male bias in the expansion of individual entries.

It must be a constant problem for Late Roman prosopographers how to spell names. I would question the decision to treat, e.g., Eraclius, Erennios, Ioannes, Ioannis, Iobianus and Iobinus separately from Heraclius, Herennius, Iohannes, Iovianus and Iovinus, as these are only different graphic variants of the same name. The practice does not seem to be quite uniform throughout the work. One may also be surprised to find an entry for Ouesperion, with no trace of an entry for Vesperion. More similar cases might be found. Finally, I note that the correct reference for Victorina 1 should now be ICUR X 27330.

As far as I can see, this is a carefully produced book and extremely useful for a number of further studies on onomastics, prosopography, social and ecclesiastical history, and gender studies, among others. It will take its place as the basic reference work alongside PLRE.

Antti Arjava


The first edition of this book appeared almost sixty years ago, in 1943. Karl Schefold (1905-1999), though assisted by collaborators, was himself responsible for the majority of the revisions and additions. This point might not have deserved mention except that the author had done this work in his nineties. Schefold's profound knowledge of all forms of ancient art, acquired through painstaking research over many decades, is clearly recognisable in this as in so many other contributions. The revised version of Die Bildnisse is considerably larger than the original one: numerous new illustrations have been added (while some from the 1943 edition have been omitted), new materials are included (statuettes in terracotta and reliefs), and more space is given to the photographs of coins. As a result, the catalogue displays 329 illustrations from archaic representations of musicians and singers to a statuette of Christ from the fourth century A.D. What is more, recent scholarship and research on ancient portraits are duly discussed. This is partly reflected in the essays which have been essentially rewritten. Many discussions of individual pieces are also more solid than before, and chronological issues have been thoroughly rethought. In fact, now the portraits are arranged not according to the period in which the persons represented lived (or were thought to have lived), but according to the period in which the specific portrait type was established.

The book focuses on poets, orators and thinkers. However, the contents are sometimes beyond what is suggested by the title, for besides a number of poets who may not be poets in the proper sense of the word, one also encounters portraits of politicians, doctors, historians, and even a relief representing a priestess (identified as Diotima). The inclusion of the last-named (fig. 39) is somewhat artificial, as the necessary link with literature is created only by Diotima's appearance in Plato's Symposium. What is more,
too much imagination may be required to agree with Schefold (and some others) that the funerary relief from Mantinea shows none other than the Platonic Diotima. As a matter of fact, the identification of the persons represented constitutes a major problem in Schefold's work. Though a number of attributions of the first edition have been revised, many questionable entries remain. In general, it seems that Schefold is too optimistic about the possibilities of identification. Some proposals are based on no more than what have been traditionally regarded as typical attributes of a philosopher or of a poet. Even inscribed pieces are often problematic, for an epigraphic label may be of secondary, even spurious origin. To cite an example, despite the fact that his name is displayed, can we be sure that fig. 244, and thus also fig. 243, really represent Seneca? But even if Seneca could be thus established, it may be too simplistic to postulate a connecting link between him and the Socrates represented on the opposite side of the double herm: the reason why such a herm was erected would be that both figures were known to have committed suicide. Another case (fig. 245): a man on a funerary relief (now in Basle) is identified as Phaedrus, the writer of fables, because a mouse is represented to the left of his head: interesting rather than convincing (note that animals, including mice, are not an uncommon topic in Roman funerary art). To be sure, Schefold is well aware of such difficulties, and so he has frequently added a question mark after the person's name.

The essays, accompanied by 177 endnotes, provide a great deal of pertinent reading (see, respectively, within Ch. 1 [Einleitung: Geschichte der Bildnisse der antiken Dichter, Redner und Denker] and Ch. 4 [Ergebnisse]). Among the many important insights into ancient portraiture, one may note the following: One and the same individual could be represented in stylistically varying versions in many different periods. A good example is, of course, Homer who was portrayed in most periods of antiquity. As a further case, one may cite Aristophanes (provided that the attributions are correct): While the Late Classical fig. 50 (+ 64), regarded as belonging to the comic poet's funerary relief, portrays a spiritually tense figure, the famous (High) Hellenistic bronze head fig. 149 f. shows a fairly serious drunkard (note that, according to Ath. 10, 429 a, not only Alcaeus but also Aristophanes composed his pieces in a state of intoxication). Regarding the differences between Greece and Rome, it is interesting to observe with Schefold that Roman poets were generally not represented in plastic art before Trajanic Classicism.

Mika Kajava


In this book, Chr. Zindel publishes 36 fish plates from a Swiss collection. 'Fish plate' is traditionally used to denote a certain type of shallow and circular ceramic ware on which fishes were often depicted. Early interpretations of the application of fish plates were obvious: they would have served as plates for fish dishes.

Unfortunately, since the Gottet pieces come from the antiquarian market, the