

Hans Rupprecht Goette, **Schwertbandbüsten der Kaiserzeit. Zu Bildtraditionen, Werkstattfragen und zur Benennung der Büste Inv. 4810 im Museum der Bildenden Künste in Budapest und verwandter Werke.** Publisher Dr. Kovač. Hamburg 2021. 124 pages with 56 figures.

Hans Rupprecht Goette is one of the ten classical archaeologists whose publications I most enjoy reading. One of the usual characteristics of his works is the suggestion of new ideas (see for example, his proposal that ›Typus Mondragone‹ heads should be viewed not as representations of Antinous but as ideal statues: H. R. Goette, *Göttingische Gelehrte Anz.* 250, 1998, 42 s.; a hypothesis picked up by Klaus Fittschen in: B. Ewald / C. Noreña [eds.], *The Emperor and Rome. Space, Representation, and Ritual* [New York 2010] 244 s.). It is therefore easy to understand that the publication of his latest monograph is excellent news for everyone interested in the classical world.

The book is about a topic that is well-known in the scientific community: the Δ0-type portraits of Hadrian and their relationship with Roman age baldric busts (until now, the two key works on this question were F. C. Albertson, *Musa* 27, 1993/1994, 11–29 and M. Bergmann in: A. Caballos / P. León [eds.], *Italica MMCC* [Seville 1997] 143–146. See also the summary in K. Fittschen, *Boreas* 32, 2009, 128 s.). Although I am not aware of any previous studies on the Δ0-type by Goette, his dedication to the study of Roman busts has been a constant in his research career (see for example *Studien zu römischen Togadarstellungen* [Mayence 1990] 64–74; *Boreas* 7, 1984, 89–104; *Mitt. DAI Rom* 92, 1985, 291–318; in: P. Karanastassi / Th. Stefanidou-Tiveriou / D. Damaskos [eds.], *Γλυπτική και κοινωνία στη ρωμαϊκή Ελλάδα. καλλιτεχνικά προϊόντα, κοινωνικές προβολές* [Thessaloniki 2018] 75–82). The five main hypotheses in the book demonstrate his expertise in this aspect of Roman sculptures.

(1) In all the known cases, the Δ0-portraits of Hadrian were placed on a very particular type of bust. This is characterised by a naked torso, a mantle over the left shoulder and a double diagonal baldric across the chest. A bust in Columbia (p. 43 no. 1 fig. 44) and one in London (p. 45 no. 4 fig. 45) are the main ones to affirm this.

(2) A headless bust in Budapest Fine Arts Museum (p. 45 no. 5 fig. 1, already published by Goette in: *Fragment of a Newly Discovered Portrait of Hadrian in Budapest* [Budapest 2019]) might originally have been

topped by a Δο-type portrait of Hadrian. This is suggested by its typological similarity with the two busts of the Princes mentioned in Section 1.

(3) The type of bust with Δο-portraits of Hadrian was imitated by some inhabitants of the Empire. A bust found in Jumilla (Murcia, Spain) is the clearest evidence of this (p. 32 no. 33 fig. 43). Its existence, however, allows the assumption that the headless bust in Budapest (p. 45 no. 5 fig. 1) was not a representation of Hadrian but the likeness of an unknown person (pp. 13 s.). The same problem applies to another headless bust in the Vatican Museums (p. 45 no. 6 fig. 42).

(4) The exaltation of the military virtue of the Princes must have been one of the main purposes of the baldric busts with Δο-portraits of Hadrian (p. 22 and 27). This hypothesis is based on the double diagonal belt across the torso of those busts: an iconographic attribute often associated with military contexts (pp. 5 s.).

(5) Baldric busts with Δο-portraits of Hadrian may have been created in about A. D. 105 or 106 to celebrate his designation as Caesar (pp. 22 s. and especially the reflection in the second part of n. 63. For the Trajanic date of the model of the Δο-portraits of Hadrian, see also Fittschen, *Privatporträts mit Repliken. Zur Sozialgeschichte römischer Bildnisse der mittleren Kaiserzeit* [Wiesbaden 2021] 19) and revived in about A. D. 138 to represent the Divus Hadrianus (pp. 26 s.).

