

REGINA GEE

FOURTH STYLE RESPONSES TO ‘PERIOD ROOMS’ OF THE SECOND AND THIRD STYLES
AT VILLA A (“OF *POPPAEA*”) AT OPLONTIS

(Taf. XXVII–XXIX, Abb. 1–10)

Abstract

La pittura murale nella Villa A (di *Poppaea*) in Oplontis (Torre Annunziata), grazie alle successive fasi di decorazione (almeno quattro) con esempi di Secondo, Terzo e Quarto Stile, offre un eccezionale esempio per la storia dell’ arte che si occupa degli stili d’epoca in Campania. Ciò è dovuto in gran parte alla complicata storia della villa vicino al mare nella baia di Napoli, costruita circa nel 50 a.C. e ripetutamente ampliata fino alla sua sepoltura nell’eruzione del 79. Risulta ovvio che, durante le fasi di ampliamento e ridecorazione, il proprietario prese decisioni riguardo il preservare lo Stile esistente o ridecorare tenendo in considerazione la nuova estetica. Una chiara traccia indica che il proprietario decise di preservare alcune stanze nello stile esistente, facendole restaurare quando necessario, mentre altre stanze venivano ridecorate secondo il gusto della nuova moda. Questa ricerca esamina come in questa villa i pittori usarono il Quarto Stile in reazione agli stili precedenti, prevedendo il restauro o la ridecorazione, con particolare attenzione a come l’artista accentuava o nascondeva la nuova decorazione.

This essay presents selected examples of the Fourth Style at Villa A (“of *Poppaea*”) at Oplontis as viewed through a particular analytical lens (for a plan of Villa A, see Abb. 1 in J. R. CLARKE’s article in this volume). The Fourth Style visually dominates at Villa A in total area, but with the exception of the spectacularly vivid garden rooms of the east wing, appreciated for their glowing colour and sophisticated alignment, it is the least-well examined among the three styles present. Not without reason the show-stopping Second Style rooms, particularly the *atrium* (5) and *triclinia* (14, 23), have garnered the lion’s share of attention. In 1987, J. CLARKE published the first detailed study of all the Third Style ensembles¹. The complete record of surviving wall paintings reveals an art historical narrative more complex than a sequenced unfolding of Second, Third, and Fourth Styles². This history is shaped by but not utterly dependent on the attendant story told by earthquakes and economics, and the style narrative undermines attempts to create a straightforward progression through discrete categories, offering up instead a series of permutations and combinations. Within the larger and longer dialog in contemporary scholarship on diachronic studies versus the synchronic consideration of wall paintings as meaningful markers of social use, this examination is intended to mediate between the two. I use both methods of inquiry to consider Fourth Style paintings inserted within earlier decorative programs at the villa. The corpus of Campanian wall painting gives examples of painting preservation in the comprehensive decorative system of a house along a calibrated scale of removal, true restoration, or a combination of old and new sections³. This examination considers all three responses in the material record of the villa with an emphasis on the choice by the artists to reveal or conceal the stylistic intervention within the earlier work. The Fourth Style’s complexity in terms of repertoire and the ability to respond to previous styles is made explicit in a new way in this case study.

¹ Clarke 1987, 267–294; Clarke 1999, 126–140.

² De Franciscis 1975, 9–18.

³ For a discussion of restoration versus removal in Pompeian wall paintings including case studies from Villa A (rooms 10 bis, 12 and 14) see Ehrhardt 2012.

