

Zwei Beiträge betreffen die hispanischen Provinzen Roms. G. Alföldy (325-356) gibt einen Überblick über den heutigen Stand der Forschung zu den Fasten und zu der Verwaltung der drei Provinzen. Vor allem inschriftliche Neufunde rechtlichen Charakters wie das Stadtgesetz von Irni und seine 'Kopien' sowie das SC de Pisone in der Baetica, aber auch die Regelung der Verteilung des Ebrowassers haben Spanien zu einem Paradies für Forscher auf diesem Gebiet gemacht. A. Stylow (357-365) publiziert hier das neugefundene Fragment eines Stadtgesetzes, das nicht aus der Serie der domitianischen Munizipalordnungen stammt.

In den Osten führt uns St. Mitchell (366-377), der am Beispiel von Ancyra und Galatien zeigt, welchen Schwierigkeiten die Römer in einem großen Gebiet ohne Städte begegneten, und wie man mit ihnen umging. Eine hübsche Bemerkung am Rande (372): der Augustustempel in Ankara war golden angestrichen mit den Inschriften in Zinnoberrot! Auf die Schwierigkeiten, sich in einem so großen Reich, mit und ohne Städte, zurechtzufinden, geht schließlich R. Talbert (256-270) ein, der in dem sog. Itinerarium Antonini keine offizielle oder inoffizielle Publikation sieht, sondern eher das Werk eines privaten, keineswegs der Oberschicht angehörenden, Reisenden (*centurio? beneficiarius?*), dessen Aufzeichnungen und Kopien von Routen erst im Frühmittelalter Benutzer fanden.

Ein seit dem bahnbrechenden Werk von L. Mitteis, 'Reichsrecht und Volksrecht' (1891) und dem Aufsatz von H.J. Wolff über die 'Konkurrenz von Rechtsordnungen in der Antike' (1979) immer wieder aufgenommenes Problem behandelt H. Cotton (234-255), nämlich die Frage, welches Recht zwischen Angehörigen verschiedener Rechtskreise im Imperium Romanum bei Streitfällen anzuwenden war, und wer der zuständige Richter war. Das von Gaius genannte *ius gentium* war sicherlich kein 'Internationales Privatrecht' im modernen Sinn, aber es bot den nicht-römischen Reichsangehörigen eine normalerweise gewährte Toleranz ihrer angestammten Rechtsordnung, wie Cotton schön am Beispiel von P. Yadin 15 zeigen kann.

Der letzte Beitrag von F. Millar (438-446) über die 'Bedeutung der Cursusinschriften für das Studium der römischen Administration im Lichte des griechisch-römischen Reiches von Theodosius II' vergleicht die auf die hohen moralischen Qualitäten des *honorandus* abhebenden griechischen, aber auch lateinischen, Inschriften der Spätantike, die aber höchst selten Ämter und cursus nennen, mit den viel präziseren Ehreninschriften der hohen Kaiserzeit.

Der sehr solide gemachte, von Druckfehlern nahezu freie Band schließt mit Personen- Orts- und Sachregistern sowie einigen Tafeln. Die Anordnung der einzelnen Beiträge bereitet den Herausgebern, natürlicherweise bei einer solchen Sammelschrift, einige Probleme, aber dies ist fast das Einzige, was man ihnen vorwerfen kann. So ist der Band nicht nur für den Empfänger dieser Incognito-Festschrift, sondern auch für die Editoren ein großes Kompliment.

Hartmut Galsterer

Bonn

Peter Stewart, *The Social History of Roman Art*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. 200 pp. ISBN 978-0-521-01659-9.

The importance of Peter Stewart's (hence S.) book is manifest in the themes discussed in each of its five chapters (163 pages): Who made Roman art, Identity and status, Portraits in society, The power of images, and Art of the empire. Although all five themes are familiar and have been discussed repeatedly<sup>1</sup> (as reflected in the 18 pages of bibliography, the bibliographical essay on pages 173-176 and in the numerous references annotating the text<sup>2</sup>), they have not been dealt with adequately hitherto under the umbrella of social history. Therefore, although the volume is hardly

1 Including Stewart's own work (P. Stewart, 2003, *Statues in Roman Society: Representation and Response*, Oxford; and 2004, *Roman Art*, Oxford).

2 Although in several references the pages are not specified, e.g. p. 20 n. 43.

innovative, the emphasis S. lays on the difficulties in tracing the social history of Roman art calls attention, yet again, to the caution needed when analyzing both written and visual data. S. thus provides valuable guidelines for art history students, who should learn from this volume to give more careful consideration before offering social interpretations of Roman art, no matter how attractive they may seem.

The 'Introduction' (1-9) opens with observations about high art and low art, art and non-art, art and material culture, visual culture and visual history; it also explains the choice of visual examples and declares that the book is by no means an 'introduction' of any kind. A brief and selective survey (4-6) of approaches and fields of interest provides the reader (who may not be familiar with the studies themselves) with a general idea of the field of social history of art.

