

A NEW PORTRAIT OF  
GAIUS JULIUS CAESAR  
IN BASALT

by

John Pollini, Ph.D.

Professor of Classical Art and Archaeology  
University of Southern California

## A New Portrait of Julius Caesar in Basalt

Although damaged, this high quality, slightly over life-size, dark grayish green basalt head of a man in his 50s is a truly magnificent and powerful piece of portrait art.<sup>1</sup> The individual portrayed turns his head slightly to his right, establishing a less than three-quarter view of the left side of the face as the optimum angle of view. The head is organically and volumetrically conceived, portraying its subject in a very naturalistic way with a great understanding of anatomical structure. With his short-cropped hair style and no-nonsense facial features, the subject appears to be a Roman, most likely, as we shall see, the great Roman statesman and general, Gaius Julius Caesar.

In the intense countenance and simple hair style of the individual portrayed we immediately perceive the Roman virtues of *constantia*, *gravitas*, and *severitas*. Yet these qualities are not expressed in the brutally harsh, Roman "veristic" (or "Restio")<sup>2</sup> style, characteristic of a number of portraits created in the Roman Republic of the first century B.C. In treatment and carving, this work appears to be a Hellenistic interpretation of Roman verism.<sup>3</sup> In expressing the individual's emotional state of being, however, the sculptor did not create a "Pathosbild" ("emotionally-charged image") with an uplifted and/or violently averted head, a typically Hellenistic centrifugal pose encountered in some of the more baroque interpretations of Greek and Roman portraits in the second century and first half of the first century B.C.<sup>4</sup> Instead, the sculptor of our basalt head concentrated all his attention on the physiognomic features themselves and presented us with an image of intense, yet controlled emotion, more in keeping with trends of the last years of the Republic.<sup>5</sup>

The basalt head is broken at the neck and is likely to have once formed part of a bust or portrait statue that no longer survives.<sup>6</sup> Because the hair at the back is treated in a rather summary fashion and because the stone at the back is somewhat flat, it is likely that the original block of stone ended at this point. The head is preserved to a total height of 10 1/2" (26.7 cm). The distance from the chin to the crown of the head is 9 1/4" (23 cm); from ear to ear, 7 5/8" (19.4 cm); and from the root of the nose to the back of head, 7 5/8" (19.4 cm). Broken off are the nose, the right upper lip, the area between the nose and the lip, the lower part of the chin, and the right back section of the neck and hair. Also severely damaged is the lower right lip and the adjoining area directly below. The rims of both ears have been chipped off. Minor abrasions and scratches are evident over the entire surface of the face, especially in the eyebrows, eyelids, and pupils. Traces of a reddish color, apparently endemic to this type of basalt, are concentrated in the area of the broken chin, on the hair locks on the left back side of the head, and sporadically elsewhere on various parts of the hair. A short, roughly horizontal calcareous strip is found above the right ear and right back side of the head. This strip might be an accretion, built up from contact with a crown or wreath that the portrait might once have worn.

The hair of the individual portrayed is raised in a low relief-cap with patterns of hair chiseled and incised in a linear fashion that is typical of portraits of Roman politician or businessman of the late Republic. The cap of hair has been intentionally left rough to contrast with the highly polished surfaces of the face and neck. This bichromatic effect, which imparts a sense of color to dark stone sculptures in the round that were otherwise not painted, had a long tradition in



portraits in the round in Egypt from the XXX Dynasty (380-342 B.C.) throughout the Ptolemaic period (305-30 B.C.). This technique stands in contrast to the common practice in antiquity of painting portraits in white marbles and limestones.<sup>7</sup> A work employing this bichromatic technique and dating roughly to the time of our basalt head is the so-called "Black Head" from Egypt in the Brooklyn Museum.<sup>8</sup> Unlike our basalt portrait, however, the Brooklyn head represents a native Egyptian with curly hair and is carved in a typically Egyptian "rectilinear" or "cubistic" style; that is, the sculptor respected the rectilinear/cubic form of the block in which he carved the head by avoiding integrating the frontal and profile views into an organic whole. The planes of the face are simplified, as is often the case with other works carved in such hard stone. In our basalt head, however, the sculptor has represented his subject's features in a more plastic manner, with attention given to fluctuating surface realism. As mentioned, our portrait appears to be a Hellenistic interpretation of Roman "verism."<sup>9</sup> A similar heightened plasticity of features and surface modeling is found in another hard, dark stone portrait of an Egyptian in the Louvre in Paris,<sup>10</sup> a work created in Alexandria around the middle of the first century B.C.

Hellenistic realism in Egyptian sculpture, which continued throughout the Ptolemaic period (305-30 B.C.), is already evident in a granite statue of Horsitutu in Berlin that most likely dates from about 305-250 B.C.<sup>11</sup> The plastic treatment of the facial surface, with its wrinkles and creases, is remarkably like that of our head. Even though the configuration of locks is different, the mass of Horsitutu's hair is raised in a low relief cap, as in our portrait. Even the linear quality and thickness of the individual locks are remarkably similar to those of our head. Notably different, however, is the rectilinear form of Horsitutu's head, a feature that we have noted is characteristic of other portraits of Egyptians. The endurance of this Greco-Egyptian style is evidenced in a diorite head of an Egyptian priest in the Museo Baracco in Rome.<sup>12</sup> This portrait, dating about the mid-first century B.C., is roughly contemporary with our head. Despite obvious differences, the intensity of gaze in both works is similar. Even the short, linearly engraved locks of the hair and beard of the priest are treated in a manner very much like that in our head. Another roughly contemporary portrait of an Egyptian priest, in the Athenian Agora,<sup>13</sup> is treated in a plastic manner, giving us a better idea of how a Greek sculptor might represent an Egyptian subject in a more typically Hellenistic *koina*. This form of Hellenistic realism closely resembles that of our portrait.

