Gottheit dargebracht werden können (blutig, frugal oder auch als fertige Mahlzeit), als Theoxenien bezeichnet. Es geht dabei aber um die Speisung des Gottes im Bild, die z.B. für den Festablauf in Samos und Ephesos (229ff.) überliefert ist und sich unter die Pflege der Statue (Kapitel 4, s.o.) einreihen läßt: neben Bad, Schmückung und Kleidung gab man den Göttern in ihren Bildern auch zu essen, und zwar über das hinaus, was bei jedem Brandopfer dem Gott zuteil wurde.

Theoxenien als eigenes Fest der Götterbewirtung sieht B. durch eine Opfervorschrift von ca. 180 belegt, die sich auf ein Fest für Zeus Sosipolis in Magnesia bezieht, an dem Zeus ein Stier geopfert wurde, was sich (offenbar zu dem Zeitpunkt der Inschrift) zu einer prächtigen Feier und zusätzlichen Tieropfern an Zeus, Artemis und Apoll ausweitete: der Stephanophoros hatte an der Spitze der Prozession die festlich gekleideten Xoana (nicht die Kultstatuen, so B. 222) der zwölf Götter zu tragen, diese wurden in einer ad hoc aufgebauten Tholos neben dem Zwölfgötter-Altar auf der Agora auf allerschönste Klinen gelegt, immer vier auf eine. Die Zwölfgötter waren Gäste des Festes, repräsentiert durch gewiß kleine Statuetten, sie nahmen als Zuschauer teil, ohne daß sie eigens unter den detailliert aufgeführten Empfängern des Fleisches genannt waren.

Die Arbeit B.s endet etwas abrupt, statt mit dem Versuch einer Zusammenfassung, mit einer Appendix über den Kult der Artemis Orthia in Sparta und Messene, bei dem Priestertinnen das Kultbild der Artemis im Arm hielten (s.o.); allerdings fehlen für Messene erklärende Nachrichten, die den Vorgang erläutern.

Trotz der Fragen, die man im einzelnen hat, ist man dankbar für die Klärung mancher Probleme, die B. in selektiver Auswahl angegangen hat. Viele interessante Einzelbeobachtungen, besonders aus dem sprachlichen Bereich, machen dieses Buch reizvoll, allerdings bedarf es bei der Lektüre einiger Sucharbeit, da wichtige Fragen oft in den Anmerkungen versteckt behandelt werden, denen man aber auch nicht immer trauen sollte, da B. mit Namen und Zahlen nicht auf bestem Fuß steht.

Rom

Fernande Hölscher


In recent years the most important advances in the study of imperial portraiture have been made by adopting a more rigorous typological approach to the surviving portraits. Klaus Fittschen and Paul Zanker attempted the first systematic application of the new method, but no one has since done more to develop and refine that method in practice than D. Boschung (henceforth B.). One of the
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drawbacks of this otherwise very fruitful approach is that it concerns itself almost exclusively with identification, sometimes giving the impression that this is the only thing that counts in the study of portraiture – whether we can identify precisely who is represented, or whether an emperor was portrayed in one, two, or more types. It is to be welcomed, therefore, that B. has now published an in-depth study of Julio–Claudian portrait groups which places the emphasis instead on the contexts in which such monuments were displayed (Aufstellung), and which is explicitly aimed at the larger goal of understanding the function (Wirkung, Bedeutung) they performed in early imperial culture. B. attempts to view the portraits not so much in terms of the intentions of the patron and sculptor (‘Whom was the statue intended to represent?’ ‘What model was followed?’ – although for B. these questions still remain central), but more from the perspective of potential viewers (‘In what circumstances and surroundings did people encounter these images?’ ‘What did these groups of statues mean to those who saw them?’). B. himself, in the epigraph he chose for the book, seems to acknowledge that this shift in viewpoint, from production to reception, provides an important corrective to the thrust of his earlier work: «I sat upon the shore / Fishing, with the arid plain behind me / Shall I at least set my lands in order?» (T. S. Eliot, The Wasteland, 423–5).¹ The task B. has set himself is a highly ambitious one, as he is well aware.² Whether or not that goal is fully attained, the appearance of this book is an event of major importance for everyone engaged in the study of Roman portraits.