The Fourth Style has not received much analytical attention at the villa at least in part because surviving examples lack the complex architectural framework and central programmatic mythological panels of its most complex manifestation⁴. Villa A, by contrast, has numerous variations on the stylistically simpler sub-category of the Fourth Style referred to by J. CLARKE as the “Tapestry Manner”. Characteristic features include a black lower zone (often with a plant motif), a middle zone of red or yellow fields with figured “tapestry” bands framing single centered motifs alternating with contrasting intervals holding *candelabra* and/or *aedicula* frames, and a white ground upper zone featuring architectural frames with simple decorative motifs interspersed⁵. Villa A has a single example of the Tapetenmuster or “wallpaper” design, and is a necessary destination for any scholar considering zebra-stripe decorative systems⁶. There are also the aforementioned garden rooms found along the east wing and as part of the visual axis on the north entry⁷. In any event, the Fourth Style at the villa is rich, not so much for the level of pictorial complexity, which tends to shape the index of value for scholars, but in its ability to demonstrate the range of the visual vocabulary. If those who work within the canonical style classifications are frank, they admit to the Fourth Style’s resistance to the discursive practice of art history built upon taxonomies. In many ways, the study of Villa A’s Fourth Style paintings confirms M. SHAPIRO’s observation that “styles are not usually defined in a strictly logical way and that they resist systematic classification into perfectly distinct groups”⁸. Style works structurally like a language in its ability to be deployed with self-referential content as part of the communication, to quote or paraphrase, for example, within and across style histories⁹.

THIRD STYLE AND FOURTH STYLE IN ROOMS 17, 18 AND 8

In the section of the villa to the west of the north *propylon* entrance (21) is a set of rooms (17, 18 and 8) originally painted in the Third Style with stylistic affinities suggesting the same workshop¹⁰. Together they preserve a record of intervention in which each room reveals a different Fourth Style response. Room 17, to the west of the north-entry axis, has characteristic early Third Style elements including slender decorative architectural elements and stylized Egyptianizing motifs in delicate shades of light blue, light green and pink (Abb. 2). The once spectacular and expensive cinnabar red middle zone is largely destroyed. The lower zone features a black socle with regular division into vertical panels forming the bases for the architectural elements above. Each panel is bisected horizontally by a white carpet band and below the carpet band, resting on a white narrow horizontal band, a garden plant motif repeats regularly. The socle is early Fourth Style, an alteration contemporary with the addition of a doorway on the west wall¹¹. This lower zone makes clear that in the work executed concurrently with the addition of the door, the decision was to insert a socle whose colour and dimensions were harmonious within the syntax of the room but did not copy the original design of delicate white palmette-and-volute and palmette-and-dart Egyptianizing motifs, reasonably presumed to be preserved in the “matching” Third Style room of 30, on the east side of 21.

⁴ The post-62 programmatic paintings of rooms n and p in the House of the *Vettii* are often cited as examples of this stylistic sub-category, designated the “Baroque” or “Theatrical” style as well as a variation on the *Vorhänge* and *Durchblicke* formula in modern scholarship, see Clarke 1991, 227; Ling 1991, 78–80.

⁵ The best general descriptions remain Clarke 1991, 65–68; Ling 1991, 71, who prefers “embroidery borders” to “carpet borders” for the characteristic ornament. The best-preserved examples of the Fourth Style “Tapestry Manner” rooms within the villa are 18, 24, 27, 33, 34, 37, 38, 40, 41, 66, 77 and 81.

⁶ The Tapetenmuster or “wallpaper” pattern is found in the upper zone of 31. The use of zebra stripes is extensive in the east wing of the villa and quite varied; see Corrado-Goulet 2001, 74–83 fig. 43–68; Laken 2003, 176 and fig. 20–23, and L. CLINE in this volume.

⁷ Bergmann 2002, 87–120.

⁸ Shapiro 1994, 53.

⁹ This structural analogy I consider distinct from discussion of a style’s functions as a cultural sign system in the sense of a vehicle for conveying meaning and/or a code for pointing to meaning(s) outside of itself.

¹⁰ The decorative system is more specifically Early Third style c. 20–1 B.C. (subdivided by F. L. BASTET into 1a 20–10 B.C., 1b, 10–1 B.C.), or A. MAU’s “*candelabrum* style” proposed as a stylistic transition between Second and Third Style, see Clarke 1987, 287.

