

Martin Kovacs, **Kaiser, Senatoren und Gelehrte. Untersuchungen zum spätantiken männlichen Privatporträt**. Publisher Dr. Ludwig Reichert, Wiesbaden 2014. 304 pages with 14 illustrations, 150 plates in black and white and 1 appendix (Beilage).

The book is the slightly adapted version of the author's 2010 dissertation at the Georg-August-Universität Göttingen. It is divided into six chapters, followed by a catalogue of 182 portrait heads, twenty-one of them imperial. These heads are ordered by the place where they are currently kept. Since the book covers sculpture that was recently, and independently, considered in Oxford University's ›Last Statues of Antiquity‹ database ([www.laststatues.classics.ox.ac.uk](http://www.laststatues.classics.ox.ac.uk)), I have compared his conclusions with those of the database throughout this review, with references to the relevant entries. I will refer to single monuments by both the catalogue numbering and the LSA-number.

The introduction (pp. 17–24) drafts the central questions of the investigation and gives an introduction to previous research history. The second chapter (pp. 25–40) is dedicated to theoretical and methodological questions. It discusses the possibilities and limits of traditional stylistic analysis in view of the ›mass phenomenon‹ of re-use in late antiquity, difficulties of dating provided by ›type, iconography, and regional and chronological pluralisms‹ and considers the concepts of ›classicism‹, ›renaissance‹, and ›retrospectivity‹, and their applicability. The brief third chapter (pp. 41–44) outlines the interrelations between imperial and non-imperial portraiture in the earlier imperial period and sums up the methods developed for description and analysis of portrait heads of this period, focusing on the concept of ›Zeitgesicht‹ (›Period face‹). The nucleus of the study is chapter four (pp. 45–212), where most of the portraits in the catalogue are discussed. This is divided into six larger sub-chapters dedicated to the ›portraits of the Constantinian period‹ (pp. 47–64), the ›non-imperial portraits after Constantine until the end of the Valentinianic dynasty‹ (pp. 65–74), a consideration of the ›mechanisms of representation of the late antique senatorial aristocracy‹ (pp. 75–90), the portraits of the late fourth and early fifth century (pp. 91–130), the portraits of the fifth century (pp. 131–194), and the non-imperial portraits of the sixth (pp. 195–212). Chapter 5 (pp. 213–252) considers large-scale sculptured portraits in late antiquity in comparison with other media. The text closes with some final considerations (pp. 253–258). Catalogue, appendix, and plates follow. The plates have pictures of most of the portrait heads collected in the book, all of very good quality, and in almost all cases from at least two sides. The appendix is entitled ›Dated portrait monuments‹; however, important dated sculpture, such as the statues of Gaius Caelius Saturninus in Rome (B 131, LSA 903 and 1266), of Aemilianus in Puteoli (B 94, LSA 46 and 41), or of Flavius Palmatus in Aphrodisias (B 12, LSA 198 and 199), and the carved Por-

phyrius bases in Constantinople (LSA 349 and 361) are missing. On the other hand, a number of imperial images are included that cannot be dated with any confidence: the imperial heads in Paris (so-called Theodosius II, A 13, LSA 453), Copenhagen (so-called Leo, Anastasius or Justin, A 10, LSA 758), Venice (so-called Justinian I, also ›Carmagnola‹, A 20, LSA 454), and the colossal bronze statue in Barletta (so-called Marcian, Zeno or Leo, A 2, LSA 441).

The catalogue records the greater part of the published portrait heads from the Constantinian period onwards, a total of 182. For each monument it has data and a brief description of the object. Stylistic descriptions and further discussions are integrated into the main text; an index by which to find the catalogue numbers in the text would have been helpful. By contrast, a search in ›Last Statues of Antiquity‹ will produce around 240 male portrait heads for the period; the difference from Kovacs' 182 is mainly due to the fact that he included neither a portrait of Constantine nor of any of his sons in his catalogue. I will restrict my comments on more than three hundred pages to some basic aspects, the method applied, and the interpretation.

