

# **Imperial portrait practice in the second century AD: Marcus Aurelius and Faustina the Younger**

Christian Niederhuber  
Lincoln College  
University of Oxford



A thesis submitted for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
Hilary 2019

# Imperial portrait practice in the second century AD: Marcus Aurelius and Faustina the Younger

Christian Niederhuber  
Lincoln College  
University of Oxford

A thesis submitted for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
Hilary 2019

## **Abstract**

Case studies of Faustina the Younger's and Marcus Aurelius' portraits on coins and in sculpture demonstrate that a more flexible approach than currently allowed for is needed to describe ancient practices and processes behind the phenomenon of 'replicated' imperial portraits. Possible norms are investigated in this study, and an adjusted model of an imperial portrait 'system' in the second century A.D. is outlined.

Key concepts of the prevailing model are the assumption of an official commissioning of all imperial portrait types, the view of a close correspondence between imperial coins and sculpture and the belief that types were created to commemorate specific historical events. All of this, however, is far from certain and a close examination of the preserved evidence makes it necessary to revise the model in certain ways: it is suggested in this study that the creation of portrait types and their adjustment was not necessarily restricted to official commissions only. Very likely, some types or images designated as new types by archaeology originated within the mint or in the environment of the metropolitan marble workshops and were then further disseminated. Furthermore, it is possible to prove that there is no complete correspondence between portraits on imperial coins and sculptured portraits. Finally, a different view of the basic purpose of imperial portrait types is argued for: it can be shown that in most cases new types were not about the commemoration of historical moments, but about (a) recognisability and identification, (b) changing elite styles and fashions, and (c) dynastic conceptions and strategies to affirm imperial power.

# Table of Contents

Abbreviations .....	iv
<b>1. INTRODUCTION: AIMS AND METHODS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
A. STATE OF RESEARCH .....	3
B. RESEARCH QUESTIONS, AIMS, AND SCOPE .....	8
C. METHODOLOGY AND MATERIAL .....	9
<b>2. FAUSTINA: IMPERIAL COINS AND MEDALLIONS .....</b>	<b>17</b>
A. RESEARCH HISTORY AND STATE OF RESEARCH .....	17
B. TYPOLOGICAL SEQUENCE AND CHRONOLOGY .....	20
C. PORTRAIT TYPES .....	25
D. ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS .....	52
<b>3. FAUSTINA: MARBLE PORTRAITS .....</b>	<b>67</b>
A. RESEARCH HISTORY AND STATE OF RESEARCH .....	67
B. PORTRAIT TYPES .....	68
C. ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS .....	96
<b>4. FAUSTINA: DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>5. MARCUS AURELIUS: IMPERIAL COINS AND MEDALLIONS .....</b>	<b>114</b>
A. RESEARCH HISTORY AND STATE OF RESEARCH .....	114
B. CHRONOLOGY .....	114
C. CHRONOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGE OF THE PORTRAIT .....	116
D. ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS .....	126
E. ORGANISATION OF THE MINT OF ROME AND SYSTEM OF PRODUCTION .....	136
<b>6. MARCUS AURELIUS: MARBLE PORTRAITS .....</b>	<b>146</b>
A. RESEARCH HISTORY AND STATE OF RESEARCH .....	146
B. PORTRAIT TYPES .....	147
C. ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS .....	170
D. MARBLE TECHNOLOGY AND MARBLE WORKSHOPS .....	173
<b>7. MARCUS AURELIUS: DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>179</b>
<b>8. IMPERIAL PORTRAIT PRACTICE: NORMS AND MODELS IN THE SECOND CENTURY .....</b>	<b>190</b>
A. EVALUATION .....	190
B. OUTLINE OF AN ADJUSTED MODEL OF AN IMPERIAL PORTRAIT 'SYSTEM' .....	202
<b>9. CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>211</b>
<b>Appendix: Portrait Lists of Faustina and Marcus .....</b>	<b>213</b>
<b>Illustration Credits .....</b>	<b>228</b>
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>237</b>
<b>Illustrations .....</b>	<b>256</b>

## Abbreviations

Abbreviations for periodicals and standard reference works are those of the American Journal of Archaeology 104, 2000, 10–24. Further abbreviations employed are:

BMCRE IV = H. Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum IV. Antoninus Pius to Commodus* (London 1940, corr. reprint 1968).

CELLINI, treatises = *The treatises of Benvenuto Cellini on goldsmithing and sculpture*. Translated into English by C. R. Ashbee (London 1898).

GNECCHI I–III = F. Gnechi, *I medaglioni romani I–III* (Milan 1912).

IK = *Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*.

RPC Online = Roman Provincial Coinage Online (<http://rpc.ashmus.ox.ac.uk>).

SHA = *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*.

## CHAPTER 1

### Introduction: Aims and Methods

It has long been recognised that the portraits of Roman emperors and their immediate family members ('imperial portraits') from the age of Augustus to ca. the middle of the third century A.D. are not unique representations but show in many cases a remarkable accordance in the rendering of certain iconographic details such as the arrangement of the hair.<sup>1</sup> While it is clear that the basic purpose of this phenomenon was to ensure recognisability, the ancient processes behind it, the processes of creation, dissemination and replication, are obscure.<sup>2</sup> As related literary sources are sparse or of a later period, we are almost completely reliant on archaeology, on the portraits themselves and the evidence of statue bases, to shed light on these matters.<sup>3</sup> The way we perceive these processes is important because it influences our interpretation of imperial portraits in general.<sup>4</sup>

To investigate these processes, this study is primarily concerned with the appearance and details of the imperial portrait heads with their replicated individualised portrait identity (and posture) – frequently the only part of the portraits surviving. The term 'portrait' is, accordingly, used in a very narrow sense. One must be aware, however, that in sculpture the head was never a self-sufficient monument on its own in ancient times. It was always combined with a statue or bust support – the primary forms of display of the imperial family around the empire – as a vital part of the message the portraits were intended to convey in their local context. Furthermore, the statues were set on an inscribed base, as an integral element of the monument. The favoured costume choices for emperors'

---

<sup>1</sup> Swift 1923, 286–90; Brendel 1931, 11–13; Stuart 1939, 601. – Non-imperial portraits are frequently called 'private' portraits. This conventional term, also used in the following, can be misleading as they often had a 'public' function e.g. as part of an honorific monument. For a discussion of the term see Fittschen 2010, 235–36 with further references; Fittschen 2015, 52–53.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Smith 1996, 33 for the recognisable portrait identity.

<sup>3</sup> For the predominantly late Roman literary sources see Friedlaender 1920, 57–58, 61–63; Swift 1923, 297–300; Bruun 1976; Pekáry 1985, 23–25; Ando 2000, 228–32; cf. also Eck 2017.

<sup>4</sup> Fejfer 2008, 408.

portraits in the second century were cuirassed, standing for the military emperor and – much less common – naked with weapons ('heroic costume'). The toga costume was still a possibility, but in contrast to the first century A.D. it was rarely employed in our period. The empress, in comparison, was represented draped with tunic and mantle. All of these choices were not restricted to imperial portraits but also used for 'private' portraiture.<sup>5</sup>

The archaeological and textual evidence suggest that the production of imperial portraits reached its height in the second century A.D. and it is absolutely clear that the surviving portraits are only a fraction of what once must have existed.<sup>6</sup> They were a demonstration of loyalty, a massive approbation of the imperial family organised from below by communities and individuals.<sup>7</sup> On the scale of this approbation – in the following referred to in its entirety as constituting an honorific 'system' – we are informed by one of the very few contemporary literary sources on imperial portrait practices in our period, a famous letter of Cornelius Fronto to his pupil Marcus Aurelius (*ad M. Caesarem* 4. 12. 6):

'You know how in all money-changer's bureaus, booths, shops, porches, forecourts and windows, anytime and everywhere portraits of you are displayed to the people, badly painted most of them to be sure, and modelled or carved in a rude, not to say coarse kind of art; yet whenever your image encounters my eyes in the streets, never is it so unrecognisable that it would not make me blow a sweet kiss'.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Zanker 1979; Smith 1998, 64. The statue or bust supports employed did not display the actual individual appearance of the emperor or the empress but were choices out of a repertoire that made statements about their roles or qualities (e.g. military leader). – For the statuary types see Niemeyer 1968; cuirassed statues: Stemmer 1978; nude statues: Hallett 2005; toga statues: Goette 1990. See also the various articles in: La Rocca – Parisi Presicce 2011; La Rocca – Parisi Presicce 2012.