Stylistically, our head appears to date to the third quarter of the first century B.C. In its raised hair cap with linearly incised hair locks, surface realism with emphasis on facial wrinkles and creases, and mimetic expression, it finds a very close comparison with a portrait of a man on a grave relief from the Via Statilia in the Palazzo dei Conservatori in Rome, a work dated to the mid-first century B.C.<sup>14</sup> However, in its dry, harsher surface treatment, indicative of a local Roman workshop tradition, this grave portrait differs from our basalt head. More in keeping with our portrait's Hellenistic interpretation of Roman verism is a contemporary marble portrait of a Roman in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek in Copenhagen,<sup>15</sup> which shares with our head a mimetic expression not uncommonly found in late Roman Republican portraiture.

The hard, dark, highly polished basalt of our portrait, as well as the crisp carving, linear chiseling, and incision work, remind us of dark antiqued bronzes -- a resemblance that was probably intentional. Since hard, dark stones like basalt, shist, and diorite were relatively rare and certainly more costly for sculpture than bronze, they were not chosen as an economical substitute for bronze. In fact, it is likely that such stones were selected not only because of their inherent ability to take fine detail and a very high polish but also because of their rarity and costliness. As



such, they were symbols of wealth and status.+263

The dark grayish green basalt<sup>16</sup> of our portrait appears to be a type that probably comes from quarries on the West bank of the Nile in Lower Egypt, at Faiyum, which was the primary source for basalt in antiquity.<sup>17</sup> Especially in the first century B.C. of the Roman period, when our portrait dates, basalt and other hard, dark stones from Egypt were chosen for works of art not only because of the beauty and costliness of the material but also because of the Roman taste for exotic things.<sup>18</sup> The interest in Egyptian or Egypto-Roman works no doubt intensified as a wave of Egyptomania swept over Rome and parts of Italy after the fall of Alexandria to Caesar's great-nephew and adopted son Octavian in 30 B.C. and the annexation of Egypt, when colored stones from Egypt came into use for portraits of Romans.<sup>19</sup> Such stones were generally reserved for sculptural images of very important people, mainly members of the imperial family. The use of basalt for our portrait head is, in fact, a strong indication in itself that our portrait represents a great Roman personage like Julius Caesar, who was "intimately" connected with Egypt.

The original provenance of our portrait is unknown. Was the raw stone imported into Rome or some other western center, or was this sculpture created in Egypt? Although there is some evidence for skilled workers creating portraits of priests of Isis in hard, dark Egyptian stones in Rome already at the time of Caesar, the employment of such stone for Roman portraits certainly became more widespread in the Augustan and Julio-Claudian period.<sup>20</sup> Unlike our basalt head, most of these works are not treated bichromatically, as were those created in Egypt.<sup>21</sup> Given the type of stone employed, the bichromatic effect of flesh and hair, the distinctive Hellenistic style, and apparent date (ca. third quarter of the first century B.C.), it is likely that our portrait was produced in Egypt, more specifically in Alexandria, where Hellenistic workshops were active in the Ptolemaic period.

Apart from the question of the original provenance of our portrait, it has been suggested that it might have been in the Chateau of St. Cloud outside Paris prior to 1870, when the Chateau burned down.<sup>22</sup> The St. Cloud head is included among the possible ancient portraits of Julius Caesar in a monograph on Caesar's portraits published in 1903 by F.J. Scott.<sup>23</sup> According to Scott, the basalt bust of Caesar was "destroyed in 1870, during the siege of Paris." By "destroyed" did Scott mean that the portrait was completely destroyed, or perhaps that the bust was destroyed and that all that was left was a badly damaged head? Unfortunately, there are no actual photos of the piece, only engravings made for Visconti, the accuracy of which are also in question.<sup>24</sup> There is a general similarity between our head and that in the engraving, especially in the hair line, the forking of the locks over the right eye, the brushing of locks to the subject's left side, and the general pattern of locks over the left ear (visible only in the one profile view made of the left side of the bust). However, there is no evidence in the St. Cloud portrait of the very distinct treatment of the forehead of our head. Significant also are the comments of M. Froehner, a French archaeologist who worked at one time in the room in St. Cloud where the bust had been kept. Scott reports that Froehner characterized this bust of Caesar as a "non-antiquity" and of "poor workmanship."<sup>25</sup> Such an assessment would not be applicable to our portrait, which is clearly ancient and of excellent workmanship. In addition, the portrait shows no traces of the burning that we might expect as a result of the destruction by fire of the Chateau of St. Cloud. All things considered, the St. Cloud Caesar and our head are not, in my opinion, one and the same work.

In the history of our head, there does, however, seem to be French connection. Reportedly, it



is one of two portraits that came from an old French collection in Aix-en-Provence in Southern France. The other work, which is also of dark grayish-green basalt, high quality, life-size, and similarly defaced, is possibly a youthful portrait of Antonia Minor<sup>26</sup> that was probably created in the second to last decade of the first century B.C. Both basalt heads could very well have been brought to France during the Napoleonic campaigns in Egypt or thereafter, when Egyptian antiquities were in great demand. As we shall see, these two basalt heads might originally have been part of a larger group of portraits of notable personages that were set up in some sanctuary or public place.

Could our head, if produced in Egypt, be a portrait of Julius Caesar, perhaps created in Alexandria during his campaigns in Egypt in 48 B.C. or some years later? At first view, the portrait reminds us of Julius Caesar, particularly when seen in the less than three-quarter, optimum view. Many portraits have been identified in the past as Caesar. In the first "comprehensive" study of Roman portraits for its time, *Romische Ikonographie*, published in 1882, J.J. Bernoulli identified 60 sculptural portraits of Caesar.<sup>27</sup> Since Bernoulli's time, many more works have been added to the corpus of possible Caesar's portraits. However, less than one third are in fact ancient images of him, with the rest being either portraits of private individuals or not ancient.<sup>28</sup> In the most recent review of Caesar's portraits by F.S. Johansen, only some twenty sculptural works are taken to be genuine ancient images of him.<sup>29</sup>

