

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,

especially on coins issued by Sulla after his return from the East (M. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage I*, cat. 359, pp. 373–374. 1974). These show a jug and a *lituus* on the reverse, which fact has been interpreted to refer to Sulla's augurate. North argues that "Sulla was either never augur at all, or only after passing his law on the priesthoods", and that the symbols on the reverse of the above-mentioned coins do not evoke the holding of priesthoods but the piety of the successful Roman general. In this interpretation he comes close to that of J. Rufus Fears who saw the *lituus* as the symbol of the *felicitas* of the charismatic general ("The Coinage of Q. Cornificius and Augural Symbolism on Late Republican Denarii", *Historia* 24, 1975, 592–602 – an article not found in North's bibliography). *Ceterum*, the paper has a short appendix on the so-called *Fasti augurum* (ILS 9338). There, in his last footnote he refers to the present reviewer "for a recent statement of the case for the list being all augural" – this is somewhat baffling, since I explicitly wrote that "the evidence for the inscription as a whole remains inconclusive. In particular, we cannot rule out the possibility that the inscription comprised more than one college – that is to say, that one tablet might be a fragment of a list of the augurs; another that of the pontiffs" (*Hermes* 130, 2002, p. 105). North's suggestion for the heading of the inscription, ... *in comment*]arios c[ollegii, is also very close to my own proposal, ... *apud comment*]arios c[ollegi, which he does not mention.

Christian Kvium's treatment of augural matters ("Inauguration and Foundation. An Essay on Roman Ritual Classification and Continuity") is less felicitous and leaves the reader somewhat baffled. On augural matters, it rests in practice solely on Jerzy Linderski's (admittedly unsurpassed) *ANRW* article "The Augural Law", thus oddly ignoring all more recent augural studies, including, e.g., the highly relevant "Founding the City: Ennius and Romulus on the Site of Rome" by Linderski (reprinted now in his *Roman Questions II*). As a result, his discussion with research is rather limited. One also finds several statements that are unfounded, e.g., the idea that an inaugurated place in Rome should be visible from the *auguraculum* (p. 66), or that inaugurations began with the taking of auspices (p. 67) – surely the taking of auspices was an integral part of the ceremony itself and not a preliminary act as in the case of, for instance, *comitia*. The whole discussion concerning the augur's orientation (facing south – ignoring, for one, the concrete evidence offered by the *auguraculum* of Bantia, where the augur's seat is to the west of the *templum*) and the delimitation of *templum* (p. 72 ff.) seems very confused and reveals misunderstandings of sources: e.g., the formula given by Varro *templa tescaque m(eae) f(ines) ita sunt* does not say 'my boundaries between *templa* and *tesca* ...'.

James Richardson's contribution, "The Vestal Virgins and the Use of the *Annales Maximii*", is a novel attempt to explain the ritual entombment of an unchaste Vestal and also why these cases would not have been recorded in the *annales maximii*. His explanation carries conviction: the offence of the unchaste Vestal was irreparable and inexpiable; thus it had to be removed from existence. Her entombment was not a punishment as such (she was put in an underground chamber with some food, drink and a lamp), but a ritual by means of which the Romans solved the problem. This is why the unchaste Vestal was also deprived of any monuments and why it would have been unlikely that the *pontifex maximus* had kept any record of the trial and entombment. The unchaste Vestal suffered a complete *damnatio memoriae* (an expression avoided by Richardson), and therefore it is likely "that most of the notices concerning the condemnation of unchaste Vestals are annalistic fabrications".

Fay Glinister's "Bring on the Dancing Girls: Some Thoughts on the Salian Priesthood" is a learned discussion on the *Salii* and especially on their less-known female counterparts the *Saliae*.

There is much we do not know and that remains conjectural about these “dancing girls”. Glinister refutes the older idea that the *Saliae* were lower class hired women and argues forcefully that they were real counterparts of the *Salii*: this would fit the discernible parallelism in Roman religion, where the archaic priesthoods have their male and female branches, like the *flamen* and *flaminica* or *rex* and *regina*.

In his contribution “The *haruspices* of the Emperor: Tarquitiu Priscus and Sejanus’ Conspiracy”, Mario Torelli tries to show that Tiberius’ *haruspex* was behind Sejanus’ falling into disfavour with the emperor. This might be true, but the evidence is highly conjectural and left the present reader in doubt at several points in the chain of evidence.

Federico Santangelo’s paper, “*Pax deorum* and Pontiffs”, deals with the concept of *pax deorum* and the role of the pontiffs in establishing it. Based on the surviving textual evidence, Santangelo challenges the traditional view about “the peace of the gods” as a firm theological construct: there was no such status which the Romans tried to maintain or (after its breach) to restore. According to him (if I understand him correctly) the *pax deorum* was something that had to be negotiated (just as in war the peace has to be negotiated) each time the gods needed appeasement. This interpretation, however, raises some questions. First of all the expression *pax deorum* appears so many times in literature that it looks very much like a concept. Secondly, one also has to think about the context from another viewpoint and ask whether certain circumstances are more likely to elicit such mentions. It is in wartime that one talks about the peace. Hence the mere looking at the textual evidence can be very misleading.