<sup>6</sup> For the portraits see for example Fittschen – Zanker 1983; Fittschen – Zanker 1985; Fittschen 1999. – Textual evidence: Pekáry 1985, 4–12. – Statue bases: Højte 2005.

<sup>7</sup> Smith 1996, 34.

<sup>8</sup> '*Scis, ut in omnibus argentariis mensulis perguleis taberneis protecteis vestibulis fenestris usquequaque, ubique imagines vestrae sint volgo propositae, male illae quidem pictae pleraeque et crassa, lutea immo Minerva fictae sculptaeve; cum interim numquam tua imago tam dissimilis ad oculos meos in itinere accidit, ut non ex ore meo excusserit jactum osculei et savium.*' (ed. van den Hout 1988; see also van den Hout 1999, 184–85 for a commentary).

The text passage tells us that imperial portraits were ubiquitous, painted or sculptured in all sorts of qualities, but never so *dissimilis* that it would not have been recognisable. As we know from the archaeological and textual evidence, the imperial image was not only omnipresent in Rome and Italy, but also in the cities throughout the empire: in public places and public buildings, but imperial portraits were also on display in private houses and shops. Likewise, the emperor's image was ever-present in the realm of the military, in every legionary and auxiliary camp.<sup>9</sup> Besides sculpture in the round and reliefs – in precious metal, bronze or stone (predominantly marble), and from colossal to under life-size – many portraits must have been painted. But other media are also known to have been used for the imperial image, such as gems and cameos, just to name a few examples. Beyond that, almost everyone must have known the emperor's likeness from coins.<sup>10</sup>

## A. STATE OF RESEARCH

Research on the phenomenon of 'replicated' imperial portraits has eventually led to modern typological studies, clearly demonstrating by means of the modern practice of the typological method that extant imperial portraits depend on now lost centrally defined models ('original' model or prototype). These shared models, setting the individualised portrait identity of the subject, are called portrait types. Several of them are known for many emperors and their family members. It is evident from the extant portraits that these types were made available to the workshops in Rome and further disseminated to provincial cities by mechanisms we do not fully understand and that they were revised for reasons we often do not know.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> See Niemeyer 1968, 28–37; Zanker 1979, 361; Pekáry 1985, 42–65 (with literary sources); Fittschen 1986, 19; Eck 2017, 272–73. For military contexts see for example Stoll 1992 (Obergermanisch-Rätischer Limes).

<sup>10</sup> See for example Bonanno 1976 (historical reliefs); Lahusen – Formigli 2001 (bronze portraits); Kreikenbom 1992, 56–109 (colossal portraits); Dahmen 2001, esp. 15–60, nos. 1–104 (under life-size portraits); Megow 1987 (cameos). See also Fejfer 2008, 152–80 for different portrait media.

<sup>11</sup> Swift 1923, 286–90; Brendel 1931, 9–15; Fittschen 1971, 220–24; Fittschen 1977, 6–8; Bergmann 1978, 13; Zanker 1983, 8–9; Fittschen 2010.

These regular portrait practices and processes of creation, dissemination and ‘replication’ of imperial portrait types with the purpose of ensuring the recognisability of the imperial image are in the following referred to as the ‘imperial portrait system’. The term ‘system’, however, has to be understood without intention like ‘propaganda’ or central direction and organisation. The phenomenon of ‘replication’ of sculpture for easy recognition of the subject was not new when these portrait practices started under Augustus. Classical-looking marble figures for an Italian villa market had already been ‘replicated’ in an organised manner since the late Republican period and some kind of ‘system’ must have been at hand.<sup>12</sup>

### **Portrait types**

The term ‘portrait type’ was introduced by J. J. Bernoulli in the last volume of his study on imperial portraits *Römische Ikonographie II. 3* (1894).<sup>13</sup> It was first systematically defined and used by O. Brendel in his dissertation *Ikonographie des Kaisers Augustus*, published in 1931.<sup>14</sup> Portrait types are frequently named after their supposed reason of creation or after what is regarded as their best surviving example. Both practices are not unproblematic, as the first implies that the reason for the creation of the type is certain while the latter promotes a particular portrait against which others are measured. In relation to the type, all portraits are adapted in some way or another.<sup>15</sup> Consequently, portraits made after the same type are in this study simply called ‘versions’ instead of using the confusing terms ‘copy’, ‘replica’ or ‘repetition’, that are too greatly influenced by modern perceptions.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Fittschen 1977, 4–6; Pfanner 1989, 176–78; Smith 1992, 270–71; Smith 1996, 31, 33–34; cf. also Neudecker 1988 for the phenomenon. – In comparison to the first century A.D., the reproduction of imperial portrait types became more exact and systematic in the second century (Smith 1996, 35, 41).

<sup>13</sup> Bernoulli 1894, 35–47; see also Fittschen 2010, 223 with n. 6; Fittschen 2015, 53. The term ‘type’ (*typos*) was most probably already used in antiquity to designate an original image (model) on which ‘copies’ were based, as Fittschen recently pointed out (Fittschen 2010, 226, 228 with n. 24; Fittschen 2015, 53–54).

<sup>14</sup> Brendel 1931, 9–15.

<sup>15</sup> Smith 1996, 37; Fittschen 2015, 59.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1999, 10–11 for the synonymous use of the terms ‘Kopie’, ‘Replik’ and ‘Wiederholung’, a terminology originally introduced by Lippold 1923 for copies after Greek originals.

## Typological method and identification of imperial portraits

The modern practice of the typological method in portrait studies consists of a detailed comparison of all the extant portrait heads that are suggested as versions of a given subject ('Kopienkritik' or 'Kopienrezension'). The aim is to establish a 'core-group' of versions that allows conclusions to be drawn on the design, appearance and style of an underlying model. Based on this 'core-group' and our perception of the underlying model, portraits that fall within a range of adjustment and variation of a set of common characteristics are considered versions of the same type after a lost 'original model' (prototype), while portraits that fall outside that range are excluded.<sup>17</sup> The main criterion for the classification is not a general portrait resemblance but the repetition of a sufficient number of key features. The most readily and objectively comparable feature is the hairstyle, in particular (for male portraits) the formation of hair above the forehead, but other characteristics such as the (more variable) physiognomy are also compared. The result of this procedure is a list or series of portraits after one model or type, all representing the same subject.<sup>18</sup> In a next step, the subject can be named by an inscribed example.<sup>19</sup>

The typological method shows that the range of variation of different versions of a type is not continuous but that they vary 'around a set of repeated design elements'. Seemingly dissimilar portraits can refer to a common model or type by the repetition of certain key features, while apparently similar images merely resemble imperial portrait types.<sup>20</sup> Therefore, the method allows us, once the types are securely attributed to imperial personage, to identify imperial portraits from objective criteria among the vast quantity of similar non-imperial ('private') portraits that were either influenced by imperial portraiture, or from which these images emerged.<sup>21</sup> It is important, as R. Smith noted, to distinguish the practice of the modern typological method from the ancient

---

<sup>17</sup> Fundamental to this subject is Fittschen 1971; see also Smith 1996, 31–33; Fittschen 2010, 223–26 for a recent discussion with further references.

