Art and Archaeology

'The history of Rome is a history of the idea of a city that used to be.' Wrenched from its context in Leonard Barkan's ★★*Unearthing the Past*,[1] this might seem like a perverse assertion. Since when has Rome surrendered to longings of lost urban glory? The changes wrought for the millennial *Giubileo* only confirmed what lovers of the Eternal City already knew – that Rome's enchantment lies as much in its accommodation of the new as with its display of the old. For all that archaeologists hold up the tunnelling of new lines for the *Metropolitana*, the past never seems too much of an onus in Rome. It may be a fault of Barkan's approach that he is over-ponderous in weighing the effect of old stones; but this is a deservedly substantial account of how artists and collectors during the Renaissance worked *all'antico*, rendering homage to the past – mostly without letting it oppress them. The subject has become vast, with one academic centre – the Warburg Institute in London – dedicated to its study; so Barkan's focus settles on five aspects. First, the process of discovery; then the matching of discoveries to stories (from Pliny and others); then the effects of the fragmentary condition, which leads to a consideration of the art and business of reconstruction; finally, a look at how the vocation of the artist was redefined by the presence of antiques.This final chapter has the effect of conducting an audit on the whole process, by assessing the life and work of Baccio Bandinelli. Bandinelli was more or less contemporary with Michelangelo, and in his time both a prominent artist and an organizer of artists. Like Michelangelo, Bandinelli was much taken by the Laocoon. But while Michelangelo let the lines and energy of the ancient statue flow into his own work, Bandinelli was the one who undertook the full-scale replica. And some commentators at the time saw what we would recognize now – not plagiarism: just a wearisome backwards loop. To delve among the ruins should be a way of liberation, not constraint. For all that, it is pleasant to fantasize that Raphael Sanzio, whose respect for antiquity had its pedantic side, would have approved the collection of essays entitled B★*Ancient Rome: The Archaeology of the Eternal City*.[2] As in Barkan's text, there is a pervasive sense here of scholars celebrating the historical identity of a modern metropolis – the sense that, if you offered them lunch, they could spend all day showing you parts of Rome you never knew existed. Peter Wiseman sets the tone with an introduction pitched as a balloonist's perspective over the city. What lies beneath the view below? Various answers follow, in scope mostly thematic rather than chronological. No Italians are among these contributors, rather misleadingly all billed as 'working at the centre of recent archaeological developments in Rome'. Without direct access to the latest results of excavation – digs on the archaic Palatine, for instance – certain sections of the book seem only to rehearse the already-known. Where synthesis works best is in scrutiny of the urban practicalities: construction, security, the supplying of water and food to the living, and the disposal of the dead. We can enjoy ancient Rome because it is ancient: we do not have to negotiate its living conditions, here described (by John Patterson) as 'insecure, chaotic, insanitary and dangerous'. Juvenal was joking when he said that there were as many opportunities for death for pedestrians in Rome as there were windows open above them,

[1] *Unearthing the Past*. Archaeology and Aesthetics in the Making of Renaissance Culture. By Leonard Barkan. Yale U.P., New Haven, 1999. Pp. xxxiii + 428, with 199 illustrations. Paper £14.95.

[2] *Ancient Rome*. The Archaeology of the Eternal City. Edited by Jon Coulston and Hazel Dodge. Oxford University School of Archaeology, 2000. Pp. xi + 408, with black and white figs., *passim*. Paper £19.95.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.1.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