Although inscribed statue bases of Caesar have come down to us from antiquity, none of their accompanying images have survived.<sup>30</sup> Conversely, a number of ancient images of Caesar are extant, but without associated inscriptions. Brief and rather generalized ancient literary descriptions of Caesar's physical appearance are only of very marginal value in the identification of his sculptural portraits.<sup>31</sup> For example, Suetonius (Caes. 45) comments on Caesar's baldness (*calvitium*) and also mentions that Caesar was *ore paulo pleniore*, a phrase that could mean that either his "mouth" or his "face" (*os*) was "a little fuller" [than normal].<sup>32</sup> Our most reliable source for Caesar's portraiture is numismatic evidence, since coin images often bear his name and titles.<sup>33</sup> With the coinage, however, we are limited to only a profile view. There is also a certain diversity in Caesar's physiognomic features as preserved in these numismatic images. These differences are partly due to the interest and ability of the die-engravers in representing Caesar's features accurately. Nevertheless, coins minted between 44 and 42 B.C. are the best sources of his likeness, even though they appear more brutally veristic when compared with many of his sculptural portraits. Even the image of Caesar on the denarii of Marcus Mettius, issued in 44 B.C., considered to be the most accurate representation of his physiognomy,<sup>34</sup> appears to the modern eye to have an almost caricature-like quality. The die-designer's intention, however, was most likely to present through the vehicle of portraiture Caesar's character and virtues, as well as his emotional state of being, in keeping with the cultural and ideological interests of the day.

From ancient literary and epigraphic evidence, we know that a number of sculptural images of Caesar were set up in his lifetime, and a number of these in the Greek East,<sup>35</sup> of which Alexandria was also a part. The earliest of Caesar's portrait images seems to have been a statue in the Temple of Victoria at Tralles in Asia Minor.<sup>36</sup> This particular image could have been set up as early as 74 B.C. when Caesar was only about 26 years old and active in this general area. None of the portraits of Caesar created in his life-time can conclusively be shown to be now extant.<sup>37</sup> The majority of sculptural images to have come down to us date to the Augustan and Julio-Claudian periods and are presumably based on models that were ultimately created in Caesar's life-time. Many of these extant replicas and variants of lost portrait models<sup>38</sup> are executed in the classicizing



style consciously promoted by Octavian for ideological reasons both before and after he took the name Augustus and established the Principate in 27 B.C.<sup>39</sup>

The approximately 20 or so genuine surviving portraits of Caesar are now generally divided into two principal types. One of these is the so-called "Tusculum type,"<sup>40</sup> after a head from Tusculum now in the Museo d'Antichità in Turin.<sup>41</sup> This type is known in several replicas and variants (or perhaps even a sub-type).<sup>42</sup> Of his two principal types, the Tusculum is ostensibly the more realistic, revealing a man in his 50s who is already balding, as is evident from the sparseness of the hair over his forehead and temples. Other realistic features found in this type are the distinctive saddle-like depression in the skull (clinocephalia) and an asymmetry to his head (plagiocephalia). Of all of Caesar's previously published portraits, only the Tusculum head might date to Caesar's life-time.<sup>43</sup> But whether created shortly before or after Caesar's death, this particular head replicates a lost prototype that was most likely produced in Caesar's life-time.

The Tusculum type comes closer to the portrait type represented on the denarii of Marcus Mettius, mentioned above.<sup>44</sup> Even the beginning of a saddle-like depression in his skull is visible behind his wreath in this and other numismatic examples. Because Caesar was very sensitive about his baldness, it is said "of all the honors voted to him by the Senate and People, there was no other that he either received or used more willingly than the right of wearing a laurel crown at all times" (*ex omnibus decretis sibi a senatu populoque honoribus non aliud aut recepit aut usurpavit libentius quam ius laureae coronae perpetuo gestandae*: Suet. Iul. 45.2). Almost all of his numismatic portraits represent him wreathed, but not, apparently, with a real laurel crown, which would have been bound at the back with ribbons.<sup>45</sup> Much heavier and without ribbons, the crown which Caesar wears should not be confused with the *corona triumphalis* (= aurea, Etrusca), the large gold crown of Etruscan origin that was held over the triumphator's head during the triumphal procession by a state-owned slave.<sup>46</sup> The type of crown worn by Caesar in the numismatic examples is most likely a golden laurel crown, as indicated by the shape of its leaves and multiple berries. Because it was artificial, it did not need ribbons to bind it at the back.<sup>47</sup> Such a golden laurel crown, moreover, would have underscored the perpetual nature of Caesar's right to wear it. Besides hiding his baldness, it would have masked his clinocephalia, perhaps serving to explain why the wreath is bushier than other wreaths of this sort.

The other of Caesar's two principal portrait types, the so-called "Chiaramonti-Camposanto type,"<sup>48</sup> takes its name from two marble replicas that are considered to represent at best another lost prototype. One of these two replicas is to be found in the Sala dei Busti in the Vatican, formerly in the Museo Chiaramonti;<sup>49</sup> the other, in the Camposanto in Pisa.<sup>50</sup> Of his two principal types, the Chiaramonti-Camposanto type represents Caesar as more youthful, with a full head of hair, in contrast to the sparse hair of the Tusculum type. The locks of hair on the forehead of the Chiaramonti-Camposanto type are brushed to his left side from a "hair-fork" over his right eye. Two distinctive "hair-pincers" are formed over both temples. His hair style and youthful look are to be attributed to the classicizing style promoted by Octavian/Augustus. Even the two pincers of Caesar's hairstyle recall -- undoubtedly for ideological reasons -- the single hair-pincer formation over the right eye in at least two of Octavian/Augustus' generally accepted portrait types -- the so-called "Actium," or "Octavian," type and the famous "Prima Porta" type.<sup>51</sup> That the Chiaramonti-Camposanto type was the more popular of Caesar's two portrait types is clear from the fact that most of Caesar's surviving portraits are of this type and date to the Augustan and Julio-Claudian periods.



Although it is not known when the lost prototype was created, the classicizing style of the Chiaramonti-Camposanto type suggests that the original prototype was produced after Caesar's death and deification. In fact, the lost prototype may have been specifically created for the image of Caesar that was set up in his temple in the Roman Forum between 36 and 29 B.C. The cult image is shown in the Aedes Divi Iuli, known now only from representations on aurei and denarii, dating ca. 36 B.C.<sup>52</sup> An idealized portrait image of Caesar, fairly close to the Chiaramonti-Camposanto type, appears as early as ca. 38/37 B.C. on sestertii of Octavian.<sup>53</sup> If such a portrait type was created after Caesar's death, it would have to have been a "revised" model based on a type produced during Caesar's lifetime, be it the original model of the Tusculum type or some other lost model.

