

emperor worship. Fujii's book adds to our understanding of the imperial cult and its processes in the Roman East.

Sanna Joska

MARTIN KOVACS: *Kaiser, Senatoren und Gelehrte: Untersuchungen zum spätantiken männlichen Privatporträt*. Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden 2014. ISBN 978-3-89500-843-6. 456 S. 660 s/w –Abb, 150 Taf. EUR 98.

This work is based on the 2010 dissertation by Martin Kovacs for the Georg-August-Universität in Göttingen. Needless to say, the most important research literature on Roman portraiture is in German, and, this volume continues the tradition – including in its bibliography all the important research literature in the other four main languages covering the subject.

The author aims to deal with the portraiture of the late antique Roman aristocracy and its development in various fields (such as style, cultural history, etc.) through a new set of criteria. The conclusions are that Imperial Roman portraiture and aristocratic self-presentation grew apart after Constantine and this intended form of presentation varied in different media. The traditional statue (*rundplastische*) became the most individualized form of aristocratic portraiture. This also varied regionally, especially when we compare the statues found in Italy, Greece, and Turkey.

Chapter 1 (pp. 17–24) includes the introduction, research questions and the relevant research history. Kovacs' aim is the study of the archaeological material (*Privatporträt*) in its social (as in a society, *gesellschaftliche*) and political context, and, its social (*soziale*) meaning. Chapter 2 (pp. 25–40) introduces us to the variable problems of previous research – dating, style, and so forth – which Kovacs intends to set straight. Chapter 3 (pp. 41–44) portrays in general the previous Imperial portraiture from the first to the third century CE. The massive Chapter 4 (pp. 45–212) includes subchapters of subchapters counting up to four digits. The total volume consists of close to 60 chapters, subchapters, and appendices, so only Chapter 4 will be looked at more closely below.

Chapter 4 “Das spätantike Privatporträt – Identität, Norm und Individuum von 4. bis 6. Jh. n. Chr.” is divided into six subchapters, which in turn are divided into further subchapters. The primary subchapters are: “Die Porträts konstantinischer Zeit – Die Loslösung vom Kaiserbild oder die Abgrenzung des Kaisers von der Elite?” (4.1); “Die Privatporträts nach Konstantin bis zum Ende der valentinianischen Dynastie – Individualisierung statt Normierung.” (4.2); “Kaiser, Rom und Senat im 4. Jh. – Die Repräsentationsmechanismen der spätantiken Senatsaristokratie.” (4.3); “Die Porträts des späten 4. und frühen 5. Jhs.” (4.4); “Die Privatporträts des 5. Jhs.” (4.5); “Die Privatporträts des 6. Jhs.” (4.6).

The themes of differences between the Imperial and aristocratic portraiture are explained by their different motives. As the Imperial portraiture underlines timelessness, the aristocratic seeks “moral fiber” in tradition. This tradition, however, and across the Mediterranean, causes problems for the correct dating of these statue portraits: especially in the 6th century when the art was slowly reduced to the level of “type portraits”.

Even though Chapter 4 could have been divided more practically, it should go without saying that the chapter names follow the rigid and informative German tradition of naming the chapters

according to their content – most useful, time saving, and user friendly to any scholar just checking out the table of contents.

Chapter 5 (pp. 213–252) is the prelude to the conclusions, gathering the previous massive set of data into finding out the “average meaning” of the late antique portraiture. Kovacs’ case for purposefully individual late antique aristocratic portraiture is made with a thoroughly considered mass of literary and archaeological evidence. The comparative evidence for his case includes sarcophagi, gold cups, mosaics and paintings. In chapter 6 (pp. 253–258) Kovacs rounds up his final conclusions. These chapters are followed by an excellent catalogue and illustrations.

Kovacs moves effortlessly through late antique time and space with the help of archaeological, literary, and comparative evidence. This is a truly wonderful book and it should be found in any library concentrating on classical art, archaeology, and the like. In my opinion, Kovacs’ goal of better understanding the development of late antique aristocratic self-representation (p. 253) is achieved.

*Juhana Heikonen*

*Priests and State in the Roman World.* Edited by JAMES H. RICHARDSON – FEDERICO SANTANGELO. Potsdamer Altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 33. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2011. ISBN 978-3-515-09817-5. 643 pp., 24 b/w ill., 8 b/w tables. EUR 88.

This substantial book has its origin in the conference which took place 28–30 August 2008 at the University of Wales, Lampeter. The published collection is divided into two parts: Priests and priest-hoods, and Regional contexts, each comprising twelve contributions. The size of the volume both as regards the number of papers and the range of subjects is too large to be covered within this review so I will focus on the pagan priest-hoods of the first part.

Jörg Rüpke starts the first part with a general account on the membership of the priestly colleges (“Different Colleges – Never Mind?”). As the author of the massive *Fasti sacerdotum* (Stuttgart 2005) he is able to draw from his vast knowledge of the priest-hoods and reflect on their diversity and homogeneity. He makes observations about “the process of institutional isomorphism” of the priestly colleges, and the recruitment to different priest-hoods from the point of view of age, mental qualities, and earlier priest-hoods. As to the expression *sacerdotum quattuor amplissima collegia*, Rüpke interestingly concludes that *amplissimus* is an impressive rather than a technical term (p. 26).

The second article, “*Lex Domitia* Revisited” by John North, deals with the *lex Domitia* of 104/103 BC which regulated the priestly elections of the major colleges. The main concern of the paper is the provision mentioned by Cassius Dio (39.17) that two men from the same *gens* (συγγενεία) could not hold the same priest-hood at the same time: was this rule already included in the *lex Domitia*, or added later to the *lex Labiena* of 63 BC, which is said to have restored the provisions of the *lex Domitia* after Sulla had abolished them in 81 BC? Among the very flimsy evidence, which North uses with due caution, the central place is held by Sulla’s claimed place in the college of augurs; if he became an augur while the *lex Domitia* was in force, there would have been two Cornelii in the college simultaneously in the 80s BC, thus showing that Dio’s clause belonged only to the *lex Labiena*. However, Sulla’s whole augurate is based on very controversial evidence,