but dying can never have been remote from the agenda of any adult Roman citizen – including those in the imperial provinces. Their plans for the eventuality are implicitly charted in another anthology of papers, ⋆⋆*Burial, Society and Context in the Roman World*.[3] As one of the editors of the collection stresses, Roman modes of burial have had relatively scant attention, unless linked to particular historical issues, such as the spread of Christianity. The theoretical possibilities of the so-called 'archaeology of death' have been tried frequently enough upon Greek and Etruscan material: but Rome is no less rich in data. There are several studies included here of mortuary practices in Rome and Italy in later antiquity, but principal consideration is given to the north-west provinces. How funerary rituals can be reconstructed; what burials tell us about social status; how landscapes of commemoration were shaped, and to what extent localized traditions might be 'Romanized' – these are the subdivisions of a volume which, by contrast with the previous one, carries all the signs of current archaeological investigation. Beyond the black-dotted plans and diagrams, what emerges is not so much a prospect of redefining the generalities of some supposedly 'Roman way of death', but rather the impertinence of such a category. Thanks to the microscopic techniques of examining carbonized plant remains (archaeobotany) and bodily traces (palaeopathology), every excavated grave is redeemed by its own story. To paraphrase Rupert Brooke – we shall not hear their trentals, nor eat their arval bread. But to ponder the number of newly-born infants buried in jars at a Gallo-Roman cemetery in the forest of Fontainebleau, and the assortment of 'grave goods' left with the adults there – old shoes, coarse potshards, handfuls of nails – is insight hinged with the pathos of human fellowship. From this rustic burial-place at Chantambre, the city of Rome seems very remote. Yet long before the Papacy fostered the ideal of *Caput Mundi*, successive emperors were concerned to package Rome as an international centre. Augustus set the outstanding example. And although this eponymous Forum must have appeared, at first sight, a forbiddingly enclosed space – as a protection against fire, it was marked off by a high wall – the ideology of design and decoration within was expressive of an open, cosmopolitan outlook. At least, that is the reasoning of Joachim Ganzert's ⋆*Im Allerheiligsten des Augustusforums*.[4] Ganzert is an architectural historian, and he makes a wide as well as detailed survey of the complex – beginning and ending with discussions of its treatment by the Fascists. His phrase for what Augustus intended to spell out is 'ecumenical acculturation', which unhappily yokes New Testament Greek and a modernism: but once it is understood to describe the hybrid structure of the temple of Mars Ultor, the concept gains some cogency. It was not a gospel-writer but Athenaeus who described Rome as *epitoma tas oikoumenas*, 'quintessence of the whole world'. Ganzert claims that the architects of Augustus went much further in this project than simply canonizing the Corinthian column. Comparisons are fetched, for instance, from Nebuchadnezzar's Palace at Babylon. Throughout, creative use is made of computer graphics and simulations. And necessary use, too – for what remains of the Augustan Forum is not easily visualized as a whole. Being bisected and overpaved by Mussolini's processional road, it

[3] *Burial, Society and Context in the Roman World*. Edited by John Pearce, Martin Millett and Manuela Struck. Oxbow Books, Oxford, 2000. Pp. xxiv + 272, illustrated throughout. Paper £35.00.

[4] *Im Allerheiligsten des Augustusforms*. Fokus "oikoumenischer Akkulturation". By Joachim Ganzert. Von Zabern, Mainz, 2000. Pp. 120, with 81 colour illustrations, 44 black and white and 67 line drawings.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.1.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

must be left mostly to the imagination. But was the Augustan culture of international monumentality entirely new to Rome? Some would argue that it was fostered at least a century earlier; and among the advocates for that case are contributors to [B]★★*From Pergamon to Sperlonga*,[5] arising from a conference held in Florida in 1997. E. S. Gruen's analysis of how the Attalids of Pergamon vigorously projected themselves abroad as much as at home is the piquant appetizer for a sequence of essays either useful and or else intriguingly discursive. There is much discussion of chronology, although all sculpture classified under the term 'Pergamene Baroque' still defies efforts to date it by features of style; more fruitful, I think, are the explorations of Hellenistic iconography at large. So, for instance, the visual echoes of the Pergamon Great Altar's Gigantomachy are researched into deepest Etruria. And some devious interpretations of the sculptural assemblage in the so-called 'Grotto of Tiberius' at Sperlonga are pursued: including the proposal that the 'Pasquino' group – hitherto most likely construed as Ulysses bearing the body of Achilles (as in Ovid, *Met.* 13.280–5) – represents Aeneas supporting the body of Lausus (as in Vergil, *Aen.* 10.814–32). How far such iconographical speculation should go is one of the questions lurking in the background of John Boardman's ★*The History Greek Vases*[6] – and one to which the author's answer is unclear. He has himself tried some readings of Athenian sixth-century B.C. imagery that hang very tenuously upon a sentence or two in Herodotus – unwarranted fantasies, in the view of R. M. Cook, the scholar to whose memory Boardman's book is dedicated – yet he is openly Eurosceptic when it comes to the modes of exegesis practised by Herbert Hoffmann, Francois Lissarague and others deriving from the Parisian schools of Structuralist Anthropology. The appeal to 'common sense' is not, I fear, sufficient to settle this matter. Other problems – the ancient value of the vases, for example – are quelled with authority and, at times, a barely-concealed tone of impatience towards dissent. Of course readers can feel themselves to be in safe hands: many of the references cited in support of the text indicate works of J. Boardman. There are gentle forays into some areas hitherto not much explored in print, including the thwarted rapport between J. D. Beazley and James Elroy Flecker, and the disquieting conundrum of what manner of crockery served an ancient Greek for eating a stew. But it is in the end hard to see whose needs are being served by this book. Robert Cook's *Greek Painted Pottery* has been recently reprinted (by Routledge); there are plenty of dependable handbooks around (including Boardman's); and for illustrations at least, Lissarague's *Greek Vases: The Athenians and their Images* (Eskenazi, 2001) has set dramatically higher new standards of photography and reproduction. As Boardman reminds us: 'Fired clay is virtually indestructible, so all ancient vases still exist, somewhere.' If we give disproportionate attention to those produced in the Athenian Kerameikos, that is not only because the art of decorating fired clay was so intensively and competitively practised there. It is also because some of the uses that the Athenians had for vases were unusual and particular. The so-called Panathenaic amphorae, vessels containing the oil awarded to winners in the Panathenaic Games, are just such. Produced over several centuries according to more or less formulaic design and appearance, they may not always be objects of conspicuous