<sup>18</sup> Smith 1996, 32; Fittschen 2015, 62.

<sup>19</sup> The naming of imperial portraits involves in most cases the comparison with coin portraits.

<sup>20</sup> Smith 1996, 32–33.

<sup>21</sup> Fittschen 1971, 221, 223; Smith 1996, 33.

processes behind the phenomenon of ‘replicated’ portrait images. They do share, however, the basic common purpose of recognition and identification.<sup>22</sup>

### **Non-type imperial portraits**

It cannot be ruled out that ‘unique representations’ or ‘non-type’ portraits (‘Einzelstücke’) of the emperor or his family members were made. However, without any reference to known imperial types nor an identifying inscription or context, it is on an objective basis impossible to identify them archaeologically and distinguish them from contemporary non-imperial ‘private’ portraits. In consequence, ‘non-type’ imperial portraits remain an entirely theoretical category.<sup>23</sup>

### **Prevailing model of an imperial portrait ‘system’**

The prevailing model of an imperial portrait ‘system’ was first systematically expressed by K. Fittschen. He suggested that imperial portrait types were conceived in connection with specific events and that an artist was commissioned by the court in Rome to create a three-dimensional ‘original model’ or prototype (normally thought to be made of clay, plaster or wax). This ‘official’ prototype was then made available to the mint and to the marble workshops where it was transformed into a mint model by a ‘master die-cutter’ (‘entwerfender Münzstempelschneider’) and into a sculptured model made of durable material (presumably marble or bronze) by a ‘master sculptor’ (‘entwerfender Bildhauer’) respectively. According to Fittschen, the sculptured model was then ‘copied’ by the marble carvers of the metropolitan workshops and further distributed.<sup>24</sup>

Key concepts of this model are, accordingly, the assumption of a metropolitan creation of all portrait types under control of the court (official commissioning), the view of a close correspondence of

---

<sup>22</sup> Smith 1996, 32.

<sup>23</sup> Fittschen 1971, 223–24; Zanker 1983, 9 n. 8; Smith 1996, 33; Fittschen 2010, 232–34 with a discussion of the scholarly debate and further references.

<sup>24</sup> Fittschen 1971, 219–24; Fittschen 1977, 6–7; Bergmann 1978, 13; Zanker 1983, 8–9.

imperial coins and sculpture, and the belief that types are in most cases, if not all, created to commemorate specific events.<sup>25</sup>

### **Significance of method and model for modern portrait studies**

It is of fundamental importance not to misunderstand Fittschen's work and the typological method as 'some kind of misguided, positivist exercise that is out of touch with ancient realities and complexities', as R. Smith characterises the opposition to Fittschen's view-point.<sup>26</sup> Despite controversial positions in scholarship, it must be explicitly stated that the practice of the typological method is essential for modern portrait studies.<sup>27</sup> It clearly works, and the alternative of an identification and attribution of imperial portraits based on subjective criteria such as a general resemblance of physiognomy and hairstyle is not an option.<sup>28</sup> Furthermore, the model of centrally provided imperial portrait types has in principle to be accepted. 'No other model of explanation will account for the observable phenomena', as Smith correctly noted.<sup>29</sup>

However, the prevailing model of an imperial portrait 'system' appears to be too inflexible in a number of cases to describe the ancient portrait practices and processes behind the phenomenon of 'replicated' imperial portraits. The main weaknesses of the model have most comprehensively been sketched by J. Fejfer. She argued that it is far from sure that imperial portrait types were created in connection with specific events to commemorate them – too much depends on the interpretation of imperial coinage and the ambiguity involved. Furthermore, the relation between portraits on imperial coins and sculptured portraits is presumably not as tight as generally assumed. There appears to be no complete correspondence between the portraits in the two media. Fejfer supposed that the creation of portrait types was not necessarily restricted to official commissions only.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Cf. most recently Fittschen 2010, 228–32; Fittschen 2015, 56, 58–59 on these assumptions.

<sup>26</sup> Smith 1996, 31, 35.

<sup>27</sup> For the different positions and a brief discussion of the debate with further references see Fittschen 1999, p. X with n. 8; Fittschen 2010, esp. 223 with n. 3.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1971; Smith 1996, 35 on this matter.

<sup>29</sup> Smith 1996, 34.

<sup>30</sup> Fejfer 1998, esp. 46–47; Fejfer 2008, 410–11, 416–17; for others cf. for example Højte 2005, 86 n. 191.

What has still been missing up to now is a systematic investigation of these issues – there is much to discuss and new ideas to propose in this study, that will lead to an adjusted model of an imperial portrait ‘system’.

## B. RESEARCH QUESTIONS, AIMS, AND SCOPE

To approach the portrait practices and processes of creation, dissemination and ‘replication’ of imperial portrait types, questions have to be set out. One wants to know how the ‘system’ worked and what it was for. Possible answers to these fundamental questions can only be found by a close investigation of the surviving evidence – by an investigation of the two most abundantly preserved and well-studied portrait media: imperial coins and marble portraits. This naturally entails a strong focus on the workings of the imperial portrait in the mint of Rome and in the metropolitan marble workshops, as the majority of the surviving sculptured imperial portraits originate from Rome and Italy. Basic questions involved are: what happened to portrait types after they came into existence? How were imperial portrait types received and adjusted in the marble workshops and in the mint of Rome? To what extent do sculptured portraits and portraits on imperial coinage correspond and do they share the same prototype or ‘original model’?

This will lead to the more comprehensive questions of this study: one would like to know why and for whom it mattered that imperial portrait types were created and disseminated. Furthermore, why were multiple types conceived for many emperors and their immediate family members and what were they for? Finally, we will return to the initial question of what the ‘system’ was for.

### **Aims and scope**

This study is primarily intended to examine the main aspects of the creation of centrally defined imperial portrait types and the first ‘step’ of their dissemination in metropolitan Rome. The aims are

to gain new insights into portrait practices of the second century A.D. and to clarify prevailing misconceptions. This is of further leading importance, because without a correct understanding of the centrally defined models and their workings in metropolitan Rome we can hardly assess the significance of local variants and their functioning in the provinces.<sup>31</sup>

The wider deployment of imperial portrait types in the provinces will be briefly outlined in Chapter 8 as part of an adjusted historical model of a Roman imperial portrait 'system' that better accounts for the observations and findings presented here than the prevailing model.

### C. METHODOLOGY AND MATERIAL

The research questions will be investigated on a broad material basis, by two sets of systematic comparative case studies of the portraits of Marcus Aurelius and Faustina the Younger on imperial coins and medallions as well as in the round.<sup>32</sup>

In a first step, the different media (coins and marble sculpture) will be examined and discussed separately in Chapters 2 and 3 (Faustina the Younger) and Chapters 5 and 6 (Marcus Aurelius) to get a clear and objective picture of each medium. Beyond that, further questions and related aspects are addressed sequentially in these chapters: Chapter 2 has a strong focus on the relation of birth-related reverse types on coins to the portrait types of Faustina, while Chapter 3 looks into aristocratic female 'private' portraiture and its relation to the imperial image. Chapter 5 investigates in detail the workings of the imperial portrait in the mint of Rome and offers a close-up view of the mint's organisation and the system of production. Chapter 6, finally, addresses the workings of the imperial portrait in the metropolitan marble workshops and outlines marble technology and the difficulties involved in identifying individual workshops.

---

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Smith 1996, 34 in a different context.

<sup>32</sup> In sculpture, only imperial portraits made of marble survive in sufficient numbers to study them on a broad material basis. This study departs from and focuses on portraits from metropolitan Rome.