Kovacs' criticism of traditional stylistic analysis is based primarily on the observation that the almost ubiquitous re-use of heads in late antiquity defies this methodology. The observation of indicators of re-use or re-working has indeed become a major issue in recent scholarship; the exemplary analyses by Julia Lenaghan who did the lion's share of research on sculpture within ›Last Statues of Antiquity‹ must be pointed out here. The author consequently abstains from narrow dating; his dating categories are the Constantinian period, the Valentinianic period, the late fourth to early fifth century, the fifth and the sixth century. These, however, are described in terms of stylistic criteria which are neither consistent nor well-defined. In consequence, a number of problems of traditional research are repeated.

For example, Kovacs (p. 206) thinks that a head from Italy in Copenhagen (B 73, LSA 813) can be securely dated to the sixth century ›by its eye zone‹. A similar dating is suggested for a lost head from Asia Minor by its ›ornamental wrinkles‹ (B 70, LSA 320). However, the hairstyle of both these heads, with the hair brushed forward from the cusp to the brow and into the neck, leaving the ears free, can be reliably associated with the Theodosian period, because it is worn, for instance, by the high dignitaries surrounding the emperors on the reliefs of the obelisk base in Constantinople (dated 390/392), and also by high dignitaries on diptychs and other monuments datable to the late fourth or earlier fifth century, in both the eastern and western halves of the empire. It is different from the tight-fitting hairstyles of the earlier and mid-fourth century, and also from the voluminous ›mop-hairstyle‹ worn by dated monuments of the later fifth and the sixth century. This ›Theodosian‹ hairstyle is the clear-

est indicator of a late fourth or early fifth century dating; and indeed, elsewhere, the author uses it as such.

This touches upon one of the points where traditional stylistic analysis has led to an irritating impression of stylistic and typological anarchy in late antique portraiture. Different methods are possible. Lenaghan, for instance, bases her assessments mainly on marble techniques, in particular the markings of eyes, and, as a second line of argument, on hairstyles (a ›typological‹, rather than a ›stylistic‹ criterion). There is more that needs to be said about this. A certain Ephesian head with Theodosian wreath hairdo (B 138, LSA 688) has traditionally been dated to the sixth century, and the author repeats this late dating, citing the ›sharp, strictly ornamental folds‹ in the eye zone (p. 206). A similar outline of the eye zone has indeed been taken as a safe criterion for a late fifth or even sixth century date for a whole series of Ephesian heads (LSA 688–689, 691, 693–696 and 702). Epigraphic evidence, however, suggests that the statue habit (or the epigraphy associated with it) was dead almost everywhere outside Constantinople already by the mid-fifth century. In the late fifth and sixth centuries it survived only in very few places; only Aphrodisias has produced evidence of noteworthy quantity at this late date. Even at Ephesus, not a single inscription is datable to the sixth century with certainty or even probability (cf. LSA 726, 727 and 2084). Massive late dating of sculpture, in Ephesus and elsewhere, has to account for this conflicting epigraphic evidence.

Occasionally Kovacs betokens the possibility of dating by hairstyle; he considers a roughly coeval date for three chlamys busts which have been separated by more than half a century by earlier scholarship (B 149, LSA 90 [Thessalonica], B 41, LSA 447 [Stratonicea], and B 152, LSA 2282 [Sebastopolis]; pp. 30–33). Regrettably he revokes this immediately, considering a long runtime for the Theodosian hairstyle. However, the heads with this coiffure, that have been assigned to the sixth century on stylistic grounds, cannot prove a runtime of a century or more for this fashion of hairstyle, as the author stipulates in chapter 4.6: this is a circular argument.

Consular diptychs and related monuments provide the best evidence for the real runtime of this hairstyle. Ardabur and Plinta on the missorium of Aspar of 434 still show the same clear distinction between lank hair on the skull and coiled hair at the brow as the latter appears on earlier Theodosian monuments. However, the coiffure of Flavius Asturius, consul (of the West) of 449 does not have this distinction; moreover, here the ears are covered. Similar haircuts to that of Asturius, distinct from those of the Theodosian period, are consistently visible on portraits of high ranking officeholders on the diptychs of the late fifth and sixth century, from both East and West, and on mosaics from the same period, as at San Vitale, Ravenna. Also, the datable large-scale sculpture in the round of this period has such hairdo (Flavius Palmatus B 12, LSA 198,

and Pytheas B 4, LSA 147, both at Aphrodisias). Grouping together all heads with ›Theodosian‹ wreath hairstyle would avoid such irritating dissonances in chronology; the evidence would suggest that the whole group should be dated to the late fourth and earlier fifth century.