¹¹ For the comprehensive history of building alterations within the villa, see Clarke – Thomas 2009, 201–209.

Room 18, originally part of the small bath complex to the north of the kitchen, gives an example of the complete replacement of its Third Style decorative system (Abb. 3). Unlike 17, at the time of the construction of the new entry this room was reworked with no interest in preservation. The ceiling was lowered and the walls repainted in a conventional and fairly modest Fourth Style. Although badly damaged, enough remains to discern the decorative scheme. There is another black socle with a plant motif here topped by a middle zone with alternating purple-red fields and narrow black intervals. The middle zone’s wide fields have yellow “tapestry” band frames around single, centered floating motifs, and the narrow intervals feature tall brown *aedicula* structures framing yellow-gold *candelabra*. The upper zone alternates purple-red and yellow fields, each with a simple centered architectural frame holding a simple centered motif surrounded by additional decoration of white “tapestry” bands and green foliated staffs and garlands. Above the Fourth Style upper zone, particularly on the north wall, it is still possible to see Third Style remains, which to my knowledge have not been previously discussed (Abb. 4). The previous decoration’s colour palette in which pastel blue and pink dominate suggest the same workshop as rooms 17 and 30. The earlier decoration was concealed by the new scheme, and the superimposition of the later style only became visible in the course of the modern reconstruction¹².

Room 8, the last example from the trio of Third Style rooms, mediates between 18 and 30 in the complexity of the stylistic response. Its preserved Third Style decorative system includes tall slender columns and piers carrying the architrave, a central panel in the middle zone with subordinate flanking designs, a colour palette featuring pink, pale blue and pale green and the use of Egyptianizing decorative motifs on both the frieze and selected column shafts. On the north wall, the middle zone’s central sacred landscape framed by a round-headed arch is part of the original Third Style scheme. The room has Fourth Style restorations and additions, the result of a remodelling of the space during the Julio-Claudian period which altered its function in the process from part of a bath complex to a reception/dining space. The Fourth Style paintings and accompanying structural reworking of the room have been carefully recorded by J. CLARKE in his 1991 article, briefly summarized below¹³. Room 8 has a socle on a low black base with alternating porphyry red and black panels, a cinnabar red middle zone, and a yellow-gold upper zone subdivided into sections by white horizontal and vertical “tapestry” bands. As is most evident on the east wall, the decorative system of the lower and middle zone continues the colours, layout and motifs of the side walls but with variations revealing the scheme as a Fourth Style insertion (Abb. 4). The middle zone, except for the passage on the left in the north corner, is no longer true cinnabar red but a less expensive version created by a cinnabar red wash over a yellow ochre field¹⁴. The frieze with the Egyptianizing motif is also present along the north side in its original porphyry red and white design, but changes to (again, less expensive) black and white in the same motif, and its dimensions also change, becoming noticeably narrower in width. As on the north and south walls, the east wall’s upper zone is all Fourth Style and retains the same colours and organization, yellow-gold fields with delicate white architectural *aedicula* frames, green garlands and white “tapestry” bands. In the east wall niche, a rounded-headed arched opening gives a view through to a landscape of a sacred precinct and *Hercules* with the apples of the Hesperides, the only mythological narrative surviving within the villa. Room 8 presents an example of repainting that was neither wholesale nor part of an easily removed and repainted section like the socle of room 17. New sections were carefully pieced around the old to create a unified whole visually and compositionally. The Fourth Style insertion is clear, however, in both the imitation cinnabar red and the stylistic variations, including the *aedicula* frame of the east wall landscape, the change of colour and dimensions in the Egyptianizing frieze and the use of “tapestry” bands in the upper zone.

This trio of rooms collectively shows three spaces painted in the same style in the same section of the villa with divergent stylistic histories, one obliterated, one with the lowest simplest zone replaced, and one reworked with complicated intersections and transitions intended to preserve the overall integrity of the design. Rooms 17 and 8 both have, with varying degrees of complexity, a Fourth Style insertion that is imi-

¹² Room 18 underwent the same process in a different period as room 12’s transformation from Second to Third Style during which the ceiling was lowered and the decorative system re-painted in the newest style.