In a second step, the correspondence and interaction of the portraits on coins and in sculpture will be discussed and more comprehensive questions concerning the creation and dissemination of imperial types will be further pursued (Chapters 4 and 7). This is followed by a broad evaluation and an adapted model of an imperial portrait 'system' (Chapter 8) and a brief conclusion (Chapter 9).

### **Imperial coins and medallions**

Imperial coins as a primary source are virtually completely preserved in their typological variety.<sup>33</sup> No other medium offers the opportunity to investigate the diachronic development of the imperial portrait, securely attributed by the coin legend, in this density. Moreover, the identification and chronology of the emperor's and empress's portrait in other media in most cases depend on imperial coinage. Our understanding of how the imperial portrait functioned in the mint of Rome is therefore crucial for our perception of imperial portraiture in general.

The coin dies of the Antonine period, known to us from their mirror image on the coins, were in the majority deeply cut and produced a portrait in high relief in relation to their dimensions. Photographic images disguise the three-dimensional qualities of the coin portrait to a certain degree and make it difficult to correctly conceive the carefully articulated relief properties of the physiognomy as well as the hair- and beard-style of skilfully cut dies. A number of dies even bear witness to an attempt to go beyond the limitation of the strict profile view and to take characteristics of the frontal hair-scheme as far as possible into the profile (Fig. 1).<sup>34</sup> This is particularly obvious when this attempt led to an exaggerated stylisation of the frontal hair-scheme (Figs. 2–3). Therefore, there can be little doubt that coin portraits follow, in one way or another, three-dimensional models and are related to the portraits in the round. How close this relation is, remains to be assessed in this study.

---

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Strack 1931, 3 for this finding.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Trillmich 1971, 189 for the same phenomenon in the first century A.D.

Medallions have to be included in this analysis, as they stand stylistically and typologically very close to the imperial coinage and are, as the latter, the product of the mint of Rome.<sup>35</sup> In contrast to the coins, they were not intended for circulation as currency, but for presentation or distribution as an imperial gift.<sup>36</sup> They were issued in small numbers and are often characterised by their fine style and unusual reverse types.<sup>37</sup>

*Characteristics of the medium.* The conversion of a portrait in the round into a coin portrait involves several steps: the reduction of size, the focus on the profile and the transfer of sculptural techniques into engraving.<sup>38</sup> The small scale inevitably results in a loss of details and especially in a simplification of hair- and beard-styles. Furthermore, we have to take into account the skill of the different die-cutters, as the dies are engraved by hand. All of this can result in a certain variability of the portrait within every respective issue.

In addition, the individual style of the die-cutter can considerably influence the appearance of the portrait on the die. The same motif of an underlying model, for example short curly hair, can be rendered on different dies as curved strands of hair (Fig. 4) or curls (Fig. 5). However, this is not a typological change or change in the underlying portrait type but a variation around its design elements.

The portraits on *aurei*, *sestertii* and medallions especially were minted from carefully cut dies and they are, in the majority, of high quality, with a definable range of variation. The dies for other denominations, particularly the *denarius*, were often worked with less care and the portrait and its quality can vary more widely, as the mirror images on the coins confirm.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Strack 1931, 9–10; Toynbee 1944, 45–48; Clay 1976, 253; Mittag 2010, 20–21.

<sup>36</sup> Toynbee 1944, 15–16; Clay 1976, 253–56; Szaivert 1986, 84; Mittag 2010, 13–22. There exists no single definition of the term ‘medallion’, as the line between coin and medallion can never be drawn with absolute precision. – At least some medallions were apparently produced as New Year’s presents (Clay 1976, 254–64 with further references; Szaivert 1986, 84–87).

<sup>37</sup> Clay 1976, 254; Szaivert 1986, 84–45; Mittag 2010, 11, 21–22.

<sup>38</sup> See Albertson 1981, 14; Evers 1994, 20.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. BMCRE IV, p. xxxviii for these findings.

*Resources and investigated samples.* For imperial coins of Marcus Aurelius and Faustina the Younger, P. Strack's *Untersuchungen zur römischen Reichsprägung des zweiten Jahrhunderts. Teil III* (1937) and H. Mattingly's *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, vol. IV* (1940) remain the most comprehensive systematic collections and they are indispensable for any investigation of the subject.<sup>40</sup> For Roman medallions, the material collected by F. Gnecci and published in the second and third volume of his catalogue *I medaglioni romani* (1912) is still fundamental, although some readings are erroneous and the descriptions can be outdated.<sup>41</sup> The most comprehensive online digital resource and an important research tool is doubtless the professional version of *Coinarchives*, that offers high resolution images of a vast number of coins sold at auction from ca. the year 2000 onwards.<sup>42</sup>

For this study, two samples of 599 *aurei* of Marcus Aurelius and 257 *aurei* of Faustina the Younger have been employed to identify and investigate 216 obverse dies of Marcus and 99 obverse dies of Faustina.<sup>43</sup> This systematic die study was complemented by the detailed comparison of the identified dies ('core-group') with several thousand coins of Marcus and Faustina in different denominations – including many examples from numismatic core collections (in major public institutions) – and the medallions collected by Gnecci.<sup>44</sup>

The portraits on the identified obverse dies for *aurei* of Marcus Aurelius and Faustina the Younger correspond well to the range of variation of their portraits observed on coins and medallions not represented in the samples. That is to say, the dies identified are representative of the portrait

---

<sup>40</sup> Strack 1937; BMCRE IV.

<sup>41</sup> GNECCHI II–III; for critical remarks cf. also Clay 1976, 256.

<sup>42</sup> [www.coinarchives.com](http://www.coinarchives.com).

<sup>43</sup> The two samples consist of *aurei* of Marcus and Faustina that were sold at auction between ca. 2000 and 2017, images and descriptions of which are available on [www.coinarchives.com](http://www.coinarchives.com). – Because of the limited time for this study and the varied quality of images available, *aurei* from numismatic core collections (in major public institutions) were not included in the samples. However, for example, of the 120 *aurei* of Marcus Aurelius in the British Museum struck from 108 obverse dies, 85 dies (almost 80 %) are also represented in our sample.

<sup>44</sup> Such a detailed comparison would not have been possible without the use of online digital resources.

variety that once existed.<sup>45</sup> Two examples may suffice to support this: first, M. Beckmann did not observe any types or varieties of the portrait image of Faustina in his die study that cannot also be found in our samples, despite the fact that he identified about 200 obverse dies.<sup>46</sup> Second, of the 15 *aurei* of Marcus Aurelius as Caesar that K. Fittschen depicts in his study *Prinzenbildnisse antoninischer Zeit* (1999) and uses for his argument, 14 of the obverse dies are also represented in our samples.<sup>47</sup>

*Quantity of coins.* The quantity of extant coins of an issue in all denominations can roughly inform us if it was small or large, keeping in mind that the numbers of coins minted in the respective denomination can vary widely. This also hints at the frequency of the connected portrait, that is, if it was rare or common. However, this probably tells us more about the patterns of employment of a portrait type in the mint than about its importance proper.

*Design.* The level of imperial control on the design of imperial coins and its significance is not completely clear and is the subject of an ongoing debate in scholarship. To what extent the emperor or his close advisers took an interest in coinage is hard to assess, but the assumption of too rigid a control should most probably be avoided. However, it is almost certain that the design did accord with the ideals and beliefs the emperor wanted to be associated with.<sup>48</sup>

*Portrait types on coins and medallions.* A thorough analysis of portraits on imperial coins and medallions of a given subject, identified by the legend, should consist of a detailed comparison of the likeness from a (sufficiently) large number of different dies.<sup>49</sup> Consistency and change has to be described. The main aim of such a comparison is to classify the portraits, that is, to group them by common characteristics, irrespective of bust types (e.g. cuirassed or draped) and attributes (e.g.