Our basalt head shares a number of similarities with Caesar's general physiognomic features, including an elongated oval shape of the face, angular jaw, high cheek-bones, long creases in sunken cheeks, long naso-labial furrows, and crow's feet, as well as size and shape of eyes, eyelids, and mouth. Even though the chin of the basalt head is severely damaged, we can see from the profile view that it must have been reasonably small, another feature typical of Caesar's portraiture. Barely perceptible in the lower right side of our portrait's neck, where the break begins, is the beginning of a neck line, a distinctive feature in Caesar's portraiture. Caesar's two neck lines, or "Venus rings" as they are called, are sometimes found in the Chiaramonti-Camposanto type<sup>54</sup> but are more typical of the Tusculum type, especially as represented in the Tusculum head itself. Despite its lack of idealization, our basalt head is in many ways closer to the Chiaramonti-Camposanto type than to the Tusculum type. The profile view compares well with the Chiaramonti and Camposanto heads, as well as with a small, white marble head in the Museo Nuovo of the Palazzo dei Conservatori in Rome<sup>55</sup> that appears to be a free interpretation of the Chiaramonti-Camposanto type. The basalt head also compares favorably with the Chiaramonti-Camposanto type in the height of the fringe of locks over the forehead and the incipient receding hair line over the temples. Our portrait lacks the two distinctive pincer-locks over each temple evident in the Chiaramonti-Camposanto type; however, it shares with this type a forking over the right eye of the fringe of locks over the middle of the forehead and a continuous brushing of the hair from that fork to the subject's left side.

Although there are certain features of our head that accord well with the established iconography of Caesar, there are also some differences. Caesar's forehead tends to be slightly wider<sup>56</sup> than that of our head in frontal view. However, this discrepancy may result from the lower relief of the incised hair patterns at the sides of the basalt head when compared to the more plastically rendered locks at the sides of the head of marble versions of Caesar's portrait. The foreheads of most of Caesar's images display furrows that tend to be more or less parallel and symmetrical. By contrast, furrows in the forehead of our basalt head, especially over the left eye, are asymmetrical. The pattern of locks on the left side of the basalt head seems to follow that of the Chiaramonti portrait, whereas that on the right side is not particularly close. This difference may be the result of the somewhat greater attention given to the left side of the basalt head, since this is the side of optimum view. Despite the greater idealization in the Chiaramonti-Camposanto type, it seems that the basalt head has more in common with this type than with the Tusculum type, which it resembles only in the sparsity of hair.

It is, of course, possible that our head portrays a private individual whose features were intentionally assimilated to those of Caesar for some cultural and/or ideological reason. Such a private portrait would constitute a case of "Zeitgesicht"; that is, a "contemporaneous



countenance" resembling a known personage and conditioned by the cultural/ideological values and style of the times in which it was created.<sup>57</sup> This is, however, a decidedly unlikely possibility, since there are two basalt portraits -- our head and the possible Antonia Minor -- that were clearly originally associated with one another.

A green slate portrait bust of Caesar in Berlin,<sup>58</sup> most likely also from Egypt, likewise resembles Caesar, whom it must portray, but differs significantly from his established iconography. Although the facial features are more like those of the Chiaramonti-Camposanto type, the hairstyle is sparse as in the Tusculum type. But unlike what is seen in either type or even in our basalt portrait, the hair of the Berlin Caesar is not conceived as a low relief cap. Instead, the hair patterns are virtually incised on the skull itself. In addition, the locks of hair over the forehead of the Berlin Caesar are brushed continuously to his left side without any forking of locks over the right eye, a feature typical of the Chiaramonti-Camposanto type and evident in our portrait. The Berlin Caesar, moreover, is even more idealized than the Chiaramonti-Camposanto type. Combining elements of both the Chiaramonti-Camposanto and Tusculum types, the Berlin Caesar appears to be a "Typenklitterung" ("mix of types")<sup>59</sup> that probably dates stylistically, especially on the basis of the bust form, to the Julio-Claudian period in the first half of the first century A.D.<sup>60</sup>

Certain discrepancies in our portrait may be the result of the sculptor's freely interpreting some replica or variant of the Chiaramonti-Camposanto type or some other lost model created in Caesar's lifetime on which the Chiaramonti-Camposanto type is also based. As suggested above, because of its high quality, style, and material, our basalt head was probably originally created in Alexandria. It may even be based on a new (now lost) portrait type created in Egypt in 48/47 B.C. during Caesar's brief campaign, which put a grateful Cleopatra on the throne. It is equally possible that our portrait was created between 48 B.C. and the fall of Alexandria in 30 B.C., the approximate period in which the head appears to date stylistically. A somewhat later date also cannot be ruled out, since Caesar, a State god, would have continued to be honored.

We know that Cleopatra had built an elaborate shrine, or Caesareum, to Julius Caesar opposite the harbor of Alexandria. In this heröon stood an image (simulacrum) of the deified Caesar. After the death of Cleopatra, this shrine was dedicated to Augustus and therefore became an Augusteum.<sup>61</sup> Unfortunately, we do not know what Caesar's portrait looked like, nor do we know what other images of members of the Augustan and Julio-Claudian house were also set up here. Since this heröon was rededicated to Augustus, a portrait of Augustus was undoubtedly added. Because it was also common practice to set up images of other members of the imperial family in such shrines, a portrait of Augustus' niece Antonia Minor, if that is who is represented in the other basalt head already mentioned, would also be a likely candidate for honoring in a rededicated Augusteum or in any other public or private portrait "gallery" in Alexandria.<sup>62</sup> Of course it cannot be determined with certainty whether the two basalt portraits were created at the same time, or whether a portrait of Antonia Minor along with other (now missing) portraits was added shortly after the creation of the basalt portrait of Caesar. Nevertheless, it does seem that the two were part of the same imperial portrait group because of iconographical considerations, the distinctive and relatively rare material, the size and similarity of workmanship (undoubtedly produced by the same workshop), the nature and degree of damage, and their reported association with the same collection.