The emphasis on reception has immediate consequences for the scope and organization of the monograph, which are clearly set out in chapter one (1–7). First, unlike B.’s earlier studies, the collection of material included is not intended to be comprehensive. All known (or alleged) Julio–Claudian groups are not treated.³ Instead B. focuses on the better documented monuments, where one can attempt to reconstruct the original setting. He thus proceeds by means of a series of case studies. Second, the approach is broadly synchronic: the ‘Julio–Claudian portrait group (31 BC–AD 69)’ is treated as a basically uniform phenomenon, and groups are sorted and discussed according to where (rather than when) they were set up. B. is not aiming here to establish regional distinctions within the empire: on the contrary, groups from North Africa, Spain, Italy, and

---

¹ See also his comments in the introduction (6): «Die thematische Verengung der Porträtforschung auf Benennungsfragen ist zunehmend als unbefriedigend empfunden worden.»

² «Der ursprünglich intendierte Sinnzusammenhang des Kaiserbildnisses, das heißt sein Verhältnis zu anderen Statuen, zur umgebenden Architektur und zum Betrachter, sind dagegen noch kaum systematisch untersucht worden.» (7); «Meine Arbeit untersucht anhand von Statuengruppen die Aufstellung, Wirkung und Bedeutung von Kaiserbildnissen im architektonischen und urbanistischen Kontext.» (1).

³ Though for the sake of completeness even groups which (for one reason or another) B. does not intend to discuss are listed in two extensive appendices (Anhang I, 131–4; II, 134–44).
the Greek east are continually intermingled throughout his study.\(^1\) Instead the groups are classified according to the kind of building or 'urban context' in which they were displayed: forum and basilica (Ch. 3), theater (Ch. 4), sanctuaries, private houses and villas (Ch. 5).

B. seeks to provide a firm basis for this 'contextual study' by leading off with an extended discussion of several monuments from a single city: Leptis Magna (Ch. 2). A large number of extant inscriptions, bases, and statues reveal that there were Julio-Claudian groups set up here in a variety of locations: in the temple of Augustus and Rome, on the rostra in front of the temple, in a portico perhaps behind the temple, in the theater, in the chalcidicum (and elsewhere). In a brilliant analysis of the archaeological finds B. makes good sense of these groups as a sequence of dedications. He relates the various portrait groups to one another wherever possible – visually, spatially and chronologically. At the same time he shows how these monuments helped to shape and define the city centre, and how the collective image of the ruling dynasty is supplemented and modified over time. B. concludes his discussion with a fine evocation of the 'presence' (Präsenz) – the conspicuous visibility – of the imperial family in all Leptis' most important public spaces (24). This sharply focused picture of one particular city is intended to provide the framework within which the (mostly less well documented) material from elsewhere is to be understood. The fragmentary and incomplete groups discussed in the later chapters are all intended to support and enrich this general picture sketched out for Leptis Magna.

A serious obstacle to the study of the Julio-Claudian groups, acknowledged by B. at the outset (2), is the difficulty of deciding what constitutes a 'group'. Does it matter whether a group of statues was set up all in one go as a single commission, whether the group only came into being slowly by gradual accretion, or whether it was only produced by combining several earlier unrelated dedications in a new way? B. shows commendable caution in what he is prepared to accept as a genuine group – ruling out assemblages possibly produced by storing decommissioned statues in one depot or by gathering them for the limekiln (2–4; 131–44). Having completed his contextual survey (Chs. 3–5), he devotes an entire chapter (Ch. 6) to clear instances of re-deployment of Julio-Claudian portrait groups in later times, from the Flavian period to Late Antiquity. This represents a valuable addition to the survey, since it broadens our perspective to include the 'systematization' (127: Systematisierung) practiced on the groups by later generations. Two Appendices listing groups not taken into account in the previous chapters follow chapter six (above n. 3). These lists seem strangely placed in the book as a whole, but the rationale is presumably to keep the sections dealing primarily with archaeological material all together.

