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
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 re-
search 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 previ-
ous 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);

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 say-
ing 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


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 priesthoods, 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 priesthoods 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 priesthoods 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 priesthoods from the point of view of age, mental qualities, and earlier priesthoods. 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 priesthood 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,