A second example of the same problem is Kovacs' discussion of the Athenian evidence. The tight-fitting short hair of a portrait head of a bearded man (B 31, LSA 131) results from a re-working. The author quotes ›bulky basic structure‹ (blockhafter Grundaufbau) and ›geometricalizing forms‹ (geometrisierende Formen) as evidence for a late fourth or early fifth century date – however, the hairstyle would favour an earlier date, in the mid-third to earlier fourth century. The author discusses this head together with a crowned priestly portrait traditionally dated to late antiquity (B 30, LSA 132). The opulent hair of the latter reminds him of ›Lucius Verus in his fourth type‹, but he takes the ›strong and artificial quality‹ and the ›geometrical basic build up‹ as evidence for a late antique date; the s-shaped hairline and the u-shaped build-up, so he says, are ›typical of some fifth-century heads from Rome‹ (p. 171). However, the quoted heads (B 123, LSA 958 and LSA 1186, the latter not in Kovacs' catalogue?) reveal differences rather than similarities. They both have, different from the Athenian bearded man, a Theodosian wreath coiffure. The coarse outline of their hair contrasts markedly with the variable marble technique applied in hair and beard of the Athenian head. The hairstyle, and the effect created by the skillfully worked hair and beard against the fine polished flesh, suggest a date around A. D. 200 for the priestly head; this is strongly supported by the bean-shaped eye markings characteristic of that period (an analogous argument applies to two priestly heads, in Corinth, LSA 74, B 80, and in Dresden, B 54, discussed on p. 173). The author argues that the way the lower lids are set against the cheeks connects the two Athenian heads (B 30 and B 31) with a further portrait from Athens, this one with a ›Theodosian‹ wreath cut (B 34, LSA 101). All three are dated to the late fourth and early fifth century and it is even suggested that they came from the same workshop. If assessed by hairstyle (and marble technique), however, these heads do not testify to a ›striking iconographic variability‹ (erstaunliche ikonographische Variationsbreite) in late fourth century Athens. Rather, they suggest that Athens, as elsewhere, followed the current fashion of hairstyles of the second, third, and fourth centuries. The ›squinting eyes‹ (zusammengekniffene Augen) of a further head, which the author considers to be again from the same workshop (B 23, LSA 2293), are the result of a massive re-working (which escaped his attention). The discussion of this head is a blueprint of the dangers of purely stylistic analysis of re-worked heads, which he so justly points out elsewhere.

Thirdly on this topic, Kovacs thinks that stylistic properties enable him to distinguish a ›Constantinian‹

and a ›Valentinianic‹ period in the fourth century. A ›typical example of the Constantinian period‹ to him is the portrait bust of Cethegus (B 109, LSA 879, p. 58; the apodictic tone of such statements is a general problem of the book). Lenaghan, who has scrutinized the technical aspects of the monument and its modern reception history, came to the conclusion that the bust in its present state is a late antique pasticcio set up by his son to Cethegus, who was executed in 368 (Prosopography of the Late Roman Empire I [Cambridge 1971] 199–200 s. v. Cethegus). On historical grounds, Lenaghan suggests a date in the mid-fourth century or in the Valentinianic period for the bust. On the other hand, Kovacs quotes B 53 (LSA 896) as a typical example of Valentinianic portraiture (pp. 69 s.). This is one in a series of heads, all from Rome and its environs, which have a hairstyle strikingly similar to coin portraits of Maxentius (LSA 895–897, 884 and 2662). The similarity of the effigy suggests that they all represent the same individual; this and the over life-size measurement of some of them, suggest an emperor, most probably Maxentius. These examples challenge the categories suggested by the author: there is no good evidence to suggest a clear distinction between a ›Constantinian‹ and a ›Valentinianic‹ period in the fourth century.