Finally, most of the damage to both basalt portraits is concentrated on the front part of the



face. To be sure, the nose and chin are parts of the anatomy that are often damaged as the result of a sculpture's falling forward. However, the way the face has been battered, especially in the area of the pupils and the eyelids, and the way the ears in the male head have been chipped, as though by several blows, suggest that the two portrait were intentionally defaced. Such was the fate of a number of ancient sculptures during the Late Antique period, when fanatic iconoclastic Christians destroyed or defaced "pagan" images.<sup>63</sup> Caesar, after all, had been worshipped as a god. And if an image of him and other members of the Julio-Claudian family were once set up in a shrine, they would have been all the more likely targets of Christian fanaticism. In any case, the aggregate of evidence argues for our magnificent basalt head's being a portrait of Julius Caesar that was freely interpreted by some Hellenistic sculptor working in Alexandria at the very end of the Republic or in the earlier Augustan period.

John Pollini

Professor of Classical Art and Archaeology

University of Southern California

March 26, 1995

## NOTES

1 I thank Dr. Jerome M. Eisenberg, Director of the Royal-Athena Galleries, for first bringing this portrait to my attention and for subsequent discussions about the piece.

2 The old designation "Restio" style takes its name from C. Antius Restio, tribune of the Plebs in ca. 72 B.C., who is first represented in a harshly realistic way on coins of 47 B.C.: J.M.C. Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* (Ithaca 1978) 23-24, fig. 14; M.H. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* (Cambridge 1974) 470 (no. 455a-b).

3 The origin and relationship of Roman "verism" to Hellenistic "realism" have often been debated. Egyptologists have seen the Egyptian influence, while many Classical archaeologists have rejected or down-played it. For a more recent review of the problems and issues: R.R.R. Smith, "Greeks, Foreigners, and Roman Republican Portraits," *JRS* 71 (1981) 26-38 and *Hellenistic Royal Portraits* (Oxford 1988) esp. 116-17, 125-37. Arguing again for Egyptian influence is B.V. Bothmer, "Egyptian Antecedents of Roman Republican Verism" in *Ritratto ufficiale e ritratto privato: Atti della II conferenza inter-nazionale sul ritratto romano, 1984* (Quaderni de "la ricerca scientifica" 116) (Rome 1988).

4A. Stewart, *Attica: Studies in Athenian Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age* (The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, Supp. Paper 13) (London 1979), 19b, 22b, and esp. his chapter on "Athens, Delos and Rome," 65-98; P. Zanker, "Zur Bildnisrepräsentation führender Männer in mittelitalischen und campanischen Städten zur Zeit der späten Republik und der julisch-claudischen Kaiser" in *Les "Bourgeoisies" municipales italiennes aux II<sup>e</sup> et I<sup>er</sup> siècles av. J.-C.* (Naples/Paris 1983) 251-66. For the general concept of Pathosbild as a cultural and ideological expression, see esp. L. Giuliani, *Bildnis und Botschaft: Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Bildniskunst der römischen Republik* (Frankfurt 1986) 163-245, with figs. 48-52, 54-56.

5 Giuliani (*supra* n. 4) 200-238 for this lessening of pathos, or "Pathosdämpfung."

6 For portrait images, it seems that busts were more common than statues in these kinds of hard stones. Not enough of the neck is preserved to indicate whether it had a base cut in the form of a tenon to be let into the mortise, or cavity, of a statue body in another stone.

7 See R.S. Bianchi in *Cleopatra's Egypt: Age of the Ptolemies*, Exhibition Catalogue, Brooklyn Museum (Mainz 1988) 72. As Bianchi notes, "One may cautiously suggest that this bichromy is intentional and may have served as a substitute for paint because, to date, no example of any sculpture in the round in these hard, dark stones appears to have traces of paint preserved. (One has yet to explain satisfactorily why there are no traces of paint on such statues whereas polychromy abounds on some reliefs in hard stone still in situ and constantly exposed to the elements . . .").

8 *Ibid.*, 138-39 (cat. 43), also with color pl. IX. See also B.V. Bothmer in *Egyptian Sculpture of the Late Period: 700 B.C. to A.D. 11*, ed. E. Riefsthal (Brooklyn 1960) 172-73 (no. 132), pls. 123-24, figs. 329-31.

9 There are those who have seen Roman "verism" as nothing more than a form of Hellenistic art,



while others have seen this style as specifically coming from Egypt. For a fairly comprehensive review of Egyptian influence: A. Adriani, "Ritratti dell'Egitto Greco-Romano," *RM* 77 (1970) 72-109; cf., however, Smith, 1981 (supra n. 3) 32-33.

10 Adriani (supra n. 9), 79-80, pl. 38; and recently K. de Kersauson, *Catalogue des portraits romains: I. Portraits de la République et d'époque Julio-Claudienne* (Paris 1986) 22-23 (no. 6).

11 See recently Bianchi (supra n. 7) 125-26 (cat. 31) with color plate V. Despite the damage to the back of the head, there are no traces of a stele at the back, unlike what is found in traditional Egyptian sculptures like the Horses figure.

12 This head has in the past been called erroneously a Julius Caesar. For this head: Helbig<sup>4</sup> II, 619-20 (no. 1854); F.S. Johansen, "Antichi ritratti di Caio Giulio Cesare nella scultura," *AnalRom* 4 (1967) 56 (no. 56); Adriani (supra n. 9) 95, 99, 105; Z. Kiss, *Etudes sur le portrait imperial romain en Egypte* (Warsaw 1984) 27, figs. 10-11.

13 E. Harrison, *The Athenian Agora I: Portrait Sculpture* (Princeton 1953) 12-14 (no. 3), pl. 3; Stewart (supra n. 4) 80-81, pl. 24; Smith, 1981 (supra n. 3) 33.