¹³ Clarke 1991, 128–130.

¹⁴ On the expense and preparation of cinnabar red/vermillion (*minium*) Vitruvius 7. 8–9.

tative to a point but intended to be evocative or visually harmonious rather than a pure copy; an exact match is not the intent as evidenced by stylistic choices including the use of the “tapestry” band motif. In both cases, contemporary style elements are introduced consciously within the earlier program which suggests the owner was either agreeable to the artist’s choice or in fact made the decision.

SECOND STYLE AND FOURTH STYLE IN ROOM 5 (*ATRIUM*)

The final and in all likelihood most controversial case study of the Fourth Style’s use within an earlier decorative system is to be found in room 5, the most reproduced and discussed Second Style *atrium* in Campanian painting (Abb. 5). The surviving decoration, consisting of large sections of the lower and middle zone on the west and east walls painted in symmetrical mirror reverse as well as fragments of the *alae* on the southern end, has been celebrated since its uncovering and reconstruction as a superb example of the Mature Second Style, (H. G. BEYEN’S 1c, 70–50 BC). The room is singular within the Second Style decorative systems preserved by the villa’s owners in that the middle zone is a closed system, its impressive architectonic scheme defined by steps leading up a high podium to four sets of elaborately embellished yellow and porphyry red double doors spaced at regular intervals, two on the east wall and two on the west. It is also the only room presenting a fully developed iconography of military or agonistic victory, with motifs of shields, winged victory figures, trophy *cistae* encircled by wreathes, and fillets draped on altars. The *atrium* is also key in discussions of workshop attribution due to its clear relationship (along with 14 and 11) in terms of architectural syntax, colour palette and motifs to several equally renowned Second Style rooms belonging to the Villa of *Publius Fannius Synistor*¹⁵.

A careful look at the middle zone of the surviving east and west walls of the *atrium* makes a case for the wall paintings as a Fourth Style recreation of the original Second Style decorative system. In support of this conclusion, there are two empirically observable arguments. The first concerns one of the absolute defining stylistic characteristics of the Second Style: the relationship of painted stone surfaces to the stone it is emulating. When the stone is a recognizable and desirable type this relationship is close, as the artist, within individual parameters of personal or workshop style, attempted to replicate the variegated colour and irregular or organic patterning defining each type of expensive stone drawn upon as the model, especially alabaster (*alabastro fiorito* or *cotognino*) and Numidian marble (*giallo antico*)¹⁶. This stylistic quality as a defining feature is consistently supported by examples of Second Style painted stone surfaces from villas along the Bay of Naples and houses in Pompeii. It is not possible in this brief essay to present a comprehensive catalogue of examples; the point can be made, however, by drawing upon Second Style examples within the villa and from the *comparandum* created by a shared workshop, the paintings of the Villa of *P. Fannius Synistor*. Within the Second Style rooms of Villa A, we are fortunate to have an example of real alabaster. Dated to c. 50 BC, it can be found in the threshold for room 14 in a unique example of the stone from the period in Campania (Abb. 6)¹⁷. As represented in this sample, the alabaster’s colours range from shades of cream, gray, pale gold, to golden brown and dark brown, and form highly irregular patterns of what can be described as either blooms or clouds. The variegated colours often appear as rings, concentric circles that are irregular in area and diameter; the width of individual rings also vary or waver in thickness from one section to the next; they are grouped irregularly as well and sometimes overlap. Allowing for derivations of different workshops or hands, these are the essential qualities Second Style artists try to emulate: the variegated colour, the clouding or blooming, the concentric irregular rings and the overall variations within the passage across the surface of the whole piece of stone. For the comparison in contemporary painted alabaster, there are the ala-

¹⁵ E. LEACH groups the Second Style rooms of the Villa Oplontis, Villa of *P. Fannius Synistor* (Boscotrecase), and Casa del Labirinto under the same workshop, see Leach 1982, 151. For the virtual reconstruction of the Villa of *P. Fannius Synistor* showing the reunification of its frescoes now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, the Musée du Louvre, Paris, the Musée Royal de Mariemont, Morlanwelz, the Musée de Picardie, Amiens, the Villa Kérylos, Beaulieu-sur-Mer, and the Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli, see Bergmann 2010, 11–32.

