

Part V develops this suggestion while arguing forcefully against knee-jerk religious interpretations of Egyptian sculptures in Rome. While acknowledging that some Egyptian statues surely had cultic functions and belonged in identifiable Iseae, P. contends that they were more often displayed in connoisseurial collections just like — and alongside — Greek sculptures. Case studies include the Gardens of Sallust, the Villa of Cassius at Tivoli, Hadrian's Villa at Tivoli, and the Herculaneum palaestra: all outdoor spaces of leisure where the sacred aura of both Greek and Egyptian artworks would work in concert with greenery and water features to foster a pleasurable aesthetic experience. Part VI concludes the book by restating the central argument and its contribution; P. also gestures towards areas for future research, including Egyptian elements in the architecture of Roman Italy and under-studied materials like textiles.

The book is gorgeously produced, with nearly 100 full-colour images that vividly illustrate the craftsmanship and beauty of Egyptian material from the Roman world. P. also succeeds admirably in demonstrating that this material was even more ubiquitous than has been recognised, and that its significance was not limited to the strictly cultic or narrowly political. This is an important contribution in its own right, but the argument that the Romans instead prized Egyptian art *as art* takes for granted that 'art' is an appropriate concept to apply to the Roman world. A throwaway reference to Duchamp's *Fountain* confuses rather than clarifies the issue (5), since the 'artness' of that piece is bound up with wholly modern concepts of artist and art gallery. Also problematic is the repeated assertion that because the Romans collected and displayed Egyptian material just like Greek material, they must have regarded it as art. This oversimplifies a complex conversation on the significance of Greek artworks and objects in Rome, which has by no means concluded that the Romans thought of (what we call) Greek art as 'art' — especially if that means dissolving the link between connoisseurship and imperial subjectivity. A more robust engagement with this scholarship would have strengthened this book and made for a valuable contribution to the larger question of 'art' in the ancient world.

University of New Brunswick  
[carolyn.macdonald@unb.ca](mailto:carolyn.macdonald@unb.ca)  
 doi:10.1017/S007543582200082X

CAROLYN MACDONALD

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

MAGGIE L. POPKIN, *SOUVENIRS AND THE EXPERIENCE OF EMPIRE IN ANCIENT ROME*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2022. Pp. xvi + 325. ISBN 9781316517567. £75.00.

This clearly written, lavishly illustrated and theoretically grounded monograph examines souvenirs as a distinctive category of analysis in the study of Roman material and visual culture. It arrives in the midst of a 'souvenir boom' in scholarship — see also K. Cassibry, *Destinations in Mind. Portraying Places on the Roman Empire's Souvenirs* (2021) — and contributes to a productive turn towards closer inspection of the social and cultural worlds of (relatively) cheaply made, portable objects that too often have been side-lined or neglected in classical art and archaeology.

The book's introduction sets the stage by engaging with recent work on space, place, lived religion, sociologies of knowledge, memory studies and much else besides. What emerges is an effective framework for approaching souvenirs as mass-produced transmitters of memory and knowledge and as having a particular set of material affordances. The main text comes in two parts. Part I examines souvenirs associated with cult statues, cities and sites, such as Alexandria and Hadrian's Wall. Fundamental to understanding these souvenirs is the complex process of miniaturisation that allowed individuals to possess, touch, and display monuments otherwise out of their reach, for example, by reproducing an image of the Ephesian Artemis in terracotta. Part II then turns to souvenirs related to the cultural imaginaries of the circus, arena and the theatre. In images that seemingly pick from the world of the stage, Popkin notes that many figures are schematised and lacking any sense of movement, narrative or even reference to a performative space, which can make them difficult to place within fixed categories, such as mime and pantomime. While this may be surprising in some ways, it is an aspect of what Jocelyn Penny Small once called *The Parallel Worlds of Classical Art and Text* (2008) and certainly testament to the richness and variety of

ancient performance culture beyond the world of text. It also reminds us that many souvenirs would have been open to personal interpretations and meanings. Other objects discussed by Popkin challenge the notion of a souvenir as related to real-world events and places: For example, does it change anything when the racing chariots are driven not by human charioteers, but *erotes* (fig. 63), a motif also found in funerary contexts? Citing Diane Favro, Popkin concludes that images of Rome were not part of the wider souvenir culture because none of its monuments had become an ‘urban icon’ (245). Maybe so, but the idea (and image) of Rome as the city of seven hills was nonetheless pervasive, as were personifications of Roma (a form of cult statuary not far from the Antiochene Tyche that offers a vicarious experience of empire).

Ultimately, what kind of work is the term ‘souvenir’ doing for us? Is it more than a helpful historical analogy (see the references *passim* to contemporary American sports and their consumer culture)? Do we lose some of the finer details when grouping together very diverse objects (ranging from terracottas to rather fancy gems, metal and glass works) under the banner of ‘souvenirs’? Popkin in my view shows that the term has real heuristic value and makes us think harder about the meanings of objects and images, as well as how they can have an agency of their own and mediate different relationships. On the other hand, her book did leave me worrying that some of the term’s essentialising implications may not be helpful in all cases. Notably the intricate patterning and interest in the labyrinthine depiction of civic space make the Puteoli and Baiae glass *ampullae* a little different. In this regard, it is interesting to note that some of the inscriptions found on them refer to drinking. This raises a more wide-ranging question about use that also haunts the study of late antique containers of all sorts: are (some of these) just fancy packaging for something that was perhaps even more fancy, but ephemeral and ultimately lost to us?

Finally, I did also wonder about some of the assumptions made throughout the book about aspects of class and economy. For example, about the producers of these souvenirs we hear that ‘economic profit surely motivated them’ (82) and that they produced for a ‘middle-class market’ (188). In the final part of the book, souvenirs are then presented as a means of ‘democratising luxury’ (196). This circles back to the introduction’s statement that ‘the empire’s culture of souvenirs was a bottom-up phenomenon’ (12). But can we really know this? The danger here is to rely uncritically on assumptions about the social context of souvenirs. After all, a rather different story could emerge if we pursued the argument that ancient souvenirs, like the modern culture of souvenirs that began with the early modern Grand Tour (see, most recently, E. Gleadhill, *Taking Travel Home: The Souvenir Culture of British Women Tourists, 1750–1830* (2022)), owe more to elite than subaltern practices. These problems of interpretation are further confounded by the often context-blind approach pursued here that treats equally objects with a known findspot (e.g. the Athenian Agora) with those that are now in private collections and museums and come with little or no contextual information. Without close consideration of the archaeological contexts of souvenirs, the call is certainly not an easy one to make.

Aarhus University  
 tmk@cas.au.dk

TROELS MYRUP KRISTENSEN

doi:10.1017/S0075435823000370

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

INGO GILDENHARD and CRISTIANO VIGLIETTI (EDS), *ROMAN FRUGALITY: MODES OF MODERATION FROM THE ARCHAIC AGE TO THE EARLY EMPIRE AND BEYOND* (Cambridge classical studies). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020. Pp. xii + 415, illus. ISBN 9781108840163. £75.00.

In recent scholarship, Roman frugality has received less attention than its opposite, luxury. This has not always been the case, as Ingo Gildenhard and Cristiano Vigiotti argue in the introduction to an edited volume meant to rebalance the picture. The aim is not to resurrect ancient Rome as a model of exemplary frugality, as which it was discussed from the late Republic until the Enlightenment era, but to understand better the interplay of economic structure, moral values and literary discourse over more than one thousand years of Roman history.