The best starting point to classify fourth century portraits is hairstyle. There are basically three manners which, between them, include the vast majority of fourth century non-imperial heads. The short-cropped tetrarchic type was in use well into the Constantinian period, as the monument of Gaius Caelius Saturninus in Rome evidences (B 131, LSA 903 and 1266). This is rightly pointed out (pp. 57 s., a fine discussion which is, however, not exploited for the interpretation). The Saturninus portrait should sound a note of caution in dating ›tetrarchic looking‹ heads (why is e. g. B 119, LSA 2127 »frühkonstantinisch«, but B 122, LSA 880 »spätetetrarchisch«?). It also shows that there is some continuity from the tetrarchic into the Constantinian period, a fact which Kovacs denies flatly, but which would have deserved some discussion. Many fourth-century heads have middle-length hair, reminiscent of early imperial cut, fitting the skull tightly and leaving the ears free. This hairdo is similar to that of Constantine's portrait on his triumphal arch in Rome, and on many portraits in the round of that emperor (e. g. LSA 557, 558, 561, 807, 833, 83). As noted above, the author does not catalogue a single head of Constantine or of one of his sons, which is unintelligible given the crucial role for late antique portraiture as a whole that he credits Constantine's portrait with.

Apparently important elements of the imperial image – first of all the hairstyle – were adopted into private portraiture in the fourth century. This is not very different from the earlier imperial period – a point I will come back to later. When exactly ›private‹ individuals (I'll use this term for the sake of simplicity) started adopting the new imperial coiffure cannot be

identified with confidence. It is probably safe to assume that the ›old-fashioned‹ tetrarchic style and the new ›Constantinian‹ one were in parallel use for some time. The ›Constantinian‹ hairstyle is still observed in the Valentinianic period, as evidenced by the statue of Aemilianus in Puteoli (B 94, LSA 46 and 41; the author [p. 70] does not acknowledge the considerable importance of this securely dated monument) and the Cethegus bust (B 109, LSA 879). The wreath cut discussed above was fashionable in the late fourth century. Again it is not necessary (and not possible) to name a hard dating for its introduction; similar hairstyles may well have been worn before Theodosius ascended the throne. However, all the evidence suggests that it prevailed in the Theodosian period and ousted previous fashions widely or completely. This is of some importance, because the common acceptance of the wreath haircut goes along with the most striking innovation in late antique portraiture, namely the emergence of new statue types showing formerly unknown costumes. This issue has to be addressed in more detail in the second part of this review.

Paul Zanker in a tone-setting article of 1988 suggests an interpretation for the wreath hairstyle. According to him, the elaborately dressed wreath on private portraits occupied a position fraught with expectations: the wreath hairdo echoed the position where imperial portraits had the diadem. This interpretation implies that private portraiture referred to imperial portraiture in the late fourth century; its iconographic syntax and its semantic statement are comprehensible only by reference to the imperial *imago*. This is the second main issue of my critique. Kovacs' programmatic target is the »careful interpretation of late antique portraiture as a sociological phenomenon« (p. 17). His investigation starts with the Constantinian period, because, as he puts it, »at this time the imperial portrait abruptly got a new quality by which it was distinguished from the private images; this reflected a changed relationship between emperor and élites, in which the idea that some notable could look like the emperor had become a problem« (p. 46; my translation includes some necessary interpretation of a long sentence with grammatical problems in the original; the abundance of such sentences makes the book hard to read even for a native German speaker). The author repeatedly insists on a ›break‹ (Bruch) between the tetrarchic and the Constantinian periods. Such strong rhetoric obscures continuities. The ambition to distinguish imperial effigies from private images is manifest in the late third century, and this is relevant for our understanding of late antique portraiture.

However, this is not my focal point here. It is a widely accepted position that Constantine's portrait conception was appropriate to express the new, late antique role of the emperor as mediator between the human and the divine, and that this was crucial for its success (independent of whether this was intended or not by Constantine). The question follows whether,

and how, the élites who were still honoured with statues looked for and found new images to display their role in late antique society. Kovacs drafts a sharp contrast between the earlier imperial period, when people looked like the emperor – this is sketched out in his chapter on the notion of the ›Zeitgesicht‹, where he (over-)stresses that in this earlier period private portraits could imitate the imperial image even in particularities of expression – and late antiquity when, so the author argues, this was no longer the case.

Scholars often describe the developments in late antique portraiture in ›passive‹ terms: private individuals could not use iconographic features of the imperial portrait any more. Kovacs turns this into the active voice: the senatorial élites did not want to look like the emperor anymore (e. g. p. 64). This is the basis for his interpretation of late antique private portraiture. Kovacs sees an ever growing ambition among the members of the late antique senatorial élite. This, so he argues, is mirrored in the individuality of late antique portrait heads which no longer fit the notion of a ›Zeitgesicht‹. It is also mirrored, so he says, in the praise of individual virtues and merits in the inscriptions that accompanied late antique portrait statues. The author explicitly and polemically denies any notion of a ›collective norm‹ mandatory for the late antique élites (p. 90; the notion of ›Kollektivnorm‹ was coined by Géza Alföldy to characterize the standardized honorific inscriptions of the earlier imperial period).