[5] *From Pergamon to Sperlonga*. Sculpture and Context. Edited by Nancy T. de Grummond and Brunilde S. Ridgway. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 2000. Pp. xxiv + 315, with 125 black and white figures.

[6] *The History of Greek Vases*. Potters, Painters and Pictures. By John Boardman. Thames and Hudson, London, 2001. Pp. 320, with 358 illustrations. £29.95.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.1.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

beauty (in Beazley's judgement, 'nothing fouler than the Panathenaic vases from the fourth century has survived from antiquity'). But they can do much more than illustrate books on Greek sport, as is clear from a set of symposium proceedings entitled **_Panathenaika_.[7] Part of this volume dwells on new finds, whose provenance is not just Athens, but Macedonia, Cyrenaica and elsewhere; further essays attend to neglected aspects of production, imagery, distribution and technique (one surprise, unveiled by Alan Shapiro, is the quantity of Panathenaics made in red-figure). Not everything can be clarified – we are not sure, for example, whether the winner of a running event took home only vases painted with runners. But among the certainties that emerge is the value of the Panathenaic amphorae beyond Athens, and beyond their original contents (a full-size pot held some 38 litres of oil). In South Italy the *kudos* associated with the prize vases *as vases* is demonstrable from several tomb assemblages; eventually the distinctive shape of the vase was itself adopted in Magna Grecia as a trophy of posthumous heroization. 'Athenocentrism' is sometimes invoked as a crime of modern scholarship: but these vases are further proof of its pervasive force in antiquity.

NIGEL SPIVEY

[7] *Panathenaika*. Symposion zu den Panathenäischen Preisamphoren. Edited by Martin Bentz and Norbert Eschbach. Von Zabern, Mainz, 2001. Pp. xv + 205, with 45 pages of black and white plates.

Philosophy

**_Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy_[1] continues to maintain its high standards as a twice-yearly publication; but, oddly enough, the scope of the articles has contracted as their number has increased: all but one of the seventeen in the two volumes to be reviewed this year treat directly of topics in Plato or Aristotle. (The single exception is Suzanne Bobzien in vol. XIX, 'Did Epicurus Discover the Free Will Problem?') So, as a temporary relief from this glut of Classicism, I shall turn first of all to a major book on later ethical philosophy: Richard Sorabji's B_Emotion and Peace of Mind_,[2] a study of the Stoic theory of emotion and its influence, particularly on Christian thought. The tendency of research in this area has been to look at how the Stoics handled emotion from the point of view of their theories of cognitive functioning more generally (emotions being, by general Stoic consensus, directly related to belief in some way). Sorabji, however, approaches the question from the opposite end: he bases his account on a study of the therapeutic models suggested by the Stoics for dealing with (i.e. for eradicating) emotion. If it seems surprising that this approach is not more common, we need to remember that the Stoics themselves had much more to say about the nature of emotions than their cure (Cicero, *T.D.* 4.9); and despite the obvious attractions of Sorabji's approach, his conclusions sometimes rest, perforce, on rather thin evidence. Sorabji quickly determines, for example, that Chrysippus' therapeutic advice implies an analysis of emotion in terms of *two* judgements: one evaluating the

[1] *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*. Vol. XIX, Winter 2000 and Vol. XX, Summer 2001. Edited by David Sedley. Oxford U.P., 2000 and 2001. Pp. 372 and 340. Hardback £35.00 each; paper £19.99 each.

[2] *Emotion and Peace of Mind*. From Stoic Agitation to Christian Temptation. The Gifford Lectures. By Richard Sorabji. Oxford U.P., 2000. Pp. x + 499. £30.00.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.1.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press