In chapter seven B. considers the evidence provided by inscriptions and coins. He does not reproduce the (90) extant inscriptions (which have been well worked over elsewhere), but merely lists them in a useful table, in approximately

\(^1\) Although well equipped with site plans, surprisingly the book does not include a general map to assist the reader in placing many of the sites discussed in the text. This is a regrettable omission, since these are by no means all well known. How many prospective readers will immediately be able to place Ruscino, Zian (Zita), Centuripe, Nin (Aenona), or Nomentum?
C. H. Hallett: Boschung, Gens Augusta

chronological order, with the members of the imperial family known to have been represented. This table then forms the basis of an historical survey of Julio–Claudian dynastic groups (145–54). There are few surprises here, and the picture that emerges is basically that traced for the groups some years ago by Rose.¹ This is not a presentation of new results, and B.’s terse and sober description eschews virtually all speculation about dynastic policy or official intentions. The survey provides a clear statement of the historical overview which stands behind B.’s interpretive work with the groups, set out in the earlier chapters.

The discussion of coins (158–67), on the other hand, has a different role. Coins provide abundant and quite separate evidence for the grouping of Julio–Claudian portraits. They are widely disseminated and many survive. They indicate what sort of groupings are possible, and give some indication of the key moments when new configurations within the imperial family were publicly commemorated throughout the empire. B. singles out the Roman colony of Corinth to indicate the way in which local coinages ‘react’ to events in the capital and to the coin-types issued by official mints. And he then broadens this into an interesting discussion of the degree to which the provincial cities followed the official mints in their selection of designs, emphasizing the remarkable independence they enjoyed.

In chapter eight B. assesses the effect (Wirkung) of the group-monuments in their original settings, and what meaning (Bedeutung) they had for the ancient viewer. This ought, on the face of it, to be a statement of the results of B.’s entire enterprise – the culmination of all the case studies presented earlier. This, in the present reviewer’s opinion, is the least successful segment of the book.

B. begins with a section intended to evoke the ‘emotional’ response which viewers had to statues in the ancient world. Naturally enough such an account can only be based on the literary record, and the discussion soon becomes a catalogue of anecdotes about the range of responses to divine and imperial imagery drawn from textual sources – with an emphasis on the irrational (from religious superstition to politically motivated vandalism). The discussion is couched in very abstract terms and does not leave the reader with any vivid impression of the visual and emotional impact of the monuments. There follows a section defining the kinds of occasions on which statue-honours were voted for members of the imperial family, and the complex processes by which the statue groups came into being. Though comprehensive and informative, this section sits uneasily with the preceding one: the whole process now comes to seem remarkably rational and calculated. For the ancient reception of these monuments it is crucial to see them in the context of the public festivals, banquets and religious rituals for which they provided the focus, and B. goes on to catalogue a whole series of examples of such events from the epigraphic record. Here for a brief moment we seem close to B.’s goal of seeing the imperial groups through the eyes of the ancient audience; and in a fine description of the small Cancelleria relief B. evokes all the elements which might accompany the viewing of such statues. But in the end B.’s account of the ritual also has a rather detached quality, and the details of the public ceremony never quite manage to connect with the statues illustrated in the plates. It is symptomatic of the problem that B. does not even illustrate the Cancelleria relief he so successfully describes.

