Klaus Fittschen, **Halbierte Köpfe?** Trierer Winckelmannsprogramm, volume 28. Publisher Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 2017. VI and 44 pages with 7 figures and 22 plates, all black and white.

This slim but excellent volume by Klaus Fittschen, in the Trierer Winckelmannsprogramm, deals with an important genre of ancient marble sculpture, namely, halved (literally bisected) portrait heads that were cut in half vertically and then mounted as an appliqué on an oval or round medallion or square slab of stone. Because few scholars of classical antiquity are particularly familiar with this type of sculpture, this important contribution to the subject is especially welcome.

Generic votive profile heads were, of course, known already in Etruscan times (e. g. p. 13 n. 88), and profile portrait heads, even in terracotta, are attested as well in the late Hellenistic period (e. g., p. 12 pl. 14, 4–5). Fittschen's study primarily focuses on marble portraits. His work on this subject has its origins in lectures that he delivered in different German-speaking venues, one of which I heard at the German Archeological Institute in Berlin. This publication is well illustrated with good quality photos and useful photo montages (pls. 6, 2; 6, 4; 10, 4; 16, 3–4), in which a photo of an extant half head is flopped and then joined to a photo of the extant half head itself to produce an artificially complete head. This sort of a reconstructed head obviously does not correctly reproduce the configuration of hair locks on the forehead of the flopped side. Nevertheless, these photo montages are useful in determining the width of the face and proportions of the features and whether the extant half face (and therefore half head) was likely to have been sawn in half or originally carved as a profile portrait for attachment to a background slab of stone.

The title of the study is followed by a question mark because it cannot always be easily determined if a three-dimensional ancient marble head (possibly damaged on one side) might later have been sawn in half

in antiquity or even in modern times. The half-portrait head could then have been affixed to a modern background slab, since medallions with ancient profile portraits were a popular form of decorative art from the early modern period on. In some cases, it is difficult to determine whether the portrait used in such mounts is ancient or carved after the antique style. Arriving at an answer to that question is sometimes more difficult if a given head cannot be detached from its modern mount for further examination.

In his study the author also considers a range of other problems when interrogating this genre of portrait sculpture. Initially (pp. 1–6), he focuses on the question of authenticity. Though not a portrait head but rather an important marble half-portrait figure in relief, the famous Antinoos relief in the Villa Albani (fig. 4, 4) should be mentioned here because in the last decade it has been sometimes dismissed as a modern forgery. The profile figure, wearing a Greek style cloak in a somewhat unconventional way, is cut off at about the waist. (Fittschen asks whether this might have been a full relief figure originally.) The relief was discovered in 1735 in Hadrian's Villa and restored soon thereafter by the famous eighteenth-century Italian restorer Bartolomeo Cavaceppi. It is, however, difficult to understand how such a masterpiece, undoubtedly created in an imperial workshop, could on rather weak grounds be considered to be a fabrication by the eighteen-year-old Cavaceppi, as the author rightly points out (p. 5 s.).

After his initial excursus, much of the rest of the discussion focuses on two groups of sculptural heads: (1) those sawn in half from portraits in-the-round and (2) those that were originally carved separately as profile heads and affixed to a stone slab by means of adhesives and low relief tenons or metal dowels of different sizes and shapes. This could be termed, in my view, an ›appliqué‹ method. Particularly interesting is a marble half head of a man resembling somewhat Hadrian in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek in Copenhagen (p. 8 s. pl. 10, 3 and 11, 1). A rough-hewn hollow in the middle of the inside surface of the head would have reduced the weight of the marble head, and a rectangular slot above this hollow and two dowel holes below were clearly intended to further secure the head to a background slab of stone by means of metal attachments. This physical evidence, however, cannot alone establish whether the half head was carved separately or whether it was a three-dimensional portrait sawn in half. What does indicate that this sculpture was carved separately as a profile head designed to be affixed to a stone slab is a shallow, flat rectangular tenon that was carved out of the inside surface of the face, which then would have fit into a corresponding slotted mortise in a background slab. Had this been a three-dimensional head that was cut in half, there would not be a rectangular tenon projecting from the surface of the inside of the face. This also points up the need for detaching such a portrait from its mount for examination, whenever possible, although in some cases this is not feasible.

As the author points out in passing (p. 10), such a sculptural appliqué method offers the possibility of affixing profile portraits to background slabs in dark colored stone, although there is no definitive evidence for the use of colored stone background slabs for such attached marble portrait heads in the Roman period. As a support for this possibility Fittschen cites several examples of isolated heads on darker backgrounds in ancient Roman wall paintings (figs. 3–5). The only sculptural example of such an applique technique is to be found in the fifth-century B. C. Erechtheion, which was extensively restored in the Augustan period (twenties B. C.). Here small, separately carved white marble figures were attached to the bluish Eleusinian limestone frieze. Walter Amelung has long ago supposed that one such marble profile portrait head in the Museo Barracco in Rome (p. 11, pls. 15, 1–2 and 16, 1–2) would have been mounted on a dark stone background, like a monumental cameo. In fact, I believe that bichrome cameos, which were known to the Romans since Hellenistic times, may ultimately have been the source of inspiration for affixing white marble Roman profile portraits to dark stone backgrounds.