Hardly anybody would deny that late antique private portraits have individual features, such as warts, receding hair, wrinkles etcetera, in which they contrast with the idealized images of the emperors. However, there was strong influence from imperial on private portraiture also in the fourth century, as the adoption of Constantine's hairstyle into private portraiture shows. Indeed the creation of Constantinian haircuts was the principal target of fourth century re-workings of earlier heads, as for instance for the hair of a toga statue in the Bardo museum, LSA 1130 (not in Kovacs' catalogue) which has some drill channels from the original hair crossing the actual strands – not, as the author suggests (p. 25), the ›original Trajanic hairstyle‹, but a Constantinian one achieved by a careful re-working. The attempt to create contemporary coiffures by re-working earlier heads contrasts with heads like LSA 369 (B 2) from Seleucia Pieria. This head is cited (p. 114) as strong evidence for a ›retrospective current‹ in the early fifth century that referred back to the Antonine period. However both the hairstyle and the marble technique betray the second century date of this head; the small eye markings cannot prove a late antique date, they are not unusual in the region in the earlier imperial period.

The interpretation of the wreath hairstyle quoted above implies that such references were effective still in the late fourth and earlier fifth centuries. Kovacs indeed presumes that imperial portraiture was authoritative for the privates at least in stylistic respects: the chapter on ›Private portraiture after Constantine‹ (pp.

65–74) starts with a discussion of the imperial heads of the period, which takes more than half of the pages; and the author deals similarly with the Theodosian period. The concept of individuality as the sole explanatory concept for late antique portraiture is overstressed to an extent that it distorts the picture.

This problem is reinforced by Kovacs' isolated treatment of the heads, without reference to the busts and statues of which they were originally part. In late antiquity, as in earlier periods, honorific statues – the bulk of the extant heads will come from such statues – were symbols of social values and political power. They were set up at prominent spots in the cities' public spaces, and they were markers of political influence and of social status. The inscriptions contained information on the honorand (his public role and the reasons for the honour of a statue), on the awardee, and on the civic institutions involved in setting up the monument. They labelled the reputation and embedded it into a mandatory system of public norms and values. The statues gave haptic and visual presence to the honour; they visualized, by way of the choice of dress and of attributes, the public role of the honorand and the value system in which he was bound, and which he represented. Portrait heads could support this by iconographic features; most importantly, however, they filled the abstract social role with the powerful presence of an individual.

The author repeatedly claims the ›increased individuality‹ of late antique portrait heads; but how should this be measured against sculpture such as the famous ›Rhoimetalkes‹ of the late second and early third century? Polemically, his diagnosis of individuality is trivial, as this is the ›natural‹ function of a portrait head; by concentrating solely on the heads, the author fails to note the common features which contributed to define the public role of the complete statue monument.

This role was symbolized primarily by the statue type. In the West, this was the ›classical‹ toga statue with umbo, still prevalent in the Valentinianic period (statue of Aemilianus, LSA 46, B 94; see also LSA 580 and 1820). In the late fourth century this statue type, which was loaded with traditional Roman values, was replaced by completely new and formerly unknown statue types, the chlamydatus and the late antique toga statue. These new type statues were consistently freshly carved and were often also fitted with freshly carved heads, a practice of the fifth century, which contrasts markedly with the constant re-use in the fourth century. At no point does Kovacs address this, the most important novelty in late antique portraiture. The new costumes were adopted in East (where most of the evidence comes from) and West alike, as is evidenced by two statues in Rome (LSA 1068 and 1069, B 124 and 125) and many further images from the western part of the empire.

These new patterns were apparently considered appropriate for the representation of the late antique dignitaries which had been shaped in the course of the

fourth century. Their complete, or at least extensive, adoption into the representation of the late antique senatorial (and also provincial and municipal) élites documents a strong and comprehensive consciousness of status in this period, which embraced the different categories of which the late antique *ordo senatorius* was composed.