The real climax to the book comes in chapter nine, which addresses the Julio–Claudian family as the subject of visual representation (Bildthema). Here we are treated to a full description of the development of the portraiture of the Julio–

¹ C. B. Rose, Dynastic Commemoration and Imperial Portraiture in the Julio–Claudian Period (Cambridge 1997) 11–56.

https://doi.org/10.17104/0017-1417_2004_5_437

Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.
Claudian family, from its beginnings in Octavian’s experimental early portraits, through all the configurations of Augustus’ dynastic plans, down to the death of Nero. B. here takes the opportunity to review his account of all the securely established portrait types of the Julio–Claudian family, published nearly ten years ago (see above n. 2). This time there is an important addition. The types are now discussed in combination with one another, and – building on earlier scholarship (notably that of Fittschen and Zanker) – B. describes the evolution of Julio–Claudian portraiture as an historical narrative. For the first time B. makes fully explicit his theory as to how the much-studied hairstyles relate to one another. B.’s argument about the responsiveness of the portrait types, one to another, and to the question of the succession, is a tour de force.

The Primaporta portrait-type represents the role and position of Augustus as head of state. And the large pincer-motif within the locks of the fringe (Lockenzange), which makes the type so distinctive, gradually emerges as the sign distinguishing Augustus’ designated successors. Agrippa, Marcellus (?), Tiberius and Drusus the elder, are all given recognizably ‘Augustan’ hairstyles; but none of them is honoured with this visual marker. From their earliest portraits, however, Gaius and Lucius, are singled out in this way as heirs to Augustus’ position. B. styles the pincers «das Augustussignet» (186). Once Tiberius is adopted, however, this device is abandoned. Tiberius’ new portrait-type has a fringe with an emphatic central fork (Mittelgabelung), and greatly reduced pincer-locks at the temples, giving a broadly symmetrical arrangement. This now becomes the ‘Signet’ identifying the intended successor, Germanicus. And in a succinct but detailed discussion B. describes how the hairstyles of Drusus the younger, the sons of Germanicus, Caligula and Claudius all position themselves with respect to Germanicus’ adoption type. Claudius at the beginning of his reign has one type that draws on the hairstyle of Germanicus, and one that recalls the later portraits of Tiberius: two alternative sources of legitimacy.

In B.’s model the portraits of Caligula, Claudius and Nero at first strongly resemble the public images of their predecessors. Then, once each ruler has established his position, a new portrait conception emerges, expressing his own persona. As B. puts it, «Die Geschichte des Kaiserporträts der julisch–claudischen Zeit präsentiert sich so als eine rasche Abfolge von Rückbezügen und Neukonzeptionen.» (190) A detailed discussion of the female portraits follows, though here – without the pressure of the succession – the development in hairstyles seems more regular and consistent (192). Interestingly, for portraits of imperial princesses the defining role of the Primaporta type is played – not by any portrait of Livia – but by the ‘Wilton House type’ of Antonia Minor. The Tiberian princesses Agrippina the elder and (Antonia’s daughter) Livilla both seem to derive their hairstyles from this source. While the women of the following generation base their hairstyles on that of Agrippina the elder, in the same way that the men take care to resemble Germanicus.

The book closes with brief discussions of the political messages of the statues (192–5), formal aspects of group composition (195–7), and an evocation of the Julio–Claudian statue groups as presenting ‘an ideal image for the age’ (197–8).

It is worth emphasizing just how far ahead of any previous account of Roman imperial portraits this study is. Many authors have, in one way or another, endeavoured to do justice to all the different kinds of available evidence (archaeological, epigraphical, numismatic, textual). But never before has so much sustained attention been paid to the archaeological find-context, the original display setting of the monuments, and the statue bodies with which the portraits were combined. Most earlier portrait studies look, by comparison, like mere lists of heads. It is certainly true that B.’s work rests on an impressive foundation of
previous scholarship (meticulously documented in the footnotes). But the achievement of successfully integrating all this material so succinctly and to such telling historical effect is all his.

The book treats a large subject, and naturally there is room for disagreement. Here I shall offer just two criticisms, one minor, one of more consequence.