14 O. Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik* (Leipzig 1941) 186-93, 211-12, 249-50, 265, pls. XXVII, XXVIII.2; R. Bianchi Bandinelli, *Rome: The Center of Power* (Rome 1970) 93, 402, fig. 102; Stewart (supra n. 4) 83, fig. 21d (close up of head); D.E.E. Kleiner and F.S. Kleiner, "Early Roman Togate Statuary," *BullCom* 87 (1982) 128, pl. 43.1.

15 Poulsen, *Les portraits romains: République et dynastie julienne* (Copenhagen 1973) 55 (no. 21), pl. XXXIII.

16 Basalt is an igneous rock unlike basinites, a type of sandstone known as graywacke, which is often wrongly called "basalt" by Classical archaeologists. The ancient Egyptians knew graywacke, a stone from the quarries of Wadi Ham-mamat in the Eastern desert in Upper Egypt, as bekhen; the Greeks and Romans, as basinites. The misnomer "basalt," a corruption of bassanites mentioned by Pliny (HN 36.58), was first used in 1546 by Giorgio Agricola in his *De Natura Fossilium* (Basel). As in the case of marble, there is need for scientific testing of the different colored stones used in antiquity. For basinites ("basalt") see R. Gnoli, *Marmora Romana* (Rome 1971, 1988), 112-17, fig. XXVII (map) and esp. 114, n. 4 for the corruption of the term. See also more recently *Radiance in Stone: Sculpture in Colored Marble from the Museo Nazionale Romano*, edd. M.L. Anderson and L. Nista (Rome 1989) 56, fig. 1 (map) with further bibliography (B. Di Leo). Unfortunately, throughout this book the term "marble" is also used for the various colored stones used by the ancients. Although the ancient Romans often referred to these stones as marmora, modern scientific studies should now be using the correct geological names when known or the term "colored stone." Much work still remains to be done on identifying marbles and other colored stones employed in antiquity for sculpture, as well as the quarries from which they came.

17 See J. Baines and J. Mälek, *Atlas of Ancient Egypt* (Oxford 1980) 19-21 (with map of natural resources); C.C. Vermeule, "Roman Portraits in Egyptian Colored Stones," *JMFA* 2 (1990) 46-47, nn. 5-6.



- 18 Radiance in Stone (supra n. 16) 11-22 (M.L. Anderson) with further bibliography.
- 19 See further Vermuele (supra n. 17) 38-45.
- 20 Radiance in Stone (supra n. 16) 59-60 (B. Di Leo); Vermeule (supra n. 17) 38-48. After the Julio-Claudian period there was less interest in and use of colored Egyptian stone for portraiture until the time of Hadrian.
- 21 For a head of Augustus in the Musée Calvet in Avignon and other hard, Egyptian stone heads of Augustus: K. Fittschen and P. Zanker, *Katalog der römischen Portrats in den Capitolinischen Museen und den anderen kommunalen Sammlungen der Stadt Rom I* (Mainz 1985) 7, n. 4, Beilage 6a-d.
- 22 So suggested by Dr. Jerome M. Eisenberg.
- 23 F.J. Scott, *Portraits of Julius Caesar* (London 1903) 133-35 (no. 45 [B. 36]). See also J.J. Bernoulli, *Römische Ikonographie I* (Stuttgart 1882; reprint Hildesheim 1969) 161 (no. 36), 165, 172, 181.
- 24 Photographic copies of these engravings were reproduced by Scott (supra n. 23) 133-35 with fig. 31 and pl. XXVII.
- 25 Ibid., 135.
- 26 I thank Cornelius C. Vermeule for information on this unpublished head, including its provenance and connection with our basalt portrait.
- 27 Bernoulli (supra n. 23) 155-65. Bernoulli, 149-54, also considered some of the numismatic and gem stone images of Caesar.
- 28 The first truly comprehensive study of Caesar's portraits was Bernoulli (supra n. 23) 145-81. Two more recent surveys of his portraiture are by Johansen (supra n. 12) 7-68 and "The Portraits in Marble of Gaius Julius Caesar: A Review," in *Ancient Portraits in the J. Paul Getty Museum I* (Malibu 1987) 17-40. These two works give the principal past bibliography on Caesar's portraiture. For other recent and more specialized studies of Caesar's portraiture: L. Cozza, "Un nuovo ritratto di Cesare," *AnalRom* 12 (1983) 65-69; W.-R. Megow, "Proträtmiszellen," *RM* 94 (1987) 91-105; P.E. Arias, "Problemi attuali della iconografia di Cesare alla luce del ritratto del Camposanto Monumentale di Pisa" in *Ritratto ufficiale e ritratto privato: Atti della II conferenza internazionale sul ritratto romano, 1984* (Quaderni de "la ricerca scientifica" 116) (Rome 1988) 119-22; M.R. Hoffer, "Zum Porträt des C. Iulius Caesar," 335-39, in *Beiträge zur Ikonographie und Hermeneutik. Festschrift für N. Himmelmann* (Mainz 1989); J. Pollini, *Roman Portraiture: Images of Character and Virtue* (Los Angeles 1990) 10, 16-21. The most comprehensive recent general study about Julius Caesar is that of S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (Oxford 1971).
- 29 Johansen, 1987 (supra n. 28) 17.
- 30 A.E. Raubitschek, "Epigraphical Notes on Julius Caesar," *JRS* 44 (1954) 65-71, e.g., has collected inscribed bases of statues set up to Caesar in the Greek world during his life-time.



There is, however, no comprehensive work of all inscribed bases of Caesar.

