sense of the man behind the research. The volume also provides 531 images of Palmyrene portraiture, including fifty-four reproductions from Ingholt's *Studier*, with an updated concordance of the locations and provenance of the objects both now and at the time of Ingholt's original publication. This volume will surely stand as a new pillar for both students and scholars of Palmyra and become a fundamental resource for the future of Palmyra studies.

Individualizing the Dead, the third volume of the series, is another output of the Palmyra Portrait Project and continues to build on the foundational work of Ingholt. Unlike many volumes claiming to acquaint a student or new scholar with a particular field, *Individualizing the Dead* provides a clear, yet thorough introduction to how one 'reads' a piece of portraiture, and in particular the iconography and attributes of the sculpture.

The volume opens with an introductory chapter by Maura Heyn and Raja, which sets out the purpose of the volume, while also discussing the issues surrounding identifying attributes in portraiture. In particular, Heyn and Raja highlight the importance of the portraiture — and consequentially the need for this volume — in illuminating Palmyra and the identity of the residents of the city. This importance is made clear in the second chapter of this volume, in which Fred Albertson discusses the 'fringed' mantle, an attribute that appears in only a small number of funerary portraits. Discussing such a small group provides scholars with an opportunity to examine how certain attributes link with the identity of the deceased. Albertson insightfully connects the appearance of the 'fringed' mantle on male Palmyrene portraits with the figures' occupation as 'military' figures, either in the Roman army or alongside the Palmyrene caravans.