B.’s choice of title requires comment. The expression Gens Augusta is found in a series of inscriptions from the Julian Basilica at Corinth (65, no. 17; 175). There the names of Tiberius Gemellus, Antonia minor, and two others now unidentifiable, are accompanied (beneath) by the dedication GENTI AUGUSTAE. At first sight this seems to provide a very appropriate title for B.’s study since it is apparently the only Latin expression found on the inscribed monuments which seems to designate a whole group of Julio–Claudian portrait statues. But the phrase is found almost nowhere else in our ancient sources, and this should counsel caution. (There is apparently only one other occurrence, in an inscription from Carthage.) ‘Augustus’ was not a family name. It could never be inherited by birth or adoption in the way that ‘Caesar’ could. There was a Gens Iulia and a Gens Claudia, yes. But strictly speaking there never was – nor ever could be – a Gens Augusta.¹ In order to designate all the living members of the imperial family ancient writers readily employ the expression gens Augusti (‘the family of the emperor’), or the domus Augusta or Augusti (‘the imperial house’). Any of these could have served as B.’s title. B. does not acknowledge the peculiarity of the inscription from Corinth, and on one occasion he himself uses gens Augusta as if it were synonymous with domus Augusta (194).² This may be a minor objection, but it risks serious misunderstanding to start using this expression so prominently in scholarly literature in place of domus Augusta.

The most serious failing of the book emerges in B.’s discussion of the ‘message’ and the formal aspects of the groups (192–5). B. writes (193): ‘Where several statues in a group prove to have all been set up at the same time, they almost always employ the same costume and body type.’ He then goes on to list a series of cases where (on his analysis) groups were set up consisting entirely of figures of the same type: enthroned statues (Caere, Ephesos), veiled togate statues (Veleia), cuirassed statues (Merida, Tarraco), him-mantle statues (Gabii). He continues (194): ‘The impression of uniformity was often strengthened further by the marked similarity of the portrait heads one to another. . . . The almost boring formal-repetition of the statues within a portrait group could in this way be understood as an expression of Concordia, on which the public statements of the imperial family placed so much value’.³ Many readers are likely to feel that here B. seriously underestimates his material.

One of the most striking and interesting aspects of the Julio–Claudian portrait groups is actually the wide variety of costumes worn by the various members of the imperial family. The emperor is not portrayed in just one way, but in a num-

---

¹ The Corinthian inscription is perhaps an attempt to produce a Latin equivalent for the (more frequently found) Greek expression γένος Σεβαστός: A. West, Corinth VIII. 2 (1931) 15–7, no. 17.
² Although he avoids repeating the expression in his conclusion, and refers instead to the ‘Iuliorum Claudiorumque domus’: 198, quoting Tacitus, Hist. 1. 16.
³ «Wo sich bei der Durchmusterung der Fundgruppen mehrere Statuen als gleichzeitig aufgestellt erwiesen, handelt es sich fast durchwegs um Standbilder im gleichen Darstellungs schema.» (193).
⁴ «Dieser Eindruck der Uniformität wurde noch dadurch verstärkt, daß auch die Bildnisse oft stark angeglichen wurden . . . Die fast langweilig anmutende Gleichförmigkeit der Statueninnerhalb des Ausdrucks konnten durchaus als Ausdruck der Concordia verstanden werden, auf deren öffentliche Bekundung die Kaiserfamilie soviel Wert legte.» (194).
ber of different guises. He and his relatives are often explicitly cast by their costumes in clearly differentiated roles.

This is something familiar from contemporary cameos and relief representations, like the 'sword of Tiberius', or the Ravenna relief. On the Gemma Augustea, for example, Augustus appears enthroned in the centre with the goddess Roma, wearing a hip-mantle and holding the augur’s lituus, Jupiter’s eagle at his feet. Tiberius steps down from his triumphal chariot, wearing the triumphal toga (toga picta) and laurel crown, and looks across towards Augustus; the young Germanicus stands before the princeps wearing armour, his war horse behind him. Each of the three is deftly characterized here by means of costume and pose, and put in relation to the military trophy being erected below: Augustus above the fray, an unarmed figure, with weapons cast below his feet; Tiberius the victorious general, triumphs in the service of Augustus; Germanicus stands armed and ready, at the emperor’s command.