Chapter One (10-38) has five sections. The first three briefly survey the conclusions that can or cannot be drawn from the epigraphic and literary evidence available on the names, origin and status of individual artists (who in many cases were only skilled craftsmen) in Roman society. Following and updating Alison Burford's study<sup>3</sup>, while focusing on Roman art, S.'s interpretation continually reminds the reader that the evidence is too sporadic (where epitaphs and signatures are concerned), too highly tendentious (when historical testimonies of Roman authors are involved), and rather too ambiguous (concerning visual representations) to offer a genuine picture of the artists' perspective.

The next two sections deal with: 1. the collaboration between craftsmen (i.e. workshops); 2. the practice of passing down craft traditions from father to son or to apprentices from outside the family; 3. the contribution of craftsmen, patrons and customers to the development of Roman art concerning continuity and conservatism, innovations, thematic repertoire, and styles and taste.

Chapter Two (39-76), relates to the Romans' notions of their personal identity and place in society as manifested in the architecture and artistic decoration of the house and the tomb. Once again, historical texts are of little help here, since they relate mostly to the Roman elite, while the more humble sectors of society are evaluated by archaeological evidence and through the data from Petronius' *Satyricon* (*Cena Trimalchionis*). Two houses, the so-called Villa of the Poppaei at Oplontis and the House of the Vettii in Pompeii, provide S. with the opportunity to illustrate how the decor of the house can denote the function of the indoor and outdoor spaces as either semi-public or private; and consequently as a clue to the owner's status or, more precisely, his wealth.

Turning to funerary art, S. chooses to focus on three categories of visual evidence: the tomb (with reference to Trimalchio's fictional monument), the portrait of the deceased and the sarcophagus. The reader once again realizes that interpretations of social identity based on such evidence may be speculative. The reason, as S. rightly points out, is the lack of inscriptions with personal data and of terms suitable for accurate classification.

In addition to a few introductory comments on the origin,<sup>4</sup> range of materials, functions, contexts and meanings of Roman portraits, Chapter Three (77-107) has five sections, referring mostly to public and honorific portrait-statues. The first two mainly discuss the limitations of the typological method of identifying and analyzing a portrait according to its resemblance to a certain artistic type. In Section Two, S. discusses the use of Imperial prototypes and their distribution, possibly also via portable plaster models, which were copied in local workshops. These portrait-statues represented the emperors and were often treated as divine images.

Sections Three and Four explore the issue of what the viewer may or may not deduce from the appearance of a portrait of a Roman individual (facial characteristics, body anatomy, dress and hairstyle) about the social position and alleged character of that individual. Although the issue is intricate, S. manages, in a few pages, to point out the basic factors involved in portraiture judgment, to criticize certain approaches which he considers methodologically unreliable, arbitrary or inconsistent, and to show that our incomplete comprehension of self-representation

3 Alison Burford, 1972, *Craftsmen in Greek and Roman Society*, London.

4 The relation between Etruscan and Roman portraiture is ignored in S.'s study.

results from the partial or tendentious data which Roman portrait-statues provide. The absence, for example, of visible pigments on a draped marble image makes it more difficult to identify the connection between style of clothing and social status. In any case, a conclusion drawn without taking into account the dress accessories, the hairstyle, the attributes and context of display, cannot be completely reliable.

Who was responsible for commissioning, financing and setting up portrait-statues? This question is discussed in Section Five of Chapter Three. While in the previous sections the visual rhetoric is the core of the study of Roman portraiture, the fifth section presents the complementary contribution of epigraphy towards the placing of portrait-statues within a social context. Obviously the inscriptions tell much about *beneficia* and *honoraria* and about the status of certain wealthy members within certain communities; though one may wonder how exactly ‘the stern facial features of a provincial governor’s portraits’ can be interpreted as ‘intended to complement the conventional inscribed praise for their uncompromising honesty and austere commitment to justice’ (106). It should be noted that on page 91, S. argues that such an approach ‘to portraits is methodologically unreliable.’<sup>5</sup>

Two aspects of the power of images are discussed in Chapter Four (108-142): the ‘power of political imagery’ and ‘the power of works of art to affect people’s feelings and behaviour’ (108). In the first section (out of five) S. argues against the characterization of Imperial monuments (like Trajan’s Arch in Beneventum and the *Ara Pacis Augustae* in Rome) as visual propaganda. S. claims that ‘The Roman world, as far as we can tell, had nothing like a modern propaganda machine’ (112). Yet the Romans must have had some sort of a propaganda machine<sup>6</sup> (having no knowledge of how it worked does not prove that it did not exist); how can we otherwise explain the rhetoric of political art (covered in Section Two)? The phenomenon of adoption by private individuals of official propaganda semantics, as well as the viewers’ responses to political and religious imagery (Sections Three and Four)<sup>7</sup> point to the efficiency of the Roman system of propaganda.