Specialists in Roman Art have sometimes criticized the publication of books in a small format (see for example, E. Moormann, *Bull. Ant. Besch.* 93, 2018, 265). It is therefore possible that some readers will be disappointed by the diminutive size of the study; barely twenty-seven pages of text. I have never understood that opinion. Good studies have been written in small books (e.g., N. Himmelmann, *Bemerkungen zur geometrischen Plastik* [Berlin 1964]; J. C. Grenier, *L'autel funéraire isiaque de Fabia Stratonice* [Leiden 1978]; A. Shapiro, *Re-Fashioning Anakreon in Classical Athens* [Munich 2012]). Goette's monograph can now be added to those. This is justified not only by the relevance of his five key hypotheses but also by a sixth contribution of the study: new data in it allow a reappraisal of two classic issues of Hadrian's images.

The first of them concerns his Diomedes-type statues. Goette adds new evidence that confirms the connection between the baldric busts with Δο-portraits and the iconography of the Argive hero Diomedes (p. 25 n. 69). This means that these busts can be linked with the Diomedes-type statues of Hadrian (for a list of Hadrian's statues of the Diomedes type see D. Ojeda, *Trajano y Adriano. Tipología estatuaria* [Seville 2011] 29–34 nos. 3–7 fig. 3–6. Statue no. 8 fig. 7, 1 should be removed from this list. If it is a representation of Hadrian, the best typological classification is that of M. Bonna in: Th. Stephanidou-Tiveriou / P. Karanastassi / D. Dimitris [eds.], *Κλασική παράδοση και νεωτερικά στοιχεία στην πλαστική της Ρωμαϊκής Ελλάδας* [Thessaloniki 2012] 237. The best photograph of the statue is in V. Aravantinos, *The Archaeological Museum of Thebes*

[Athens 2010] 340). The connection between these two ways of representing the Princeps ratifies the role that military virtue must have played in his ideal images (for the expression of military virtue in busts with Δο-portraits, see p. 22 and 27; in the Diomedes-type statues of the Princes, see Ojeda, *Trajano op. cit.* 107–109).

The second issue concerns the types of statues used to represent Hadrian after his divinization. The statuary typology of Divus Traianus is known at present (for the Herrscher type see most recently M. Cadario in: M. Papini [ed.], *Le sculture antiche I. Ritratti e rilievi, Opere dalla Fondazione Dino ed Ernesta Santarelli* [Milan 2015] 150–153. For a list of statues of Trajan of the Herrscher type see Ojeda, *Trajano op. cit.* 35–42 nos. 9–16 fig. 7–13. H. R. Goette and B. Freyer-Schauenburg, *Jahrb. DAI* 135, 2020, 163–236, have questioned the identification of Statue no. 9 in that list. I have replied to their critiques on two occasions, see in: A. Landskron [ed.], *Continuity – Stability – Crisis. Antoninus Pius and Infallible Signs of Crisis* [Vienna 2022] n. 1 and in: A. R. Martin [ed.], *I Congreso Internacional y Multidisciplinar sobre el Mundo Antiguo* [Santander 2022] n. 1). However, the typology of the images of Divus Hadrianus is not known. Numismatic dies suggest that baldric busts with Δο-portraits may have been used for this purpose (pp. 26 s., see also M. Beckmann, *Am. Journal Num.* 31, 2019, 153 s.). The evocation of Attic grave stelae by means of the double diagonal baldric and the use in a funerary context of the same type of bust in the case of the unknown person in Jumilla (p. 32 no. 33 fig. 43) are further two arguments supporting this possibility (p. 27).

I can only add one point to the results published in the book. Appendix III D (pp. 46–49) lists the known modern copies of the Δο portraits. From the Renaissance onwards, this type must have been especially appreciated, as clearly shown by the large number of copies and even a drawing by Peter Paul Rubens (p. 50 no. 39 fig. 53). The Cerralbo Museum in Madrid possesses another modern copy (Inv. 2504) not made known before, which we can present here as the frontispiece of the reviews in this issue of the *Bonner Jahrbücher*.

Madrid

David Ojeda