

archaeology, but actually he achieves much more. He is able to give a clear picture of how mathematics and statistics can be used in archaeology, knowledge which is not only essential in the analysis of excavated objects but also in the planning of a good field-project.

In the introduction the author clearly expresses his position in the current debate between different archaeological schools: the book can be viewed as a prolonged answer to the criticism by the 'post-processual' archaeologists who have tried to undermine the value of statistics in archaeological interpretation. According to the author, the split between field archaeology and high-level theory "will persist until the zone in between is occupied by the rigorous analysis and interpretation of archaeological data patterning" (p. 3).

Even though the book does not require more than a basic knowledge of mathematics and the employed statistical methods are well explained, the pages with complicated formulae will probably drive away the archaeologists who feel they have no mathematical skills. For these readers Clive Orton's *Mathematics in Archaeology* (London 1980) can still be recommended, in spite of the fact that the rapid improvements in computer technology and quantitative methods in the past twenty years have partially rendered the book out of date. I hope someone will take up the challenge and write a new general book on the subject as good as Orton's classic.

The topics covered in the book range from quantitative description and pictorial summaries of single variables to correspondance analysis and probabilistic sampling in archaeology. In addition to the two last mentioned, estimation and testing with normal distribution and randomisation are also mainly new additions to the second edition. As a suggestion for a future third edition, randomisation tests perhaps deserve more detailed coverage, conceivably even their own chapter.

I sincerely hope that this excellent book finds its way not only into university classrooms but also onto field archaeologists' desks.

*Jari Pakkanen*

*Roman Portraits. Artistic and Literary.* Acts of the Third International Conference on the Roman Portraits held in Prague and in the Bechyně Castle from 25 to 29 September 1989. Ed. by Jan Bouzek and Iva Ondřejová. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 1997. ISBN 3-8053-2335-2. 130 p., 36 pls. DEM 98.

This publication presents the majority of the papers given during the Third International Conference on Roman Portraits in 1989. Unfortunately, the publication of the volume was delayed by the "Velvet Revolution" in Czechoslovakia and the problems in domestic policy after that, but we have to be grateful to have the conference proceedings finally at hand.

The book has been divided into five thematic sections: *Official Portraits from Italy, Roman Provinces, Numismatics and Other Minor Arts, Literary Portraits and Comparisons, and Later Perception*. The title of the first section is, however, misleading, since the papers in this section present a wide variety of themes from the Hermes of Olympia to imperial couples assimilated with divinities in Roman art.

The articles discuss a great many topics, but I comment on those that are close to my own interests. In the first paper (pp. 9-15), Paul Zanker gives some new views on the realistic portraits of the Late Republic. He criticizes R. R. Smith for using a too simple

definition for the portraits of the Late Republic, as examples of a common Roman self-knowledge, and L. Giuliani for his theory of "pathognomische Eintönigkeit" that could express the Roman virtues.

Niels Hannestad (pp. 20–23) puts forth a group of portraits as renderings of the deified Julius, recognizable with a star that has been added to the forehead. He admits that these portraits do not share common features with the traditional portraits of Julius Caesar, rendering a young person with features characteristic of princes from the early Julio-Claudian period. Hannestad explains this with the help of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, where Caesar underwent a change to a bright star.

Klaus Fittschen (pp. 32–36) presents a controversial new dating for the two statues of togati in Paris that have generally been identified as representing Emperor Julian. He gives several arguments and comparisons to support his new dating to the second century AD.

The late Elizabeth Alföldi-Rosenbaum (pp. 83–87) commented on the imperial portraits and iconography on the contorniates of the fourth and fifth centuries. She had collected the evidence for the reuse of pattern books and earlier coins in the Roman mints. She explained that the use of different portraits could have had many reasons. Nero arranged games and theatrical performances, which could explain his popularity with the Roman people. Trajan was the 'model' emperor, and Antinous was probably regarded as a pagan god. As she pointed out, the non-existent prominence of Augustus among the portraits is a riddle.

Jan Bouzek (pp. 101–103) discusses the development of artistic and literary portraits, and gives a striking comparison for Late Republican portraits: the portraits of American businessmen. Why not German, French or English, if we use these kinds of comparisons? Another peculiar sentence (p. 102) concerns the portraits of Tiberius, Claudius and Nero: "sometimes the negative qualities of their character became more evident through superficial idealisation."

Gunhild Vidén (pp. 106–108) explains in her interesting study the background for the unfavourable portraits of women in Tacitus' *Annals*. Vidén suggests that Tacitus loathed the female greed for power, which resulted in the negative literary portraits of the Julio-Claudian women.

The layout of the volume is clear and the plates of good quality, only some minor errors are left in the text (for example, Livius for Livia in pl. 35, fig. 6). All in all, this selection of papers gives much food for thought, presents new ideas and new material. In the future, it would be fruitful to place more emphasis on the later perception of Roman portraits, from the Renaissance period until the 20th century. Conservators and sculptors usually changed the appearance of the original statue, combined fragments from separate statues and added new pieces to create the desired aesthetic effect. This has resulted in numerous erroneous identifications, which have been and will be tiresome to rectify.

*Arja Karivieri*