¹⁶ Alabaster and Numidian marble in particular, show a consistent interest on the part of the artist in remaining faithful to the observable defining surface qualities of these stones as part of a larger vocabulary of naturalistic depictions of well-crafted luxury furnishings, see Leach 2004, 78.

¹⁷ Fant 2007, 338.

baster columns from *amphitholomos* 11 in the villa as well as the painted alabaster columns from Room G at the Villa of *P. Fannius Synistor*, which famously shares a number of the same decorative motifs of Villa A’s *atrium* (Abb. 7)¹⁸. Both sets of painted alabaster columns use a color palette with five separate shades discernable (cream, pale yellow, gray-gold, dark gold and brown-gold). Although they are not identical, there is a shared pattern of juxtaposition of shades and calculated irregularity in the patterns, a deliberate uneven quality in the width of individual bands and the stripes of colour within each band. This together with the subtleties of shading from yellow ochre to dark brown effectively mimics the organic cream gold and brown clouds and swirls of the actual stone. Turning to the pairs of painted alabaster columns in *atrium* 5 at Villa A, the initial observations are that the columns on the west and east sides are clearly by different hands, and the artist of the set on the west wall is more skilful in getting visually closer to alabaster. In their own ways both pairs of columns utterly fail to achieve the relationship between real and painted alabaster present in every other example of the Second Style here and elsewhere. Concerning the set on the east wall, it is possible to say the desire to create a regular pattern seems almost irresistible to the artist, and the range of shades within the colour palette is reduced to yellow, an unusual pink-gray and white (Abb. 8). The overall tendency is even horizontal striations with bands quite uniform in width and with regular repetition of the colour pattern. On the far right edge, mid-shaft, there is an attempted “cloud” but the execution is schematic, reduced to a single pair of concentric ovals. The thick uneven pink-gray bands edging the columns are also unique to the columns of this room. The same general observations can be repeated concerning the west wall, although both are better executed in terms of creating a variegated surface. Recent chemical analysis of the pigments of rooms 5, 11, 14 and 23 by P. BARALDI confirms this empirical observation concerning the distinct qualities of room 5’s columns. The pink-gray colour used extensively to create the alabaster surface is unique to those of room 5; nothing remotely similar is present in any of the other Second Style rooms examined¹⁹.

In the example of the alabaster columns discussed above, style analysis is only superficially a discussion about quality in terms of a “good” or “bad” artist. Variations in technical execution can be seen in every room and often within different contemporary artists working in different sections of the same room – including the Second Style rooms. Concerning the stylistic difference, it is much less a question of artistic skill than temporal and stylistic distance from the original painting, and this distance is manifest in the result²⁰. When discussing the canonical four styles, scholars easily fall into the analogical use of language, speaking particularly of architectural syntax of structure and the vocabulary of decorative motifs. Following this model, my point is while the syntax and vocabulary are correct, the language is not being spoken by a native speaker, the disparity or gap is revealed in both execution and delivery, and that something discernable is lost in translation. While the Fourth Style does revive painted marble surfaces as part of wall decoration, the characteristic representation of stone is markedly different. The treatment is more schematic and referential rather than the Second Style’s naturalistic “extension” of the valuable stone as part of a larger category of expensive luxury materials reproduced in painting, including silver, gilded bronze and tortoiseshell. The difference is also observable when examining real and painted Numidian marble, a stone, which, like alabaster, was valued as soon as it was introduced into the Roman visual index of luxury in the 1st century BC. Examples, again all from the villa, reveal the same patterns of traceable temporal movement away from the original: real Numidian marble (fragment inserted in the decorative pavement around peristyle 32), Second Style painted marble (14, west wall), Third Style imitation of the Second Style original (14, east wall) and finally Fourth Style in a Fourth Style room (27, *lararium* base) in which it becomes a barely recognizable schematic quote (Abb. 9).