While referring to the political imagery of Octavian and Mark Antony (125-126), S. admits that their ‘programmatic use of politically resonant religious and mythological images comes closer to the modern phenomenon of propaganda than any of the later, imperial works considered above ...’. This distinction ensues from S.’s belief that the Emperor was not involved in shaping the visual programs of monuments erected by the senate and the people of Rome (112-116). But is it conceivable that an emperor would have allowed any sort of commemoration (at least in Rome) to be carried out without his approval? The points of similarity between the official and the private Imperial imagery — e.g. cameos (121-123) and interior decoration (House of Augustus) — make it possible to suggest that the emperor himself, or at least someone on his behalf, dictated the type of propaganda that was manifested in the public monuments.

Section Five of Chapter Four investigates the role of religious and cultic art in Roman society and briefly also discusses the responses of the believers in Pagan and Christian communities to the narrative and non-narrative<sup>8</sup> imagery.

5 The argument on p. 91 refers to the interpretation of Nero’s portraits that stems from the literary sources on the vicissitudes of his life.

6 Not necessarily as sophisticated as the coin-minting propagandistic machinery.

7 On these matters see Rivka Gersht, 2001, ‘Roman Condensed Indicative Symbols and Emblems’, in: *The Metamorphosis of Marginal Images from Antiquity to the Present*, eds. Nurit Kenaan-Kedar and Asher Ovadiah, Tel-Aviv University, 49-58 (Hebrew). See also Barbetta Stanley Spaeth, 1996, *The Roman Goddess Ceres*, Austin; and Olga Palagia, 1986, ‘Imitations of Herakles in Ruler Portraiture — a Survey from Alexander to Maximinus Daza’, *Boreas* 9 137-151, for the role of Ceres and Heracles in Imperial propaganda.

8 Within non-narrative imagery, S. includes detached (in the round or in relief) images and symbols.

'Art and Empire' is the title of the final chapter (143-172). The first two sections discuss the issue of the identity of Roman art, a topic that was already referred to in Chapter One. In Chapter Five, S. relates to the circumstances that introduced the Greek heritage into Roman society and the resulting stylistic pluralism of Roman art. The *Sebasteion* in Aphrodisias is taken as a paradigm for a 'sophisticated provincial homage to Roman power' (150). Sophisticated it is, yet perhaps more than already recognized. Aphrodisias's privileged status as a Roman ally is especially demonstrated in the mythological themes that are depicted, which address both the Greek and Roman viewer. These can be interpreted as an implicit manifestation of equality that stressed the common origin (with reference to Aphrodite, Anchises and Aeneas — the ancestors of the founders of Rome and of the Julians) of gods and heroes.

Contrary to classical Greek traditions, the non-classical traits in provincial (with Roman Britain taken as an example), 'plebeian' (of the 'ordinary people') and late Roman art, are expounded in the remaining sections of this chapter.

The book is well written and there is ample reference to literary and epigraphic sources. The descriptions of the works of art are brief, yet provide the reader with sufficient information to understand the discussion in each chapter. It is a pity though that there are so few illustrations. All in all, S. manages to combine the issues in question within the five chapters in a fascinating way, demonstrating that social history of art may mean very different things.

Rivka Gersht

Tel Aviv University

Margaret Atkins and Robin Osborne (eds.), *Poverty in the Roman World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. xiii + 226 pp. ISBN: 0-521-86211-6.

Contemporary explanations for poverty do not stand on common ground. Analysts scrutinize economic, political, environmental, cultural factors, etc., in order to measure, debate, and assess poverty on a global scale. If contemporary methods for conceptualizing poverty are so complex, how do historians tackle the issues for the ancient world? Some answers are found in Atkins' and Osborne's thought-provoking volume, which attempts to flesh out the nature of poverty in the first 400 years CE of the Roman empire. Inspired by the seminal work of Peter Garnsey, ten former students contribute comprehensive and insightful pieces that were originally delivered as part of a conference in the Garnsey's honor in 2003. An overview of the contributions follows.

As the title suggests, R. Osborne's 'Introduction: Roman Poverty in Context' (Chapter 1) provides a comprehensive summary of past scholarship related to the topic. Osborne exposes one major lacuna in the secondary literature: the failure to consider chronological issues as well as empirical data. Scholars, for example, need to reflect upon the difficulties inherent in the conceptualization of poverty, the paucity of economic data to define poverty, and the rhetorical biases of the literary sources configured around the wealthy elite.

To provide a sense of how the Romans, or better yet, modern scholars have construed representations of poverty in the late Republic and early Empire, the next two contributions consider the role of social stratification. N. Morely's, 'The Poor in Ancient Rome', (Chapter 2) takes readers through an analysis of 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century political economists and their equation of the poor with the plebs or the *populus*. Morely convincingly demonstrates the difficulties inherent in defining precisely who the poor really were. For him, they should be envisaged as a socio-cultural entity 'who, in unknown numbers, failed to make a mark in the historical record' (31). Morely advocates looking at themes such as 'vulnerability', 'exclusion', and 'shame' to acquire a more nuanced understanding of these individuals.

W. Scheidel's 'Stratification, Deprivation, and Quality of Life' (Chapter 3) delves into the problematic rhetorical trope found in the ancient literary sources. In simple terms, the Roman