---

<sup>45</sup> This does not exclude the possibility that new variations or types still could be found.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Beckmann 2014. His full evidence has not yet been published.

<sup>47</sup> Fittschen 1999, pl. 109.

<sup>48</sup> Burnett 1987, 24–25, 66–71 with relevant ancient sources; for an excellent concise discussion of the different positions in scholarship see Alexandridis 2004, 8–9 with further references.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. von Kaenel 1986, 263 n. 421; Woytek 2010, 57–58.

existence of a laurel wreath), in order to assess which portraits were made after the same model (portrait type).

The most readily comparable feature of Antonine imperial coin portraits is the hair- and beard-style. The size of the coins, however, does not normally allow specific features to be compared as known from sculptured versions of a type (e.g. distinct hair formations). The reduction in scale and the profile view result, as already mentioned, in a loss of detail. The key features of an underlying model are less clearly marked on coins. Therefore, the main criterion for a classification of coin portraits is an accordance of a set of key components of the hair- and beard-style and their composition, rather than counting individual locks. For the coin portraits of Marcus Aurelius, for instance, the contour of the coiffure (protruding curls or strands of hair versus a more uniform contour with curls confined closer to the head) and the extent and length of the beard are of importance. For the portraits of Faustina the Younger, for example, the position of the bun (back of head versus crown of the head) and the way the hair is divided into segments is of significance. To a lesser degree, the much more variable physiognomy can also be of a certain relevance.

A range of adjustment and variation of these common characteristics has to be allowed to still consider the coin portraits as versions of the same type, as not every change on coins reflects a new underlying model. Larger tendencies have to be revealed while minor deviations should not be given greater importance than they deserve. Ideally, the result of such a grouping or classification reflects different models (portrait types) available at the mint but variation and shift between types can make a clear distinction difficult.<sup>50</sup>

This approach works well for the undated coinage and the medallions of Faustina, as will be demonstrated, and besides some minor variations they correspond well to the types established. It is

---

<sup>50</sup> Fundamental for the methodology is still Trillmich 1971, 179–96.

likely that the distinction between different hairstyles of Faustina was regarded as significant. The dated coinage of Marcus Aurelius, however, reveals a different pattern. The diachronic development of the portrait often shows only a gradual but not strictly linear adjustment (e.g. extent of beard). A certain shift between types and their features can be observed, making it difficult to date their introduction in the mint exactly.<sup>51</sup> By comparison with the sculptured portraits, however, the types and their chronology on coins and medallions can be assessed.

### **Sculptured portraits**

The study of the portraits in the round has to start from what is preserved, which is in proportion very different from what once existed. In most parts of the Roman empire and especially in the Greek East, bronze seems to have been the preferred material for honorific statues in the early and middle imperial period.<sup>52</sup> However, only a minute fraction of the countless monuments are preserved, since the metal has been reused in later periods. Portraits made of precious metal, of course, shared the same fate. Marble, in contrast, has a much lower scrap value and comparatively many portraits did survive. In consequence, the preserved evidence of the sculptured portraits gives only a distorted picture of what once existed.<sup>53</sup> Furthermore, the surviving marble portraits are predominantly from Rome and Italy and they are frequently (part of) life-size busts while the majority of the statue bases that once carried bronzes were found in the provinces.<sup>54</sup> For example, nearly two-thirds of the extant

---

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Bergmann 1978, 40; Fittschen 1999, 20 n. 143 for these observations.

<sup>52</sup> Højte 2005, 88 states that 'marble seems to have been preferred to bronze in Italy for honorary statues', and Hallett 2007, 343 suggests that 'there is a marked preference for bronze in the East, and an apparent predominance of marble in Italy and the West'. The latter is broadly supported by the archaeological evidence for Asia Minor where 592 statue bases of emperors survive from Augustus to Commodus as against ca. 60 portraits of emperors from the same period; that is to say, there are ca. 10 statue bases for each portrait, or a ratio of ca. 10:1. Compared to an average ratio for the whole empire of ca. 2:1, this is good negative evidence for the predominance of bronze in the East. Data for statue bases: Højte 2005, esp. 82, 619. Emperors' portraits from Asia Minor: Inan – Rosenbaum 1966; Inan – Alföldi-Rosenbaum 1979).

<sup>53</sup> Lahusen – Formigli 2001, 9–10; Højte 2005, 14. For the definition of the term 'statue base' see Højte 2005, 19. – The predominance of bronze statues is suggested by the dowel cuttings for setting them up, preserved on top of many of the completely surviving statue bases.

<sup>54</sup> Højte 2005, 81; Hallett 2007, 343.

portraits of Marcus Aurelius are from Rome and Italy while almost three-quarters of the bases were found elsewhere in the empire.<sup>55</sup>

The chances of survival are clearly not evenly spread in geographical terms, and the extant portraits by no means constitute a representative sample of what once existed. As Højte correctly pointed out, ‘the dominance of extant portraits from Italy does not reflect the situation in antiquity, but rather the uniquely high survival rate for sculpture in this area’. One has to be cautious not to overestimate the importance of the Italian and metropolitan material in relation to the provincial production.<sup>56</sup>

### **Epigraphic evidence of statue bases**

The statistical data of imperial statue bases, systematically compiled by J. M. Højte in his study on *Roman imperial statue bases from Augustus to Commodus* (2005), is deployed as a corrective for the chronology of the portrait types of Marcus Aurelius and the chronological distribution of the extant portraits. Despite being different excerpts of the entire body of imperial portraits once in existence, it is probable that the chronological distribution of the (more closely datable) statue bases applies to the extant portraits, as Højte affirms.<sup>57</sup> For the statue bases of Faustina Minor, unfortunately, no such study exists but some inferences are possible on the basis of the statistical data of statue bases for Marcus Aurelius, as will be shown.

---

<sup>55</sup> For the numbers see below, Chapters 6 and 7.

<sup>56</sup> Højte 2005, 87–88, 102.

<sup>57</sup> Højte 2005. For ‘the applicability of the evidence of the statue bases to the extant portraits’ see Højte 2005, 81–84; for critical remarks on Højte’s methodology see Hallett 2007, 343; see also Eck 2007, 524–28, who in principle acknowledges the methodology but criticises the considerable number of errors and inaccuracies, especially in the catalogue.

## CHAPTER 2

### Faustina: Imperial Coins and Medallions

#### A. RESEARCH HISTORY AND STATE OF RESEARCH

A first short treatment of the chronological 'development' of the coin portraits of Faustina the Younger by R. Delbrueck was published in 1913.<sup>58</sup> Groundbreaking for the typology and chronology of Faustina's coin portraits, however, was P. Strack's *Untersuchungen zur römischen Reichsprägung des zweiten Jahrhunderts. Teil III* (1937) on imperial coinage under Antoninus Pius.<sup>59</sup> In this thorough and systematic study he classified the portraits by hairstyle into what he considered seven basic types (T. a–g) and their variations, brought them into a chronological sequence and attempted to date the according coin issues.<sup>60</sup> Strack's typology of the coin portraits was taken up and adjusted by M. Wegner in his extensive study on Antonine portraiture *Die Herrscherbildnisse in antoninischer Zeit* (1939).<sup>61</sup> The number of seven types remained, but Wegner's re-evaluation of the hairstyles resulted in a reclassification of some of Strack's types and variations and in a renaming of all the types after the respective hairstyle.<sup>62</sup> The typology of Strack and Wegner was further adjusted by K. Fittschen in his monograph *Die Bildnistypen der Faustina minor und die Fecunditas Augustae* (1982). He used the sole criterion of hairstyle to isolate nine portrait types (*1. – 9. Bildnistypus*) and their variations and attempted to refine the chronology.<sup>63</sup>

It will be demonstrated in this chapter that Fittschen's sequence of types has to be adjusted and a previously unidentified portrait type ('New Type'), defined below, has to be added. The adjusted

---

<sup>58</sup> Delbrueck 1913, 299–302.