31 For the various ancient literary descriptions of Caesar: Johansen (supra n. 12) 7-9.

32 See infra n. 56.

33 Some of the more comprehensive works on Caesar's numismatic images are Vessberg (supra n. 14) 138-48, pls. VI-VIII; S.L. Cesano, "Le monete di Cesare," *RendPontAcc* 23/24, 1947/48-1948/49, (1950) esp. 139-49, pls. III-IV; A. Alföldi, "The Portrait of Caesar on the Denarii of 44 B.C. and the Sequence of the Issues" in *Centennial Volume of the American Numismatic Society*, New York (1958) 27-42, pl. 1; Crawford (supra n. 2) 487-495 (no. 480), 496 (no. 485), 505 (no. 494.16), 530-31 (nos. 526.1,4), 535 (nos. 534.1-2; 535); A. Alföldi, "Die stadtrömischen Münzporträts des Jahres 43 v. Chr.," *Eikones (AntK Beiheft 12)* (Bern 1980) 17-28. For useful brief surveys of the numismatic evidence for Caesar's portraiture: Johansen (supra n. 12) 10-11; Toynbee (supra n. 2) 30-33. For possible images of Caesar on gems, as well as on coins, see esp. M.-L. Vollenweider, *Die Portratgemmen der römischen Republik*, 120-32, pls. 75-87.

34 Alföldi, 1958 (supra n. 33) 27-42. See also A. Alföldi, "Das wahre Gesicht Cäsars," *AntK* (1959) 27-31, and "Der Mettius-Denar mit 'Caesar Dict. Quart.," *SchwMbl* 13 (1964) 29. For an excellent photographic enlargement of this denarius: J.P.C. Kent, *Roman Coins* (New York 1978) pl. 26 (no. 93).

35 In general: Bernoulli (supra n. 23) 145-47; Johansen (supra n. 12) 13-19; G. Lahusen, *Schriftquellen zum römischen Bildnis I* (Bremen 1984) 46-51, 109. For inscribed bases: supra n. 30.

36 *Caes. BCiv.* 3.105; *Val. Max.* 1.6.12; *Plut. Caes.* 47.1; *Cass. Dio* 41.61.4. From these sources, especially Plutarch, it would seem that the statue of Caesar had already been erected before his victory over Pompey at Pharsalus in 48 B.C. On this statue see further Toynbee (supra n. 2) 30 and Weinstock (supra n. 28) 97, 296.

37 Only a marble portrait of Caesar from ancient Tusculum may have been created shortly before his death: see infra.

38 For portrait models, replicas, variants, etc. see my brief survey with further bibliography in Pollini (supra n. 28) 8-17.

39 Much has been written on this subject in recent years. See my discussion, "The Augustus from Prima Porta and the Transformation of the Polykleitan Heroic Ideal," forthcoming in *Polykleitos, the Doryphoros, and Tradition*, ed. W. Moon (Madison 1995) with earlier bibliography.

40 Sometimes also called the "Tusculum-Agliä type," or "Agliä type," after the Castello d'Agliä, where the head was rediscovered in 1940 by M. Borda. See Johansen (supra n. 12) 20 with n. 73.

41 This head was excavated in the Forum of Tusculum by Lucien Bonaparte in 1825 and later transferred to the Castello d'Agliä (near Turin), and finally to the Museo d'Antichità. See Johansen, 1987 (supra n. 28) 24 with further bibliography.



42 Ibid., 24-27. The "McLendon Caesar" in the J. Paul Getty Museum in Malibu should not be taken as a portrait of a private individual, as maintained by Johansen (39-40, fig. 37), but one of three portraits related to the Tusculum type. The second head, not well preserved, is in a private collection (Staderini) in Rome (27, fig. 18a-b). A third head, even more badly preserved, is in the Hessischen Landesmuseum in Kassel. Despite the damage sustained by all three heads, they all seem to be so closely related to one another as to be more of a subtype than a variant of the Tusculum head. For the Kassel portrait: Megow (supra n. 28) 91-100, pls. 81.1-4, 82.2, 83.4. For the Rome head: Cozza (supra n. 28). For the Getty head, Hofter (supra n. 28) 335-37; Pollini (supra n. 28) 16-17 (Cat. 2).

43 There is no reason why this portrait could not equally have been created shortly after Caesar's death. See also Johansen, 1987 (supra n. 28) 27.

44 See, in particular, the compared good quality photos in E. Simon, *Augustus: Kunst und Leben in Rom um die Zeitenwende* (Munich 1986) 60, figs. 67-68.

45 The type of crown worn by Caesar in coinage has been much debated. For more recent views see Weinstock (supra n. 28) 272; Crawford (supra n. 2) 488 n. 1 with bibliography; and P. Bastien, *Le buste monétaire des empereurs romains I* (Wetteren, Belgium 1992) 62-65.

46 The *corona triumphalis*, moreover, was embellished with gemstones: *gemmis et foliis ex auro quercinis ob Iovem insignes* (Tert. de Cor. 13). See also A. Alföldi, "Insignien und Tracht der römischen Kaiser," *RM* 50 (1935) 38-40 (= A. Alföldi, *Die monarchische Repräsentation im römischen Kaiserreiche*, 3rd ed. (Darmstadt 1980) 156-58; T. Hölscher, *Victoria Romana* (Mainz 1967) 83-84; and esp. H.S. Versnel, *Triumphus: An Inquiry into the Origin, Development and Meaning of the Roman Triumph* (Leiden 1970) 56-57 with n. 4, 72-77, *passim*. This type of crown is different from the *corona civica*, or oak crown, which was not decorated with gemstones. For a representation of the *corona triumphalis*, see the head of Augustus in the Capitoline Museum in Rome: Sala dei Imperatori 6, inv. 495): D. Boschung, *Die Bildnisse des Augustus (Das römische Herrscherbild I)* (Berlin 1993), 129-31, pls. 38, 225.2, 226.1. Here the small leaves appear odd, most likely because they are meant to be artificial gold oak (?) leaves. Pace Zanker and Boschung, they are not finished, as suggested by H. von Heintze, as the sides and back of the leafy crown show. For a discussion of this crown see Boschung, 130. In any case, compare this gem-studded crown with the *corona civica* (without gemstones), commonly worn by Augustus: Boschung, e.g., pls. 223-224.

47 That is not to say that it could not also be represented in art with golden ribbons.

48 At one time this type was considered to be two different types, the "Chiaramonti type" and the "Camposanto type," each with its own replicas. Because the similarities between the Chiaramonti and Camposanto heads, especially in the configuration of hair locks over the forehead, far outway minor dissimilarities, both heads should be considered to be the best replicas of a lost prototype. For this reason, this type should be named after both; hence, the "Chiaramonti-Camposanto type." On this matter see K. Fittschen, *Katalog der antiken Skulpturen in Schloss Erbach* (Berlin 1977) 33-34 n. 1; Johansen, 1987 (supra n. 28) 17-24 with further bibliography.



