



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Review

Author(s): B. A.

Review by: B. A.

Source: *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 12 (1922), pp. 303-305

Published by: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/296206>

Accessed: 26-12-2015 03:00 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies and *Cambridge University Press* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Roman Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

GREEK AND ROMAN PORTRAITS IN ENGLISH COUNTRY HOUSES. By FREDERIK POULSEN. Translated by the Rev. G. C. Richards. pp. v. + 112. 112 plates, 57 figs. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1923. £4 4s.

Michaelis' *Ancient Marbles in Great Britain*, because it has few illustrations, has been comparatively little read in England. Many, therefore, and those not only laymen, will be surprised at the number of excellent portraits which Dr. Poulsen found in the nine collections which he visited. His book is divided into two parts, the first of which consists of short illustrated descriptions of the collections concerned, supplementing those of Michaelis. Some interesting forgeries are dealt with here, together with a small selection of sculptures which are not portraits.

The portraits themselves, which form the subject of the second part, are placed, with their photographs, in chronological order, an arrangement commendable from almost every point of view.

Dr. Poulsen makes full use of his wide knowledge in finding appropriate comparisons for every piece, and readers will be grateful for the excellent pictures he gives, not only of the portraits in England, but also of many abroad, quoted as parallels or related pieces.

If there is a fault to find, it is one almost inseparable from the study of any private collection, namely the sketchiness of the work done on the spot. Thus our criticism is concerned more with the judgments which the author passes on the English pieces than with the parallels which he draws, and in this restricted field perhaps less with his conclusions than with the methods by which he arrives at them. Take, for example, the question of forgeries. The genuineness of the Roman statue illustrated in fig. 21 and discussed on p. 19 had been suspected by Michaelis, and it may be indeed either modern or much worked over. Dr. Poulsen is not content to leave it at that, but calls the patch at the base of the neck 'very foolish,' and believes the nose to be a false restoration. But there is no reason why, if the statue stood in a burning or decaying building, it should not have been damaged by a falling beam or the like in exactly this place on the neck. Bluish veins in the marble of which the nose is made stop short at the line which divides it from the face, proving that the nose, whether a genuine restoration or not, is in a separate piece. This line not only does not come to an end at the nostrils (as it proved by inspection under a lens), but is not in reality at all like an incised one, the tool having yet to be invented which can produce in marble an incision to pass muster, under close examination, as a genuine join. On the other hand (p. 18) we find an extraordinary restoration of one side only of the tip of the nose in the modern head of Otho (fig. 20) cited as 'natural.' The fact is that this sort of evidence must be used with great caution, since it is liable to take its colour from a judgment formed on other grounds.

Strangely enough, in dealing with modern sculptures, whether reproductions from the antique or not, the author makes no distinction between forgeries, i.e. modern works intended to pass as ancient, and modern works intended for any other purpose. It is as inaccurate and more misleading to call the Homer (Michaelis *op. cit.* No. 168) and the Caracalla at Ince forgeries (to mention two known to the present writer) as to apply the same name to the Caryatids of St. Pancras' church. In the collector's catalogue we find documentary evidence for what is otherwise obvious: that the Homer, at least, is an acknowledged modern copy of a famous piece: and since the Caracalla is a copy of exactly similar quality from a piece in the same gallery, and appears next to it in the collector's Ince catalogue, we may be sure that both passed with him for what they really are. But to how many other of these reproductions which we have no opportunity of examining is the name forgery applied in Dr. Poulsen's book?