In his contribution, “The *fetiales* and Roman International Relations”, John Rich returns to the *fetiales* thirty years after his classic book *Declaring War in the Roman Republic in the Period of Transmarine Expansion*. This is an updated, learned and lucid account of the *fetial* priests, their history, and various activities. Most interesting of these is their role in declaring war, about which there is much scholarly disagreement. Rich is highly sceptical as to the historicity of the accounts of our ancient sources, and holds that the alleged standard *fetial* procedure for the preliminaries of war was used only occasionally during the early centuries of the Republic – many a war would have begun without any formal preliminaries. Although the *fetiales* were considered authorities on ritual requirements for war preliminaries, the role given to them by the surviving ancient sources was a later literary construct that aimed to give an idealized portrayal of Rome waging just wars.

The augural doctrine concerning war and triumphs at the end of the Republic is the topic of Alberto Dalla Rosa’s paper, “Dominating the Auspices: Augustus, Augury and the Proconsuls”. Augustus’ new position of *princeps* gave him auspicial superiority over the proconsuls, so that all military action in every province was carried out under his *auspicia*. According to Dalla Rosa this superiority had its precedents in those cases where the consuls were given auspicial prominence over proconsuls. The Republican period offers some examples where more than one *general*, both consuls and proconsuls, with equal *imperium* were on the same battlefield; this brought up the question of under whose *auspicia* the battle was fought. Augustus’ superiority was based on the *exousia ton hupaton* granted to him in 19 BC, which gave him the same dignity as a consul and the personal submission of proconsuls before departing for their province to act under Augustus’ *auspicia*. This is a sensible explanation.

In “Augustus and the Priesthoods of Rome: the Evidence of Suetonius”, David Wardle focuses on chapters 30–31 of Suetonius’ *Life of Augustus*, where Suetonius discusses Augustus’ ac-

tions in relation to state religion. Wardle demonstrates that, in its context within the *Life*, the section falls within Suetonius' discussion of the *res urbanae* and it should be seen as part of Augustus' public career as *princeps* and *pontifex maximus* rather than reflecting his private religious preferences. Wardle offers a sound discussion as regards Augustus' religious reforms mentioned by Suetonius, e.g. the sensible interpretation of *sacerdotum et numerum et dignitatem sed et commoda auxit*.

David Hunt's paper, "Fellow-Servants of God: Roman Emperor and his Christian Bishops in the Age of Constantine", and David Noy's "Jewish Priests and Synagogue Officials in the Greco-Roman Diaspora of Late Antiquity" end the first part of the book. The second half covers priest-hoods outside the *Urbs*, both in Italy and in several Roman provinces.

In sum, this is an impressive and well-edited volume which no doubt will be of great interest, especially to those dedicated to the study of Roman religion.

Jyri Vaahera

*Vom Nil aus um die Alte Welt: Rekonstruktionen ägyptischer, minoischer und griechischer Schiffe. Katalog einer Ausstellung im Winkelmann-Museum vom 27. April bis 22. September 2013.* Edited by MAX KUNZE. Verlag Franz Philipp Rutzen, Mainz – Ruppolding 2013. ISBN 978-3-447-06956-4. 96 S., 145 ill. EUR 30.

This exhibition catalogue shows ship reconstructions built by Michael Bormann, and the rich collection of ancient pictorial evidence on which they are based. The reconstructions include ships from Egypt, the Minoan culture, and Greece in the period of the great colonization. The detailed study and work on the reconstructions aims at showing how the ships and their rigging were actually built in the ancient world. Each chapter also contains information about the historical background of these ships and the archaeological excavations where the material was discovered. Besides Michael Bormann, other authors are Stephanie-Gerrit Bruer, Michael Haase, Frank Hildebrandt, Elke Mähltitz-Galler, Alex Rügler and Veit Stürmer.

Chapter one contains articles about the meaning of the Nile for Egyptian life and transport, the fleet of King Sahura (c. 2490–2475) in the Old Kingdom, and the fleet of Queen Hatshepsut (c. 1479–1458) in the New Kingdom. This is the fascinating thing about Egyptian society: that besides the Nile, they sailed on the Red Sea, to reach Punt – probably located in the area at the border of current Ethiopia and Sudan or on the coast of Somalia – and along the east coast of the Mediterranean, where the city of Byblos served as the centre for goods coming from Arabia and Mesopotamia and where the Egyptians would sail directly to take goods to Egypt. Egyptian society and culture and its high standard of living in so many different ways depended on these contacts and imported goods. Shipbuilding and its techniques can be analysed from many tomb paintings. The reconstruction of a boat from the fleet of King Sahura and a ship from the Punt expedition are shown in detailed photos and in discussions explaining their construction and stability at sea.

Chapter two deals with trade and transport vessels on the Nile in the New Kingdom. In tomb paintings they are often depicted in larger groups, with a crew from two to six men on board. The reconstruction of the transport ship is based on the depiction found in the tomb of Merire, the high priest of Aten in the service of Akhenaten (c. 1352–1336).