49 Bernoulli (supra n. 23) 156 (no. 6), 174 (no. 6); Johansen (supra n. 12) 25, pl. I; Toynbee (supra n. 2) 34, fig. 33; Johansen, 1987 (supra n. 28) 17, figs. 1a-b.

50 Bernoulli (supra n. 23) 172 (no. 22) with fig.; Johansen (supra n. 12) 28, pl. 6; L. Faedo, "Camposanto Monumentale di Pisa," in *Antichita Pisane II* (Pisa 1984) 133-37; Johansen, 1987 (supra n. 28) 22, fig. 6a-b; Arias (supra n. 28) 119-22.

51 There are many difficulties with the portrait types of Augustus. See now the catalogue by Boschung (supra n. 46). I shall also be dealing with the portrait types of Augustus in a forthcoming book entitled *The Image of Augustus: Art, Ideology, and the Rhetoric of Leadership*.

52 In ca. 36 B.C. the temple, shown as already built on these coins, was only projected. The temple was undertaken in 42 B.C. (Cass. Dio 47.18.4), but not dedicated until 29 B.C. (Cass. Dio 51.22.2; Mon. Anc. 19). For the temple see L. Richardson, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Rome* (Baltimore 1982) 213 s.v. "Iulius, Divus, Aedes." Unfortunately, the image represented on the coins, a togate statue of Caesar holding a lituus, is too small to permit any assessment about the portraiture. For the numismatic evidence: G. Fuchs, *Architecturdarstellungen auf römischen Münzen* (Berlin 1969) 37, pls. 4.57, 5.58; BMCRR II (1970) 580-81 (nos. 32-37) with n. 1, pl. cxxii.4-5; P. Zanker, *Il foro romano: La sistemazione da Augusto alla tarda antichità*, trans. from German (Rome 1972) 12-13, pl. 15; Crawford (supra n. 2) 537-38 (no. 540.1-2).

53 Crawford (supra n. 2) 535 (no. 535/1). For an excellent photographic representation of this coin type: Kent (supra n. 34) no. 115 (right view), pl. 33 (incorrectly dated).

54 See, e.g., a head in the Palazzo Pitti in Florence: Johansen, 1987 (supra n. 28) 22, fig. 7a-b.

55 Sala 35, no. 2538: Johansen (supra n. 12) 31; H.v. Heintze, "Ein spätantikes Bildnis Caesars," in *Studies in Classical Art and Archaeology: A Tribute to Peter H. von Blanckenhagen*, edd. G. Kopcke and M. Moore (Locust Valley, N.Y. 1979) 297 with further bibliography; Johansen, 1987 (supra n. 28) 24, fig. 9a-b.

56 Perhaps the meaning of Suetonius' phrase (Caes. 45) *ore paulo pleniore*: supra.

57 For the phenomenon of "Zeitgesicht" in portraiture, see esp. P. Zanker, "Herrscherbild und Zeitgesicht," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Ges.-Sprachw. R.* 31 (1982) 307-12.

58 Bernoulli (supra n. 23) 164 (no. 57), pl. 18; Blämel, *Römische Bildnisse* (Berlin 1933) R 9, pl. 5; Johansen (supra n. 12) 49-50; cf. Johansen, 1987 (supra n. 28) 33, fig. 30a-b; K. Fittschen "Die Geschichte Pompejis" in *Pompeji: Leben und Kunst den Vesuvsteten*, 3rd ed. (Essen 1973) 28-29 (no. 1); and more recently *Die Antikensammlung im Pergamonmuseum und in Charlottenburg* (Staatliche Museen zu Berlin) (Berlin 1992) 203-204 (no. 93) (color photo). Although its authenticity and identification as a portrait of Julius Caesar have been questioned in the past, it does appear that this bust is ancient and represents Caesar. The eyes, however, are a modern restoration in marble. On the authenticity and identification, see esp. Fittschen, loc. cit.

59 For the term "Typenklitterung": Pollini (supra n. 28) 9 with further bibliography.



60 See Fittschen (supra n. 58) 28-29 (no. 1).

61 For the image: Suet., Aug. 17. The principal ancient literary sources for this heröon are Philo., Leg., 22.151; Cass. Dio 51.15.5; Pliny, HN, 36.69. For the epigraphical sources and problems associated with this shrine, see recently D. Fishwick, "The Temple of Caesar at Alexandria," *AJAH* 9 (1984) 131-32.

62 A number of individual portrait "galleries" representing the imperial family and others have been discussed in the literature. For a general brief survey of the practice of setting up groups of portrait statues of Roman leaders and private individuals, as well as Greek precedents for this practice, recently two articles in *Ritratto ufficiale e ritratto privato: Atti della II conferenza internazionale sul ritratto romano, 1984* (Quaderni de "la ricerca scientifica" 116) (Rome 1988): J.C. Balty, "Groupes statuaire impériaux et privés de l'époque julio-claudienne," 31-46 and G. Lahusen, "Offizielle und private Bildnisgalerien in Rom," 361-66. See also C.B. Rose, *Julio-Claudian Dynastic Group Monuments* (Columbia Diss. 1987).

63 Images, especially cultic ones, have been regarded as substitutes for that which they signify. Some were -- and still are -- considered to have magical properties, for which reason people fear them. For the destruction of "pagan" images by Christian fanatics: E. Bevan, *Holy Images: An Inquiry into Idolatry and Image-Worship in Ancient Paganism and in Christianity* (London 1940); G.B. Ladner, "The Concept of the Image in the Greek Fathers and the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy," *DOP* 7 (1953) 3-34; E. Kitzinger, "The Cult of Images in the Age before Iconoclasm," *DOA* 8 (1954) 83-150 [= E. Kitzinger, *The Art of Byzantium and the Medieval West* (1976) 90-156]; and recently D. Freedberg, *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response* (Chicago 1989) 378-428.