<sup>59</sup> Strack 1937, 14–21. All subsequent studies on Faustina's coinage up to today build on Strack's findings.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1982, 34 with nn. 1–2 for further remarks on Strack's classification.

<sup>61</sup> Wegner 1939, 48–50.

<sup>62</sup> For a comprehensive explication of this reclassification see Fittschen 1982, 34–37.

<sup>63</sup> Fittschen 1982, 34–43.

typology and the modified type names (Types I–X) are kept throughout this study. Where necessary for clarity, the corresponding types after Fittschen (F-Types 1–9) are quoted. The complex development of the modern typology of Faustina’s portrait types up to and including the adjustments presented here is illustrated in the table below and Fig. 6.<sup>64</sup>

Concordance of types			
Adjusted typology	Strack	Wegner	Fittschen (F-Types)
Type I	T. a/T. a1	<i>S-Löckchen-Melonenfrisur</i>	1. <i>Bildnistypus</i> (F-Type 1)
Type II	T. b	<i>Stirnschuppenfrisur</i>	2. <i>Bildnistypus</i> (F-Type 2)
Type III	T. b1/T. c	<i>Stirnwellenfrisur</i> (two variations)	3. <i>Bildnistypus</i> (F-Type 3)
Type IV	T. c1	<i>Seltene Variante</i>	4. <i>Bildnistypus</i> (F-Type 4)
Type V	T. d/T. d1	<i>Langsträhnenfrisur mit kleinem Knoten</i>	5. <i>Bildnistypus</i> (F-Type 5)
Type VI/New Type	–	–	–
Type VII	–	<i>Unterteilte Wellenfrisur</i>	7. <i>Bildnistypus</i> (F-Type 7)
Type VIII	T. e/T. f	<i>Abgesetzte Wellenfrisur</i>	8. <i>Bildnistypus</i> (F-Type 8)
Type IX	–	–	6. <i>Bildnistypus</i> (F-Type 6)
Type X	T. g	<i>Drehsträhnenfrisur</i>	9. <i>Bildnistypus</i> (F-Type 9)

The number of types is conspicuous; no other ancient figure is known to have had as many portrait types as Faustina the Younger – explanation is needed as to when and why they were created.<sup>65</sup>

Someone clearly thought Faustina’s changing hairstyles important and we should attempt to assess the reason.<sup>66</sup> Fittschen stated that ‘die Bildnisse der Kaiserin keineswegs eine modische Spielerei darstellen, sondern ihre Entstehung ganz bestimmten Anlässen verdanken und dabei ganz konkrete

<sup>64</sup> Type I: BMCRE IV, pl. 22. 18; Strack 1937, pl. 7. 490. – Type II: BMCRE IV, pl. 23. 3; Strack 1937, pl. 7. 493. – Type III: BMCRE IV, pl. 22. 13; Strack 1937, pl. 7. 488. – Type IV: Strack 1937, pl. 7. 503. – Type V: BMCRE IV, pl. 23. 13; Strack 1937, pl. 7. 520 a–i. – Type VI: BMCRE IV, pl. 55. 3; Strack 1937, pl. 7. 517. – Type VII: BMCRE IV, pl. 56. 14; Strack 1937, pl. 20. ‘\*’. – Type VIII: BMCRE IV, pl. 73. 4; Strack 1937, pl. 19 e. – Type IX: missing in BMCRE and Strack. – Type X: BMCRE IV, pl. 55. 17; Strack 1937, pl. 19 g.

<sup>65</sup> Fittschen 1982, 17, 66.

<sup>66</sup> Smith 1983, 228.

Funktionen erfüllen sollen'.<sup>67</sup> His theory is that most types, if not all, were created successively, coinciding with the birth of Faustina's children, to commemorate these occasions as an assurance of dynastic continuity.<sup>68</sup>

To prove this hypothesis, more is needed than connecting the portrait types on coins that are linked to child-related reverses with literary and epigraphic sources concerning the birth of Faustina's children, as has been done.<sup>69</sup> It also has to be assessed if the introduction of the portrait types and the respective reverse types in the mint coincide. Only then, and under the disputed precondition that these reverse types carry a precise contemporary meaning, could it be argued that Fittschen's hypothesis is correct (keeping in mind that the appearance of a portrait type in the mint is only a *terminus ante quem* for its creation).<sup>70</sup>

To disprove this assumption, it is not enough to exemplify its inconsistencies, as the critics of Fittschen's hypothesis have done so far.<sup>71</sup> All circumstances must be carefully reconsidered. The complete typology of the portraits on coins and their connection with child-related reverse types has to be reassessed and the portrait types, their functioning in the mint and the real births of Faustina's children have to be correlated to allow a methodologically sound decision as to whether or not Fittschen's bold theory is correct.

---

<sup>67</sup> Fittschen 1982, 18.

<sup>68</sup> Fittschen 1982, 17–18, 67–68.

<sup>69</sup> Fittschen 1982, 22–43, 66–68; cf. also Alexandridis 2004, 28 n. 258 for references to further studies that adopted this approach.

<sup>70</sup> See Fittschen 1982, 20 for his methodology and the precondition of a precise meaning of coin reverses.

<sup>71</sup> For the manifold criticism see: Szaivert 1986, 229; Ameling 1988, 67–70; Ameling 1992; Bartman 2001, 8; Alexandridis 2004, 28–29; Börner 2012, 141–43; Beckmann 2014.

## B. TYPOLOGICAL SEQUENCE AND CHRONOLOGY

### Typological sequence

With some adaptations, Strack's typological sequence of the uniformly undated coins of Faustina the Younger is still valid today:<sup>72</sup> the presence or absence of the filiation, that is to say the mention of the father's name, PII AVG(VSTI) FIL(IA) in different variations, allowed him to divide the coins into two distinct groups (Group 1 and 2), the first of them (with filiation), by analogy with Marcus Aurelius Caesar, certainly minted before the death of Antoninus Pius in A.D. 161.<sup>73</sup> Within Group 1, the correlation of the changing obverse legends with the portrait types employed allowed Strack to bring them into a chronological sequence.<sup>74</sup>

Coins – Group 1		
No.	Obverse legend	Connected portrait types (adjusted typology)
1.	FAVSTINAE AVG PII AVG FIL (rarely F)	Type I, Type II, Type III
2.	FAVSTINA AVG ANTONINI AVG PII FIL	Type III, Type IV
3.	FAVSTINA AVG PII AVG FIL (rarer F)	Type III, Type IV, Type V
	FAVSTINA AVGVSTA AVG PII FIL (or F)	Type V
4.	FAVSTINA AVGVSTA – Rv: AVGVSTI PII FIL	Type V, Type VI

Type V and Type VI ('New Type') are with certainty the latest within the first group, as they are the only types that also appear with the simple obverse legend FAVSTINA AVGVSTA and without filiation on the reverse, clearly connecting them with the second group. The positioning of Type I at the beginning of the sequence is secured by the name of the empress in the dedicatory dative case and the occurrence of this type on Alexandrian coinage of A.D. 147/48. Finally, the chronological position

<sup>72</sup> Strack 1937, 14–21; Wegner 1939, 49–50; BMCRE IV, pp. xlili–xliv; Fittschen 1982, 34–43.

<sup>73</sup> This was already observed by Delbrueck 1913, 299; Strack 1937, 14. All coins of Marcus Aurelius as Caesar carry the filiation.