The second area of study in support of the argument for a Fourth Style insertion in the *atrium* of the villa concerns the presence of cinnabar red. Like the imitation of valuable stone, the use of cinnabar red or *minum* in the architectonic scheme of a Second Style room is a defining quality. The notably expensive and delicate

¹⁸ Leach 2004, 78; see also Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli, Inv. s.n.v.l.

¹⁹ The pigment analysis of this set of rooms conducted by P. BARALDI under my direction in the summer of 2011 is currently being prepared for publication.

²⁰ There is an earlier example of precisely this kind of insertion, a Third Style repair to the east wall of room 14 clearly visible in the middle zone between the gold jewel-studded column and the floor-to ceiling cream-colored pilaster.

pigment, which had to be carefully treated during preparation and after application, seems to have been intrinsically valued for its sumptuous hue; in other words the pigment was unusual in that it was itself a luxury material, not just the means to represent one. Artists typically used cinnabar red for panels, low walls, as narrow inset horizontal and vertical panels dividing larger sections, in architraves and in friezes²¹. The *atrium* of Villa A has no cinnabar red in the decorative system of the west and east wall, something confirmed by a systematic visual examination as well as through the chemical analysis of pigments by P. BARALDI²². On the absence of cinnabar red in the *atrium*, there are several further points to make. The first is that the rooms of the Villa of P. Fannius Synistor showing clear evidence of the same workshop, room G, *cubiculum* M and peristyle E, all feature expanses of cinnabar red²³. Additionally, every other surviving Second Style room deliberately preserved by the owners in Villa A (14, 15, 11 and 23) has large sections of cinnabar red used in architectural passages as described above. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, the *alae* on the southern end of the *atrium* do not share the decorative system of the east and west wall. This in itself is not unusual, as there are examples within the villa, in 11 and 14 for example, of changing the design to signal a conceptual change in space such as the transition into an anteroom²⁴. The wall painting of the east *ala* has a horizontal course of small panels of very well-executed imitation alabaster (Abb. 10)²⁵. In colour range and variegation the painted stone is true to the period style as described above and quite different in appearance from the limited colour palette and schematic style of the alabaster columns of the *atrium* itself. Equally significant, and this is only observable by getting very close to the wall surface, the *ala* has cinnabar red in its decoration, here as a border for the course of inset square alabaster panels. Exposure to light has changed the cinnabar red into black metacinnabar, but close examination reveals flecks of the original pigment colour (Abb. 10).

The schematic depiction of alabaster and the absence of cinnabar red in the middle zones of the west and east walls of the *atrium* make a case for both as later versions of the original Second Style decoration. Additionally, the details of the east *ala* make it untenable to accept this painting as belonging to the same workshop as those of the *atrium*'s middle zone, and I contend this brief length together with that of the west *ala* represent the only original Second Style painting currently on the walls of this celebrated space.

CONCLUSION

As a critical analytical tool “style art history” has moved in and out of favour, considered essential for the kind of morphological analysis that allows systematic classification at its birth then subsequently devalued with the rise of post-semiotic theories and social art histories for its association with connoisseurship, attribution, and value assessments based on constructions around an “original” versus a “copy”. Within the study of Roman wall painting including those of Villa A, style analysis entered from a different direction; it was developed and folded into larger archaeological studies due to its usefulness as a dating tool for building histories. Concerning the value of formal analysis and style art history in the study Villa A's paintings, there is an expanded argument in favour of its inclusion based on a specific application of the method. Close visual analysis should be used to group the similar and define differences, but at the same time the method must be disentangled from its historical applications centered around critical assessments of “quality” and overambitious speculation concerning profound historical and cultural change²⁶. The case studies of Fourth Style insertions into pre-existing decorative programs at Villa A and elsewhere suggest a considerable effort by the owner(s) to maintain select rooms to the extent their resources allowed, spaces associated with the social