B. argues that the variety of costumes and figure-types which we see in the cameos is to be contrasted with the paratactic, serial-arrangement of statues, all of similar type, found in the group monuments. But as B.’s own analysis of the groups reveals – despite the incompleteness of our evidence – the situation is sometimes remarkably similar. In the Augusteum at Roselle (69–76), for example, enthroned statues of Divus Augustus (?) and Livia are combined with a veiled and togate Germanicus, a (headless) cuirassed figure, and a hip-mantle statue of Nero Germanici (to mention only some of the figures). In the scaenae frons of the theater in Merida were displayed a hip-mantle portrait of an emperor (Augustus?), two paired cuirassed statues probably representing Gaius and Lucius, a togate statue, and another cuirassed portrait (79–81). In the basilica at Herculaneum a fully nude Claudius was accompanied by (among others) Divus Augustus wearing a hip-mantle, and a veiled and togate Tiberius (119–25). In Otricoli a fully nude Augustus was set up with a veiled and togate Gaius and a colossal (probably enthroned) Caligula (later Claudius) (67–9). B. himself lists some of these instances – and others too (197). But he generally assumes that the variations in costume are the result of statues being added to the group at different times. Different figure types then become a function of date. They reflect ‘changing conceptions’ (of the imperial family) on the part of the dedicators, ‘arising in different historical situations’. On the contrary, surely it was the need or desire for group-monuments that resulted in the use of different figure-types. With the inclusion of multiple figures of different ranks and roles in a single group, careful costume differentiation became necessary in order to register these important distinctions. In other words, the situation is indeed analogous to what we find on cameos.

B. is certainly right to insist that the bodies of imperial portraits are not recognizable ‘portraits’ in the same sense that the heads are. They are not intended to reproduce the actual bodies of those represented – Augustus’ small stature, or Claudius’ weak knees. They are instead ‘types’: constructs that embody exemplary virtues and ideals of conduct (192). (In this they are perhaps not as unlike the heads as B. suggests.) But this leads B. to dismiss statue-bodies and costumes as standardized, their messages as general and impersonal. And this attitude may be seen to have contributed to B.’s comparative lack of interest in headless statues in earlier chapters. Whenever the same body-type is used several times in a single group, B. tends to date them all to the same phase. Where no such repetition occurs, he assumes a difference in date (or that we simply cannot tell). This procedure works well in some cases (Veleia, Gabii). In others, the results are less persuasive. We are asked to believe that at Caere three statues – of Divus Augustus, Tiberius and Caligula – each enthroned and in the ‘Jupiter costume'.
were all set up together at the same time (89). Cases like this make one suspect that B.’s view of statue groups as ‘homogenous’ in appearance is partly the result of his tendency to date the same figure types all to the same phase.

What is really missing from B.’s account is any detailed analysis of the aesthetic and formal qualities of the groups themselves. There is no sustained attempt to capture the effect they made on the ancient viewer and how that effect is achieved.

For the dust jacket of the book B. chose to illustrate the Ravenna relief – a perfect choice. This relief with its rhythmic alternation of poses persuades the viewer to see all the figures as belonging together, as part of a clear overall design. But at the same time we are skillfully prevented from reading the image as a ‘family scene’, in the way that (for instance) many Attic grave stelai are intended to be read. (Roman freedman-reliefs are also designed to resist this kind of reading.)

The statues pointedly do not interact like living people, but each stands in its own space – even when (as in this case) they share the same base. The figures are carefully alternated in the way their heads turn, in the weight-bearing and relaxed legs, and in the costumes they wear, so there is a pleasing variety. But – as inscribed bases confirm – there is also significant grouping of individuals, so that meaningful combinations and sequences are produced.