The earliest known statues in the new typology are two late antique toga statues from an imperial group dedicated in Aphrodisias in 388/392 (LSA 163, A 7; LSA 165). Senatorial (and local) notables could refer to the imperial example by choosing the new dress. As pointed out, this striking innovation was accompanied by the common adoption of a hairstyle which accentuated the position above the brow where the late antique beholder was used to see the diadem on imperial portraits. The new haircut was designed to visualize the elevated position of the honorand in proximity to the emperor: in other words, his elevated role in late antique society. Honorific statues in late antiquity (including their associated portrait heads) were impressive testimonies of a value-canon and consciousness of status which integrated the various categories of the late antique élites.

The imperial image remained in every respect the guide and the point of reference for the images of this ›imperial aristocracy‹. Such reference to the emperor is also present in the inscriptions that accompanied late antique portrait statues. The author deals with inscriptions programmatically in a particular chapter (pp. 75–90). He argues that two features of late antique honorific inscriptions indicate the growing individualism and ambition among late antique aristocrats, namely the explicit reference to the personal virtues of the honorand and the ›elaborated verse form‹.

This chapter, which is basic to Kovacs' interpretational approach, is particularly problematic. The author's constant use of ›epigram‹ (Epigramm) to refer to honorific inscriptions is misleading. As in English, the German term means ›verse‹; however, verse inscriptions are almost exclusively restricted to the Greek East where they represent a share of around sixty percent among the non-imperial inscriptions. Verse inscriptions were however but one choice, and only so in the East; in the West they can be counted on the fingers of one hand. In this chapter, the author fails to make even the most basic distinctions on the descriptive level.

Late antique verse inscriptions allude to the honorand's virtues through an elaborated encoding system. The Western inscriptions on the other hand, refer to the same set of virtues in a more direct and explicit prose form; the praise of the honorand's virtues is often combined with a (portion of his) *cursus honorum*. Both phenomena are indeed markers of difference of the late antique epigraphic habit, as against the habits of the earlier imperial periods. To evaluate them as indicators of growing individualism, as the author does, again overstates this aspect to an extent that distorts the picture.

Any analysis of the late antique epigraphic habit would have to account for the fact that what we see in the senatorial inscriptions of the fourth century is rooted in the habits of local and provincial élites of the late second and third centuries; this is true for the verse form in the East, as for the praise of virtues in the West. We should not expect such analysis from this book; however, a closer look at the set of virtues that are made explicit, or alluded to, by late antique honorific inscriptions in both East and West would have been helpful and relevant for the understanding of the portrait heads.

Most prevalent is the virtue of justice (*iustitia*, *δικαιοσύνη*), and not by chance. It was the primary virtue of high-ranking office holders, in particular provincial governors, who, apart from the emperors, had by far the greatest share of statue honours in the period. This virtue was what subjects relied on most and which they wished to stress most in these public monuments. The set of virtues referred to by the late antique inscriptions defines the common set of values – Alföldy's concept of ›Kollektivnorm‹ would be an appropriate label – which late antique aristocrats felt obliged to follow, and which they agreed to represent in their public monuments.

The origin and perfected holder of these virtues was the emperor; the praise of an office holder's virtues was therefore always referring back to virtues of the ruler who had chosen him as the representative of his own justice in the provinces. The assumption that a senatorial office holder wished to guard against allegations he could have bought his office by using a verbose inscription – the author (p. 77) elevates this assumption to the rank of a ›representational mechanism‹ (Repräsentationsmechanismus) – is absurd. Kovacs' extensive discussion of literary sources in this chapter (pp. 75–90) brings out many interesting things about attitudes and rivalries within the *ordo senatorius*. However, it completely neglects the fact that honorific statues were basically a matter of city politics, that they were public monuments which formulated and visualized an ideal view of the relationships between the ruling class and its subjects.

Many details in this book deserve appreciation, and as many deserve critical comment. Martin Kovacs' 250 pages of text are without doubt the result of diligence and erudition. However, this is also a problem for the reader. The argument often lingers over marginal problems, making it difficult for the reader to follow the main thrust of the argument. The overall impression is of a work which, although recognizing some of the constraints traditional research methods have reached, does not dare to apply new methods, and in consequence reproduces old contradictions, and which, despite a massive theoretical apparatus, misses or misunderstands crucial aspects of late antique statuary.