²¹ Surviving examples of the use of the pigment in the Second Style architectonic schemes of Villa A: piers (11, 14, 15), *cornices* (11, 14, 23), friezes within entablatures (11, 14, 23), low walls/panels (14, 15, 23), *opus isodomum* walls (14, 23), frames for panels and inset painted stone blocks (11, 5 east *ala*) and pediments (15).

²² The full pigment analysis of the paintings of Villa A is forthcoming, Baraldi 2014.

²³ See Bergmann, above, note 15, and the Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli, Inv. s.n.1, s.n.2.

²⁴ In this paper I follow the conventional label of these small spaces at the south end of the *atrium* as “*alae*” although I believe they are better understood as corridors. Each has a distinct Second Style decorative system I believe was originally visually linked to the adjacent space, for example the west “*ala*” is visually aligned to the north wall of room 11.

²⁵ I question the position of the fragment as currently attached to the wall surface, as it seems too low.

²⁶ For an illuminating evaluation of the history and contemporary relevance of style art history, Elsner 2003.

status and reception, while allowing more “free play” in terms of the artist’s intervention in others. I am not arguing that the distinction between imitation and emulation, so well-chronicled by E. GAZDA in reference to sculpture, “trickled down” to something as relatively minor as repainting various walls of this villa²⁷. I am suggesting, however, a Roman attitude toward originals and reworking allowed for a variety of responses governed at least in part by a sense of appropriateness within a particular space and that this attitude plays out in a small way in these examples.

Bibliographie

- Archer 1990 W. C. Archer, The Paintings in the Alae of the Casa dei Vettii and a Definition of the Fourth Pompeian Style, *AJA* 94, 1990, 95–123.
- Baraldi 2012 (scheduled) P. Baraldi, Analysis of Pigments, in: J. R. Clarke – S. De Caro – M. Thomas (eds.), *Villa A (‘of Poppaea’) at Oplontis (Torre Annunziata, Italy), Vol. II. Decorative Ensembles, Painting, Stucco, Pavements, Sculpture* (New York 2012).
- Bergmann 2002 B. Bergmann, Art and Nature in the villa at Oplontis, in: T. McGinn, *Pompeian Brothels. Pompeii’s Ancient History, Mirrors and Mysteries, Art and Nature at Oplontis and the Herculaneum ‘Basilica’*, *JRA suppl.* 47, 2002, 87–120.
- Bergmann 2010 B. Bergmann, New Perspectives on the Villa of Publius Fannius Synistor at Boscoreale, in: B. Bergmann – S. De Caro – J. R. Mertens – R. Meyer (eds.), *Roman Frescoes from Boscoreale. The Villa of Publius Fannius Synistor in Reality and Virtual Reality* (New York 2010) 11–32.
- Clarke 1987 J. R. Clarke, The Early Third Style at Oplontis, *RM* 94, 1987, 267–294.
- Clarke 1991 J. R. Clarke, *Houses of Roman Italy 100 BC.–AD. 250. Ritual, Space and Decoration* (Berkeley 1991).
- Clarke – Thomas 2009 J. R. Clarke – M. Thomas, Evidence of Demolition and Remodeling at Villa A at Oplontis (Villa of Poppaea) after A.D. 45, *JRA* 22, 2009, 201–209.
- Corrado Goulet 2001–2002 C. Corrado Goulet, The Zebra-Stripe Design. An Investigation of Roman Wall Painting in the Periphery, *RStPomp* 12–13, 2001–2002, 53–94.
- De Franciscis 1975 A. De Franciscis, La villa romana di Oplontis, in: B. Andreae – H. Kyrieleis (Hrsg.), *Neue Forschungen in Pompeji und den anderen vom Vesuvausbruch 79 nach Chr. verschütteten Städten, Internationales Kolloquium Essen 11–14. Juni 1973* (Recklinghausen 1975) 9–18.
- Ehrhardt 2012 W. Ehrhardt, Dekorations- und Wohnkontext. Beseitigung, Restaurierung, Verschmelzung und Konservierung von Wandbemalungen in den kampanischen Antikenstätten, *Palilia* 26 (Wiesbaden 2012).
- Elsner 2003 J. Elsner, Style, in: R. S. Nelson – R. Schiff (eds.), *Critical Terms for Art History*, (Chicago 2003) 98–109.
- Fant 2007 C. Fant, Real and painted (imitation) marble at Pompeii, in: J. Dobbins – P. Foss (eds.), *The World of Pompeii, the Routledge worlds* (London – Routledge 2007) 336–346.
- Gazda 2002 E. Gazda, Beyond Copying. Artistic Originality and Tradition, in: E. Gazda, *The Ancient Art of Emulation. Studies in Artistic Originality and Tradition from the Present to Classical Antiquity*, *MemAmAc Suppl.* 1, 2002, 1–24.
- Laken 2003 L. Laken, Zebra patterns in Campanian wall painting. A matter of function, *BABesch* 78, 2003, 167–189.
- Leach 1982 E. Windsor Leach, Patrons, Painters and Patterns. The Anonymity of Romano-Campanian Painting and the Transition from the Second to the Third Style, in B. Gold (ed.), *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome* (Austin 1982) 134–173.
- Leach 2004 E. W. Leach, *The Social Life of Painting in Ancient Rome and on the Bay of Naples*, (Cambridge 2004).
- Ling 1991 R. Ling, *Roman Painting* (Cambridge 1991).
- Shapiro 1953 [1994] M. Shapiro, *Theory and Philosophy of Art. Style, Artist and Society* (New York [1953] 1994) 51–102.