B.’s excellent description of the statues from the rostra at Leptis could so easily have provided an opportunity for a formal analysis of this sort. The group composition is displayed to good effect in B.’s montage (Beilage 1), but B. merely mentions that the statues of Divus Augustus and Claudius have been designed as pendants (19). The enthroned statues both turn their heads slightly towards one another, and effectively frame the colossal chariot group of Germanicus and Drusus. Although the statue type used for each is the same, and the draping of the cloaks is similar, Augustus extends his draped right leg, Claudius his bare left one. While Augustus’ left arm is raised leading up towards the chariot group behind him, Claudius’ right arm is slightly lowered. The two statues are formally very close, yet a hierarchical distinction is made between them by the gilded bronze radiate crown which rose above Augustus’ corona civica. These two enthroned hip-mantle portraits are made to be viewed – not just together, but in combination with the acrolithic figures of Germanicus and Drusus wearing triumphal garb (probably worked in bronze: 17) which stood behind them. These four statues might be regarded as an expanded version of the group of Augustus and Tiberius on the Gemma Augustea.

Even in group compositions where the same statue-type is repeated, it is clear that the type has been carefully adapted to the requirements of the group, in order to introduce variety and to relate the figures one to another. In the forum at Gabii were discovered three hip-mantle statues which B. considers a group (45, Nr. 6. 1–3, pl. 28). The Caligula/ Claudius does not turn his head, but gazes straight out, so it probably stood in the centre. The statue of Germanicus, of the same type, has the stance reversed, the statue-support set on the other side of the body, and the head turned to the right. It probably stood to the left of the emperor, turning slightly towards him. Its mirror image, the statue (restored as Drusus Germanici), with its head turned towards the left, then probably framed the reigning emperor on the other side (Beilage 5 does not arrange them in this way). The three cuirassed statues from the same site (45–6, Nr. 1. 4–6, pl. 29, Beilage 5) were probably intended to be arranged along the same lines. Admittedly these are merely conjectures.

1 These seem much more likely to have been successive dedications. The same figure type is used in each case first in order to assimilate Tiberius to Augustus, then Caligula to both of his predecessors. If the dedications had been simultaneous they would more likely be distinguished by different costumes/types, as is universally the case on cameos.

2 Surprisingly, B. suggests that frontally seen statue groups will not generally have looked like this (196, n. 1446). In this he surely underestimates the ancient designers of these groups.
But this kind of attention to detail can be confirmed by better documented cases. When (on B.’s reconstruction) a statue of Caligula was added to the Veleia group and set next to the statue of Tiberius, it was deliberately adapted to this position (Nr. 2. 9; Beilage 3). The toga is worn the same way, but the stance is reversed, and the capsae is (unusually) set on the figure’s right, so that the two figures together form a visible ‘pairing’. Livia and Agrippina the elder (Nr. 2. 6–7) were also designed to stand next to one another, so their stances mirror one another in the same way. Formal variety and balance are deliberately sought even in one of the most ‘homogenous’ of B.’s groups.

These criticisms, however, should not be allowed to overshadow what is a remarkable achievement. In terms of the ambitious goals he set himself, B. has unquestionably succeeded. He has produced the first fully ‘contextual’ account of imperial portrait groups, with a bold and strikingly innovative presentation, including foldouts (Beilage) which vividly depict various phases of particular groups (e.g. Beilage 3), and readily display the architectural settings of major monuments from the catalogue. He has admirably described and documented the important place of Julio–Claudian portraiture in the cities of the empire. He has presented a plausible and persuasive historical model of how he thinks that portraiture developed. And he has managed all this in under 200 pages – presenting a daunting amount of material with commendable concision. Insofar as these ‘lands’ are susceptible at the present time of being ‘set in order’, B. has done it.
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