In the Soane Museum the finest portrait (Michaelis, *op. cit.* p. 475, No. 14) is passed over, without reason, as a forgery (p. 26), in favour of five busts (pp. 26 and 94-6) which 'seem, even in respect of their material, to be examples of local Romano-British portraiture.' If this means (and it can hardly be taken otherwise) that they are the work of a Romano-British sculptor of the second century A.D. then they merit a closer examination than that given them in the present volume. Since their provenance is unknown and none bears an inscription, we are entitled to ask what evidence besides

that of the material led to this hypothesis, and why, if the persons represented were inhabitants of Roman Britain, they should wear Greek dress. The further question of where statuary marble of any kind is to be obtained in England would not be otiose, were it not for the fact that three at least of the busts are of Greek marble (No. 81 certainly Parian or other island marble, Nos. 83 and 84 fine island or coarse Pentelic), and the remaining two possibly Italian (Luna), though more probably also Greek (Pentelic).

It must also be remarked that No. 80 is not destroyed by weathering, but unfinished, probably abandoned by the sculptor at an early stage because of a flaw, caused by veins of schist, on the right cheek and the forehead.

Granted that all are antique and of about the same period (the resemblance of No. 81 to the work of some sixteen hundred years later may be accidental), there is no reason why they should not have been purchased in England (Sir John Soane apparently made few purchases abroad) at the breaking up of some earlier collection, possibly the Arundel Marbles.

In details the work is hardly so accurate as might have been expected. The inscription given on p. 61 (No. 40) appears to read in the photograph (facing p. 60) MIFPRO not MIPRO, TOTIDEMM . . . not TOTIDM . . ., PERPERNIA not PERPERNEA, and (in the original) M.A.L. not M.L.L. Similarly, in the inscription on No. 74 (p. 89 f.) HELVVIVS and CONIVX appear in the text in the place of the HELVIVS and CONIVNX of the photograph, and though we are told that only the first three letters of the woman's name, RES . . ., can now be made out, the camera gives us RES . . . TA. And we are astonished to learn that the inscription under No. 41 (p. 61) is quite illegible. In No. 40 some, in No. 74 all, the stops are omitted.

There are some slight errors due to misreading of Michaelis. Michaelis (p. 359, No. 84; Poulsen, p. 76, No. 61) does not doubt the genuineness of the head, but of all except the head. Dr. Poulsen failed to find No. 227 (p. 19), but Michaelis (p. 377) is explicit about its position 'P[antheon] pediment of portico,' and the relief actually appears (just below the pediment) in Dr. Poulsen's fig. 15. Michaelis does not call No. 90 (p. 360: Poulsen No. 69, p. 84 f.) Antoninus Pius, but 'Antoninus Pius,' which (followed as here by a reference) is his normal way of quoting, not his own identifications, but those in old catalogues; he continues: 'Judging from the drawing the name is incorrect.' Then surely No. 196 Ince (Michaelis), called a forgery by Dr. Poulsen on p. 19, is identical with 217c Ince (Michaelis), rightly described on page 108 (Poulsen) as a portrait of Philippus Jurior? Two smaller errors: Poulsen No. 14, p. 41 = Michaelis No. 88, p. 359, and not Michaelis No. 110, p. 361, which is Poulsen's No. 15, p. 42.

When we have finished reading the book we are still not quite clear as to its exact scope. A passage in the middle of the last page but one of the introduction implies that all the portraits, except those iconographically worthless, in all the collections visited (except that of Lansdowne House), are catalogued and illustrated. This is not the case. In the same collection something better could be found than No. 54, p. 73: 'equally unimportant in execution and expression' from which 'polishing . . . has detracted . . . still further.' We have already mentioned the most important of several omissions from the Soane Museum. And Nos. 79, 92, 93 (to mention only some of those pieces at Wilton which, judging by their resemblance to each other, have been so worked over that they are worthless as portraits) might well have been replaced. Besides these, the inclusion of which the purpose of the book as illustrating different phases of ancient iconography does perhaps justify, we could well have spared some of the matter introduced for sentimental reasons, such as the picture of the cedars from the Holy Land (fig. 4) and the Shakespearean rhapsody on p. 11 (line 5), where the translator can hardly be acquitted of increasing the bathos by his two opening decasyllables. But these are small things in contrast to the solid achievement of the book as a whole, which presents a mass of new and interesting material, including such admirable pieces as the early Imperial (but why 'elderly'?) Roman (No. 34), the portrait of the time of Domitian (No. 47), the statue of a Roman of the late Republic (No. 22) and others which may be selected from much of less artistic merit.