²⁷ Gazda 2002, 1–24.

Abbildungen

- Abb. 1: Villa A (Oplontis), Room 17, east wall (photo P. BARDIGY courtesy of the Oplontis Project)
- Abb. 2: Villa A (Oplontis), Room 18, north wall, north wall detail of the Third Style upper zone (photos by P. BARDIGY and author, courtesy of the Oplontis Project)
- Abb. 3: Villa A (Oplontis), Room 8, east wall (photo P. BARDIGY courtesy of the Oplontis Project)
- Abb. 4: Villa A (Oplontis), plan showing Third and Fourth Styles in Rooms 17, 18 and 8 (diagram C. FIELD)
- Abb. 5: Villa A (Oplontis), Room 5, east wall (photo P. BARDIGY courtesy of the Oplontis Project)
- Abb. 6: Villa A (Oplontis), Room 14 alabaster threshold (photo author)
- Abb. 7: Villa A (Oplontis), Room 11, east wall, detail of painted alabaster columns (photo P. BARDIGY courtesy of the Oplontis Project)
- Abb. 8: Villa A (Oplontis), Room 5 (*atrium*), east wall, detail of painted alabaster columns (photo author)
- Abb. 9: Villa A (Oplontis), Room 32 pavement on southern side, Numidian marble fragment, Room 14 west wall, Second Style painted Numidian marble, Room 14, east wall, Third Style imitation of the Second Style painted Numidian marble, Room 27, south side of the *lararium*, Fourth Style painted Numidian marble (photos by P. BARDIGY and author, courtesy of the Oplontis Project)
- Abb. 10: Villa A (Oplontis), Room 5, north wall of east *ala*, detail of painted alabaster square panels and detail of cinnabar red frame (photos author)

Regina Gee
College of Art and Architecture, School of Art
P.O. Box 173680, Bozeman, MT 59717-3680
rgee@montana.edu