This notion is further supported by the fact that large bichrome cameos with portraits became increasingly popular from the Augustan period on, when this marble portrait appliqué method became common. On the other hand, this does not mean, of course, that all white marble heads were always backed with colored stone slabs, especially if white marble portraits were painted. Although Fittschen does not mention any visible traces of paint on any of the marble portraits in his study, it would be interesting to examine (especially microscopically) whether any such marble appliqué heads show traces of paint on them. Yet, like bichrome cameos, Romans might also have desired having non-painted white marble profile portraits on colored stone backgrounds. There is even evidence for bichrome statues in Roman times, as in the case of a statue of a nude Mars depicted in a garden wall painting in the House of the Marine Venus in Pompeii. The same would be true of actual bichrome acrolithic statues, as in the case of the acrolithic statue of Matidia Minor in white Parian Lychnites and blackish stone (bigio morato) from the scaenae frons of the theater in Sessa Aurunca, especially if the white marble parts were not originally painted. As far as I know, no ultraviolet-infrared or microscopic analysis of these white Marble surfaces has been undertaken.

Although not pointed out by Fittschen, additional support for a bichrome appliqué effect is also provided by the two bronze profile portrait heads that he discusses (pl. 11, 4 and 12, 3), only in this case the contrast would have been between a brassy colored metal and stone (white or colored). Fittschen clearly shows that the two bronze profile portraits that he illustrates had been affixed to a background. The plausible use of metal profile heads affixed to stone slabs (white marble or colored stone) would constitute another innovation in the employment of a bichrome appliqué method. A final point should be made in favor of white marble profile portraits being affixed to dark stone background slabs: If not for such a bichrome cameo effect, why would profile portraits not have simply been carved as relief heads out of the same block of marble that was used for a medallion or square?

In the final part of his study (pp. 13–20), Fittschen makes a very important discovery as the result of some great detective work. He demonstrates that two profile portraits – one in the Barracco Museum in Rome (pls. 15, 1–2 and 16, 1–2), the other, the so-called Augustus tondo, in Berlin (pl. 15, 3) – are related to two restored portrait busts in the Palacio Real in Madrid (pl. 20, 1–2: younger male; pl. 20, 3–4: older male) on the basis of stylistic and pronounced physiognomic similarities. Especially in the treatment of the hair locks, these four portraits appear to date stylistically to the early Augustan period (cf. pl. 15, 4: the Uffizi head of Octavian of the ›Alcudia‹ type [formerly mistakenly termed ›Actium‹ type]), though the author notes that the younger male in Madrid (fig. 20, 1–2) has a post-Augustan bust form (though in my opinion both Madrid portraits were produced in an early Augustan style in post-Augustan time by the same workshop).

Fittschen is further able to demonstrate (p. 15 s.) that all four sculptural portraits not only are ancient but also came from the same old collection once in the no-longer existing Villa Peretti Montalto on the Esquiline Hill in Rome (figs. 6–7), located between the Stazione Termini and S. Maria Maggiore. This suburban villa had once belonged to Cardinal Felice Peretti Montalto, who later became Pope Sixtus V (r. 1585–1590). It also appears that the modern restoration of the upper lip and nose of the Berlin tondo portrait is based on these features in the better preserved Barracco portrait (p. 17, cf. pl. 15, 1 and 15, 3). Fittschen also shows that the stylistic treatment of the hair and the closely related facial features of these four extant marble portraits resemble two additional, now lost marble portraits also once in the Villa Peretti Montalto, based on drawings in the Album Montalto (pl. 19, 1 and 19, 4), which also includes drawings of the Barracco and Berlin profile portraits (pl. 17, 2 and 17, 4) and the two Madrid three-dimensional portraits (pl. 19, 2–3).

But this detective story does not end here, since the author points out how in style and family resemblance these six portraits (Barracco, Berlin, two in Madrid, and two drawings in Album Montaldo) are also strikingly like the so-called Marcellus statue in the Louvre signed by the Greek sculptor Kleomenes (pp. 18–20 pl. 22, 2). The Kleomenes statue not only stylistically dates to the early Augustan period but also had once come from the Montalto collection, a fact suggesting a connection with the other six sculptures that can hardly be coincidental. Moreover, Fittschen shows that all seven portraits of these presumably related individuals are strikingly similar to portraits of Augustus' nephew Marcellus, who died in 23 B. C. and whose portraiture has been established based on several replicas and variants, among

which there are two especially important examples: one from Pompeii, now in Naples (pl. 21, 4 and 22, 3), the other in the Capitoline Museum in Rome (pls. 18, 1–2 and 22, 4). Given the strong family resemblance and early Augustan style not only of the seven aforementioned portraits originally from the same collection but also of those images of Marcellus, the author suggests that all these portraits may have represented members of the prominent Claudii Marcelli family, even though perhaps of different generations. Although none of the findspots of the seven portraits from the Montalto collection are known, I think it not unreasonable to conclude, as does the author, that they may indeed have been excavated together from either a family tomb or villa of the Claudii Marcelli that may once have been located on the Esquiline, in the general area of the centuries-later Villa Peretti Montalto.

Finally (p. 20) in note 136 (with a short catalog of other examples), Fittschen discusses the phenomenon of ›Bildnisangleichung‹, whereby prominent contemporaries or loyal supporters of Augustus to different degrees imitated his hairstyles and even his facial features in their own portraiture, which would also explain why some have misidentified the Berlin tondo portrait as an image of Augustus.

Los Angeles   John Pollini