<sup>74</sup> Strack 1937, 14–16. For an easier understanding, Strack's types (T. a–T. d) and their variants have been 'translated' into the adjusted typology, Type VI ('New Type') has been added; cf. also Fittschen 1982, 34–36 for the types.

of Types II–IV and their relation to Type I as well as Type V and VI ('New Type') is underpinned by Strack's analysis of the combination of the types with the respective legends as well as with specific reverse types.<sup>75</sup>

The second group of coins, Group 2, with the uniformly simple obverse legend FAVSTINA AVGVSTA and without filiation on the reverse can in a first step be subdivided only by changing portrait types:<sup>76</sup>

Coins – Group 2		
No.	Obverse legend	Connected portrait types (adjusted typology)
1.	FAVSTINA AVGVSTA (without filiation)	Type V, Type VI, Type VII, Type VIII, Type IX, Type X
2.	DIVA FAVSTINA (and all variations)	Type X

The position of the first two types, Type V and Type VI ('New Type'), and the last type, Type X, within this group is certain: Type V and Type VI ('New Type') without filiation are connected with the first group by the shared portrait types and have to take the first two positions (their exact position between each other will be assessed below). Type X, however, has to be placed beyond doubt at the end of the sequence because it is the only type that is also employed for the deified Diva Faustina after her death. The chronological sequence of the remaining portrait types between the first two positions (Types V–VI) and Type X is difficult to assess. The coins themselves, if we exclude the historical interpretation of reverse types, hardly offer any hint at their chronological position. Strack's attempt to primarily determine the sequence of these types stylistically and by the 'development' of the coiffure, in absence of other options, was unsuccessful, especially because he did not yet recognise or understand the specific characteristics of the hairstyles defining Types VI–IX.<sup>77</sup> Following Strack's typology, Wegner was the first to clearly define and position Types VII and VIII, but he failed

<sup>75</sup> Strack 1937, 15–16.

<sup>76</sup> Strack 1937, 19–20. His types (T. d–T. g) have been 'translated' into the adjusted typology, the types missing in Strack's typology – Type VI ('New Type') and Types VII and IX – were added; cf. also Fittschen 1982, 36–37 for the types. – For clarity of explication, posthumous coins have been included in Group 2.

<sup>77</sup> Strack 1937, 19–20. He did not recognise Types VI and IX, and described Type VII but did not understand it as an independent type. His Types T. e and T. f are only variations of Type VIII.

to expose the reasons for his sequence of Type VIII before Type VII.<sup>78</sup> The typology and sequence of types (relative chronology) prevalent today follows Fittschen (F-Types 1–9 in the sequence without the ‘New Type’ proposed here), who first defined Type IX (F-Type 6) and repositioned Types VII–VIII in their correct order. Where other methods failed (for Types VII–IX), he argued exclusively historically (with the dates of birth of Faustina’s children), leaving wide room for interpretation.<sup>79</sup>

### *Medallions*

The obverse legends of medallions before the discontinuation of the filiation and the simple legend FAVSTINA AVGVSTA (Group 1) follow slightly different rules than the coins, never clearly set out before, and they therefore have to be synchronised with the coin chronology above:<sup>80</sup>

Medallions – Group 1		
No.	Obverse legend	Connected portrait types (adjusted typology)
1.	FAVSTINAE AVG PII AVG FIL	Type I <sup>81</sup> , (Type II and III unknown)
2.	FAVSTINA AVG ANTONINI AVG PII FIL	Type III <sup>82</sup> , (Type IV unknown)
3.	FAVSTINA AVG PII AVG FIL FAVSTINA AVGVSTA AVGVSTI PII F	Type III <sup>83</sup> , (Type IV unknown), Type V <sup>84</sup> Type V <sup>85</sup>
4.	FAVSTINA AVGVSTA AVGVSTI PII F FAVSTINA AVG PII AVGVSTI F	Type V Type VI <sup>86</sup>

<sup>78</sup> Wegner 1939, 50. He still did not recognise Type VI (‘New Type’) and Type IX. – M. Wegner’s sequence of Type VII succeeding Type VIII was influential, as he regarded Type VIII as the ‘accession-type’ (cf. Fittschen 1982, 60 with n. 44).

<sup>79</sup> Fittschen 1982, 38–43.

<sup>80</sup> This opportunity is also used to rearrange the medallions in GNECCHI II and III according to the respective types and the connected obverse legend(s) following the adjusted typology. – Cf. BMCRE IV, p. xcix for a brief and incomplete ‘introduction to the subject’, as Mattingly called it.

<sup>81</sup> GNECCHI II, pl. 67. 10.

<sup>82</sup> GNECCHI II, pl. 71. 1.

<sup>83</sup> GNECCHI II, pl. 67. 5.

<sup>84</sup> GNECCHI II, pls. 67. 9; 68. 7–8; III pl. 151. 7; ‘variant’ of Type V: GNECCHI II, pls. 68. 1, 5; 69. 10; III pl. 151. 5, 6.

<sup>85</sup> GNECCHI II, pl. 69. 3–5 (same as first variant of legend-type four).

<sup>86</sup> GNECCHI II, pls. 67. 7; 69. 6, 9 (all from the same obverse die). On low grade medallions, Type VI (‘New Type’) is not easy to distinguish from portraits of Type V and VII–IX. In the present case the attribution is secured by the very low, hanging bun that excludes the portrait from representing Type V, and the filiation that does not appear on later types.

Up to Strack's legend-type three, the obverse legends of coins and medallions are identical. From that point onwards, slight differences can be observed: portraits of Type V (before the simple legend FAVSTINA AVGVSTA) are connected with the legends FAVSTINA AVG PII AVG FIL, Strack's first variant of his third legend type, and FAVSTINA AVGVSTA AVGUSTI PII F, the equivalent of Strack's second variant of his third legend type and his fourth legend type, as the filiation on all medallions of Faustina the Younger always stays on the obverse. The previously unidentified Type VI, however, is connected with the legends FAVSTINA AVG PII AVGVSTI F, and later simply FAVSTINA AVGVSTA, without filiation. The former (earlier) legend has to be understood as a variation of Strack's legend-type four on medallions, as the relative chronological position of the portraits of Type VI ('New Type') is sufficiently clear from the fact that during its period of use (and that of Type V) the filiation is discontinued.<sup>87</sup>

Group 2 of the medallions, without filiation, does not need to be discussed further, as it runs parallel to the coins, with the same difficulties of positioning Types VII–IX explicated above:

Medallions – Group 2		
No.	Obverse legend	Connected portrait types (adjusted typology)
1.	FAVSTINA AVGVSTA	Type V <sup>88</sup> , Type VI <sup>89</sup> , Type VII <sup>90</sup> , Type VIII <sup>91</sup> , Type IX <sup>92</sup> , Type X <sup>93</sup>
2.	DIVA FAVSTINA	Type X <sup>94</sup>

<sup>87</sup> Cf. also below for the chronology of Type V and Type VI ('New Type').

<sup>88</sup> GNECCHI II, pls. 67. 2; 68. 4; III pls. 150. 9; 151. 2–4.

<sup>89</sup> GNECCHI II, pls. 69. 1 (?); 70. 1; III pl. 151. 1. The medallion GNECCHI II, pl. 70. 1 was attributed to Type IX (F-Type 6) by Fittschen 1982, 36 n. 22 as he thought the coiffure was tooled (modern reworking); however, it clearly represents Type VI ('New Type').

<sup>90</sup> GNECCHI II, pls. 68. 2; 69. 8.

<sup>91</sup> GNECCHI II, pl. 69. 7.

<sup>92</sup> GNECCHI II, pls. 68. 9–10; 69. 2.

<sup>93</sup> GNECCHI II, pls. 67. 4, 6, 8; 68. 3, 6.

<sup>94</sup> GNECCHI II, pl. 67. 1, 3.