The translation as a whole is adequate, though it might with advantage have been more free: nor will the unnecessary use of foreign technical terms make the book easier for the general reader. There are one or two solecisms, such as the opening sentence of No. 20, p. 46, and (on p. 69, No. 50), 'but over the forehead hair is a flourish and, as it were, belts': obscurities, such as the passage in the first two lines of p. 58: and words misused, such as (No. 21, p. 47) 'neck *composed* for insertion in a statue' (No. 44, p. 63), 'lining section,' and (No. 11, p. 39) 'no bow *in* neck,' which might be thought simply a misprint were it not for the occurrence of the just excusable phrases 'in nape' (No. 21, p. 47) and 'in the nape' (No. 25, p. 51 and No. 104, p. 107).

The photographs, with a very few exceptions (explained by difficulties of position and lighting) are excellent, and the form of the book is attractive. We hope that Dr. Poulsen will fulfil his promise of coming to England again.

B. A.

THE ROMAN IMPERIAL COINAGE. By HAROLD MATTINGLY, M.A., and EDWARD A. SYDENHAM, M.A. Vol. i. With an Introduction and 16 plates. London: Spink & Son, Ltd., 1923. pp. 279, 10 ins. × 6½ ins. 15s.

A handy and reliable guide to the coinage of the Roman Empire has long been needed. It is well that the task of producing it should have been entrusted to two such competent specialists as Mr. Mattingly and Mr. Sydenham. Their names are a sufficient guarantee that it will be thorough, scholarly, and well abreast of the results of the most recent researches. A most auspicious beginning has been made, and the remaining volumes will be eagerly awaited. The present instalment covers the period from Augustus to Vitellius. The lists of coins are conveniently arranged, the illustrations reasonably numerous, the indexes exceptionally full and good. The various prolegomena and the explanatory notes supply the general reader with just the kind of information that he is likely to want. It is true that some of the theories they embody have not yet secured the universal assent of numismatists, but in a handbook of this sort it is probably necessary to be dogmatic, and novices will find the Introduction helpful and instructive.

The authors have left the critic little to lay hold of. But a few trifles may be noted. If the line of Lucan, which is quoted in the second footnote on p. 2, is introduced merely as an illustration, it serves its purpose well enough; if, on the other hand, it is meant for a proof, it can hardly be accepted as evidence. Again, is it not sweeping to say, as is done in discussing the *S C* of Antioch on p. 10: 'It is scarcely thinkable that a local senate, as some have suggested, should have used the formula of the Roman'? Local senates now and then did so (e.g. Dessau, 6299 f.), even within sight of the Seven Hills (*ibid.* 6245). Similarly, the broad statement that 'Republican denarii are only occasionally found in our island' might mislead the unwary. In Britain, as elsewhere, they seem to have circulated freely until Flavian times, Newstead alone yielded nine. Finally, lovers of Greek coins may be disposed to demur to one or two of the expressions used in the comparisons drawn on pp. 21 and 22. The accuracy of the typography is all the more creditable in view of the fact that the book was printed abroad. Occasionally, however, the compositor's stock of square brackets appears to have run short (pp. 23, 32, and 39), while in the first paragraph of p. 27 the substitution of 'became' for 'because' has played havoc with a sentence whose original syntax was but ill-adapted to withstand such a shock.

G. M.

THE MONUMENTUM ANCYRANUM. Edited by E. G. HARDY, Principal of Jesus College, Oxford. pp. 166. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 8s. 6d. n.

As a text book for University students, which is all that Dr. Hardy professes to offer, this volume deserves, and is sure of, a hearty welcome. There has been no English commentary at once adequate and readily accessible, and the masterly Latin edition of