gentleman's avocation to a scientific discipline and its absorption into the institutions and practices of the academy'.

University of Bristol NICOLETTA MOMIGLIANO

LIVIAS

E. BARTMAN: *Portraits of Livia: Imaging the Imperial Woman in Augustan Rome*. Pp. xxiv + 242, 194 figs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Cased, £65. ISBN: 0521-58394-2.

The portrait images of Livia constitute a difficult but rewarding body of archaeological and visual material, and Bartman's book in its wide-ranging inclusiveness both lays bare the problems and brings out many of the points of interest.

The preface describes the focus of the work clearly—'the visual evidence for Livia's portrait appearance', in all media, seen as 'a tool for promulgation of the Augustan ideology of dynasty and social order' (pp. xxii–xxiii). The book is divided into three parts. The first, 'Patterns of Response', is mostly synchronic. The second, 'The Politics of Portraits', is a detailed diachronic handling of Livia's images over nearly a century of continuous manufacture, lifetime and posthumous. The third part is a catalogue of images and inscriptions.

Chapter I, 'Identifying Livia', discusses the difficult question of the relationship of Livia's official portrait types, their surviving versions, and their identification. B. stays within the current methods of typological study, but with some reluctance, and, as suits the fluid reception of Livia's images, she proposes a more flexible classification. Most of the surviving images are not tidy instances of easily reconstituted types (as they often are for other imperial figures, especially later) but for the most part more or less 'mongrelized variants'. Chapter II, '(Gendered) Modes of Portrait Production and Reception', looks at the mechanics of making and setting up the images from the points of view of sculptors and buyers, and their possible uses and transformations of central types. Chapter III, 'Facial Signs/Body Language', is in some ways the most original and attempts a global reading of all the signifying components of Livia's statues—hair, face, dress, gesture.

Chapters IV–VII reconstruct a continuous (and often frankly hypothetical) history of Livia's images correlated with the major phases of her life as wife of Octavian (Chapter IV), as wife of Augustus (Chapter V), as widow Julia Augusta and mother of Tiberius (Chapter VI), and finally as Diva Augusta following her promotion to Diva status by Claudius in A.D. 42 (Chapter VII). Very broadly, B. places the origin of the Marbury Hall type, with complex fashion hairstyle and known in fewer (nine) versions, in the earliest period and that of the Fayum type, which has a much simplified fashion hairstyle and is known in some thirty versions, in the main period of Augustus' reign. This reverses the usually accepted chronological sequence of these two clear and distinct types. The remaining ideal type(s?), with plain, centrally parted hairstyle and highly variable physiognomies, are found, as usual, to correspond to the Tiberian and Claudian images of Julia Augusta and Diva Augusta.

The catalogue presents *c*. 90 sculptured portraits in the round arranged geographically (Rome, Italy, and the provinces, west and east) and *c*. 20 gems and cameos. The epigraphic catalogue gives texts and translations for seventy-six statue honours for Livia, arranged in broad chronological groups.

The full archaeology of Livia's imperial image is treated even-handedly, and B.

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.143 Published online by Cambridge University Press

makes all the different registers of the evidence do good work. And the overall picture of Livia's image and its evolution seems to me attractive and convincing. For example, it is indeed easier to see the Marbury Hall type, with its typically elaborate Late-Republican hairstyle and its fine sharp features, emerging out of mid-first-century female styles and as the earliest of Livia's official portraits that we can recognize, and the Fayum type as a later typically Augustan modification of it—a generalizing iconic simplification that is both more elevated and non-specific as to age.

The main difficulties of the subject are the lack of documentation of the surviving pieces (normal) and their highly 'disobedient' relationship to centrally created types (more unusual). B. is surely right to reduce drastically the number of central types to be inferred from the material to three or four, and to see the surviving portraits as a diverse and random series of local receptions, mongrelizations, and reinventions of the great woman's image. This does not invalidate the typological method, and provided expectations of what it can do are moderated (for example, it cannot itself identify images), B. need not to be so reluctant about endorsing what is one basic and necessary approach to the material. There were indeed central images available, and individual sculptors and consumers could copy, combine, transform, or ignore them. The difficulties and diversity experienced in Livia's case perhaps invite rather the question why and in what circumstances so many communities felt it best to reformulate for themselves the images that they sponsored of this imperial woman—something they apparently did not feel so necessary for their images of such figures as Agrippina the Younger or Faustina the Elder.

Since Livia's image was so thoroughly reinvented on so many occasions at the local level, the identification of undocumented pieces can be very difficult, and B. does not really argue or find a consistent methodology for identifying the 'disobedient' pieces. She is instead usefully inclusive, so that in her catalogue there are perhaps too many Livias rather than too few. It might have been useful then to set out somewhere in one place, independent of chronology, the radically simplified scheme of Livia's portrait types that emerges, arguing for highly varied response to a few core images and visual ideas, and to set some methodologically objective parameters to identification.

The chronological history of Livia's images in Chapters IV–VII assumes a central perspective, but most of the material really answers to the local perspective in which chronology was perhaps not, or not necessarily, the most important factor. That is, there seems to have been no easy correlation of dates, titles, status, and images. For example, the ideal, Olympian-style image of Livia does not necessarily represent the rôle of Livia as Julia Augusta after A.D. 14, nor do the versions of the more individual, fashion-hairstyle types necessarily belong to the period before A.D. 14. A head from Leptis (cat. 72) with fashion hairstyle belongs in the later Tiberian period (probably A.D. 23–31), while the Ara Pacis has a purely ideal image of Livia already in 13–9 B.C. This was a matter of local preferences and contexts. Some patterns emerge, but there was clearly a sliding relationship between titles and perceived rôle and status on the one hand and image type on the other that was dependent on a range of factors (such as setting, function, statue type, statue grouping, workshop traditions, local priorities) that often lie well beyond our reach. B. is alive to these complications and presents an appealing historical reconstruction, much of it convincing, at the same time as setting out fairly all the evidence in a way that allows the reader to see what adjustments and alternatives are possible.

Lincoln College, Oxford R. R. R. SMITH

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.143 Published online by Cambridge University Press