

details (and the side-notes have often ended up on a different page from the relevant text), the book is generally well produced. It should be in all public and private libraries with an interest in the classical world.

*University of Edinburgh*

F. R. SERRA RIDGWAY

## PORTRAITS OF ANTONINE PRINCES

K. FITTSCHEN: *Prinzenbildnisse Antoninischer Zeit*. Pp. xxviii + 156, 208 pls. Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1999. Cased. ISBN: 3-8053-2363-8.

This monograph offers a comprehensive treatment of the identifiable portraits of the Antonine princes, M. Aurelius, L. Verus, and Commodus (before they became emperors), together with some insecurely identified portraits of their male siblings. It was originally conceived in the early 1980s (p. ix) as a companion piece to F.'s publication (together with Paul Zanker) of all the Roman imperial portraits in the Capitoline collection (*Katalog der römischen Porträts in den Capitolinischen Museen I* [Mainz, 1985], III [Mainz, 1983]). F.'s separate monograph on the portraits of Faustina the younger was undertaken at the same time (*Die Bildnistypen der Faustina minor und die Fecunditas Augustae* [Göttingen, 1982]). Publication was postponed several times, and eventually the work had to be tackled anew, with the unfortunate result that the references to F.'s lists of 'Prinzenbildnisse' given in the Capitoline catalogues now do not correspond with the new numbering system. Nevertheless, it is this close relationship with F.'s earlier, larger undertaking—the creation of a clear typology and chronology of all imperial portraits—which explains the austere and somewhat inaccessible form of presentation here adopted. This is a book to be *used*, by specialists, and in conjunction with the other volumes already mentioned.

This study shares the strengths of the Capitoline catalogues. The presentation is supported throughout by lavish photographic documentation of a remarkably high standard and consistency. Just about every portrait listed (or otherwise important for the argument) is illustrated in good clear photographs, mostly in multiple views. The publication of all these photographs alone represents an immense labour (pp. x–xi). F. has elsewhere declared this kind of documentation a necessity in portrait studies, and once again he lives up to the high standards he has set for the field. The plates give his careful descriptions a clarity and precision otherwise unattainable, and, combined with his relatively narrow focus (on identification, types, and dates), they enable him to present a very persuasive picture of our best evidence for the official 'portrait types' of the Antonine princes.

After a concise introduction (pp. 1–12), which unravels the complex *dramatis personae* of the Antonine dynasty, the reader is launched into a series of thirteen dense sections (A–N), each of which treats a 'portrait type' (*Bildnistyp*) which F. identifies as representing an Antonine prince. Each section follows the same pattern: first a series of catalogue entries listing all known replicas of the type; then a full description of the (lost) prototype on which all these must be based, together with a discussion of its date and relationship to other identifiable types. F. briefly sets out his method in the introduction (pp. 10–12); but he deliberately considers the well-known prince-portraits of Marcus Aurelius first, to provide a practical demonstration of it (pp. 13–31). This

prepares the reader for the sections which follow, where the replicas are much less numerous and the identifications less secure. F.'s results may be briefly summarized. He establishes two types of prince-portrait for M. Aurelius, one as a boy (A: pp. 13–21) and one as 'crown-prince' (B; pp. 22–31); three of L. Verus, two as a boy (C, D: pp. 32–41) and one as a young man (E: pp. 42–5); four of Commodus, three as a boy (H, I, J: pp. 53–62), one as a young man (K: pp. 63–6); and three of other Antonine princes who cannot be securely identified (F, G: pp. 46–52; M: pp. 67–9). F. offers suggestions as to whom these last three types most likely represent (the sons of Antoninus Pius, Fulvus and Galerius Antoninus, and Commodus' younger brother, M. Annianus Verus), but he is judiciously cautious and keeps these identifications tentative. A useful review of the portraits of Aelius Verus follows, in one appendix (pp. 72–4), and another lends support to F.'s identification of the 'Capitoline-Toulouse type' as Pertinax Caesar (pp. 75–7).

F.'s annotated lists are admirably clear and authoritative, and demonstrate his command of all the evidence—literary, epigraphic, numismatic, and archaeological. More importantly, F. displays throughout a sure-footedness and good sense in the weighing of the sources that will guarantee widespread acceptance for his verdicts. But the lists mask—perhaps to an undesirable degree—the *process* by which F. has attained his results. The important new catalogue of Antonine portrait galleries (pp. 108–38), for example, which assembles all the literary, epigraphic, and archaeological evidence, might have usefully been placed *before* the sections dealing with the individual portrait types. And it is only the long appendix collecting all those portraits once identified as Antonine princes, but now rejected by F. (pp. 78–107)—some 150 catalogue entries (commendably all illustrated)—which really permits one to see just how fluid the ancient evidence is, and the difficult decisions F. sometimes faced in constructing his lists.

Some remarks in the short preface show that F. is well aware that not everyone is as convinced as he is of the value of the current emphasis in portrait studies—the single-minded drive (especially in Germany) to establish clear typologies and secure chronologies for all imperial portraits. F. offers a spirited (if terse) defense of maintaining this emphasis, and throws out a challenge to his American critics (p. x n. 8). But he offers no accessible account of his larger goals and priorities, nor any summary of his conclusions. (The lists with their appended discussions and dense footnotes *are* his conclusions.) And this is a pity, for this study contains much new and interesting material. For example: F. advances a persuasive set of arguments for grouping the first portrait types of M. Aurelius and L. Verus (his A and C), together with the 'adoption-type' of Antoninus Pius, as a single commission. And he suggests that all three may be the work of the creator of the Antinoos-portrait (or perhaps a pupil or associate). This attractive suggestion is buried, however, in the complicated discussion of L. Verus' first type (Section C, pp. 36–8). One feels that new ideas like these (and the book has many) could profitably have been given greater prominence, or collected in an overview. In short, F. has not taken the opportunity to play up the real advances achieved by means of his rigorous approach.

But this is a minor criticism. F. has produced a valuable supplement to Volume I of the Capitoline catalogues, and a richly documented account of the official images of the Antonine princes.

*University of Washington, Seattle*

C. H. HALLETT