### **Absolute chronology**

The framework for an absolute chronology of the portrait types of Faustina the Younger is provided by her main biographical data: Annia Galeria Faustina, the younger daughter of Antoninus Pius, was born in A.D. 130 or 131. She was married to Marcus Aurelius in A.D. 145 and the title Augusta was bestowed on her in A.D. 147.<sup>95</sup> Faustina died at the age of only ca. 45 in A.D. 175/76.<sup>96</sup> The accepted chronology of the portrait types was established by K. Fittschen and is based on the presumed connection of their creation with the date of birth of Faustina's children.<sup>97</sup> This chronology will not be followed here and dates independent of Fittschen's hypothesis, established on a more objective basis, will be identified under the respective types below. These adjusted absolute dates for the introduction of the types in the mint are only a *terminus ante quem* for their creation, that is, they could have already appeared in other media some time before.<sup>98</sup>

### **Alexandrian coinage**

On the dated provincial Roman coinage of Alexandria only three successive portrait types occur: Type I, Type V and Type VIII.<sup>99</sup> Of interest for this study is the earliest appearance of these portrait types on Alexandrian coins, as it provides a *terminus ante quem* for their creation in Rome. The coins are dated after the regnal years of the emperor, following the Egyptian calendar with the Alexandrian year starting on the 29th of August (30th of August in a leap year). The period from the accession to power of a new emperor to the first turn of the year was counted as the first regnal year.<sup>100</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> Faustina's date of birth is not known exactly but rests on the assumption that she was married (as it was usual) at the age of ca. 14 or 15; date of marriage: SHA, *vita Marci* 6. 6; *Fasti Ostienses* Pa 3–4, Vidman 1982, 50, 125. Fittschen 1982, 22–23, 33; Kienast 1996, 141–42; Fittschen 1999, 2 with further references; bestowal of the title Augusta: see below under Type I.

<sup>96</sup> As her date of birth, Faustina's date of death is not known precisely. She died in Halala, Cappadocia, on the way back from Egypt after the suppression of the rebellion of Avidius Cassius (SHA, *vita Marci* 26. 4; Dio Cass. 72. 29. 1), probably around the turn of the year A.D. 175/76.

<sup>97</sup> Fittschen 1982, 22–43.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. Smith 1983, 229 for the possibility of an earlier appearance of the types.

<sup>99</sup> Geißen 1978, 412–31, nos. 1943–94; Geißen 1982, 54–59, nos. 2108–19; Kampmann – Ganschow 2008, 217–24 nos. 38.1–38.136.

<sup>100</sup> Emmett 2001, pp. xii–xiv; Kampmann – Ganschow 2008, 15.

Type I (Fig. 7), as mentioned above, first occurred on Alexandrian coinage in A.D. 147/48, in the eleventh regnal year of Antoninus Pius and was in use until A.D. 160/61. Interestingly, it was succeeded by Type V (Figs. 8–9) in A.D. 161, the first regnal year of Marcus Aurelius. Most likely, it was thought necessary to change the youthful portrait type on the coinage after the news of Marcus' accession reached Egypt and Type V was the most up-to-date type available. It remains however unclear why Type VII, so widespread and popular in sculpture, as we will see, was never introduced in the mint of Alexandria. Instead, Type VIII (Fig. 10) followed Type V in A.D. 163/64, the fourth regnal year of Marcus Aurelius, probably with a short overlap in usage, as coins of both types dated to this year suggest.

### C. PORTRAIT TYPES

On coins, the types are 'hairstyle types' ('Frisurentypen') rather than portrait types ('Bildnistypen'), as Fittschen stated.<sup>101</sup> In contrast to the many distinct hairstyles, the variety of physiognomy is marked by only two or three age levels shared by the ten types, revealing a broad but not strictly linear advance in age from 'marriageable girl' to 'young mother' to 'young matron', as R. Smith termed these stages.<sup>102</sup> The very youthful physiognomy of the 'marriageable girl' only appears on coin portraits of Type I. Type II already shows the 'young mother' with a more mature and less girlish physiognomy. The following Types III–X vary, depending on the die, from 'young mother' to 'young matron', with a gradual tendency towards a more mature portrait.<sup>103</sup>

The hanging upper lids of the eyes can occasionally appear on *aurei* as early as Type III, probably 'intruding' from Marcus Aurelius' coin portrait, but they become more frequent from Type V onwards. Furthermore, from Type V to Type VIII, two 'Venus rings' at the front of the neck are often

---

<sup>101</sup> Fittschen 1982, 37.

<sup>102</sup> Smith 1983, 228; cf. also Strack 1937, 20–21 for remarks on the gradual advance of age in the physiognomy.

<sup>103</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1982, 37 for the physiognomy.

indicated as soft ridges, representing the creases seen on some of the sculptured versions of Faustina's portraits. Earlier types, beginning with Type I, occasionally feature one of these 'rings' that underline the beauty of the empress.

In the following, the different denominations and the medallions are not all discussed separately, but common features and general tendencies are pointed out, best observed on *aurei* and bronzes from dies of good quality as well as on medallions. *Denarii* especially frequently bear witness to hasty and/or less skilful carving of the dies, and they vary more widely.<sup>104</sup>

### **First portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type I)**

Literature and designation of type: Strack 1937, 15 n. 26: 'T. a/T. a1'; Wegner 1939, 49: '*S-Löckchen-Melonenfrisur*'; Fittschen 1982, 34–35, 38–39: '*1. Bildnistypus*' (F-Type 1).

The coins with a portrait of Type I (Fig. 11) feature the conversion of a tripartite hairstyle into coin-format: forehead and temple are framed by an arrangement that can be interpreted as three to four overlapping rows of flattened hair loops, the lowest of which can cover the upper part of the ear. In front of the ear, a small lock of hair is frequently depicted. A thin braid, most frequently rendered as a single or double row of beads, separates the front section of the coiffure from the intermediate part with its division of hair into three or four ridged segments running towards the back. The back of the head features a small coiled bun right above the nape that takes up the hair from the side, the crown of the head and the neck. It is formed of several rows of plaits, as the depicted rows of beads (Fig. 11) or (less frequently) bands of criss-cross pattern (Fig. 12) indicate. The thin, separating braid mentioned before, takes up the hair of the front section, as some of the coins clearly illustrate. It runs frequently into the bun (Fig. 11); however, it can also be depicted like a 'decorative hair-band', without any visible connection to the bun (Fig. 12).<sup>105</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup> Strack 1937, 20; BMCRE IV, p. xxxviii.

<sup>105</sup> Strack 1937, 15 n. 26 (T. a; the stephane of T. a1 is an attribute and does not constitute a variant); Wegner 1939, 49; Fittschen 1982, 34–35.

*Chronology.* The first position of Type I in the typological sequence is certain, as has been demonstrated above.<sup>106</sup> All coins of Faustina with a portrait of Type I carry the obverse legend FAVSTINAE AVG PII AVG FIL (or F) with the abbreviated title Aug(usta). The earliest possible absolute chronological date for their issuing is the 1st of December A.D. 147, when the title was conferred on the princess (and the tribunician power on Marcus Aurelius) the day after the birth of her first child, a daughter, as the *Fasti Ostienses* inform us.<sup>107</sup> The date of the introduction of the type in the mint, however, is only a *terminus ante quem* for its creation.

*Variation.* It most probably has no advantage for our understanding of the processes in the mint to subdivide the type into Variants a–d ('Variante a–d') according to the number of hair loops and the presence or absence of a small lock in front of the ear, as has been attempted by Fittschen before.<sup>108</sup> These variations around the design element of overlapping rows of flattened hair loops can hardly be grouped consistently as the differentiation between the individual hair loops and the small lock is often indistinct. They do not reveal a clear system or pattern behind them and we observe no real change of the motif but a variation around it.

It is likely to be more meaningful to establish two stylistic groups of portraits that each cluster around a set of common features, overlapping where they meet in their relative chronology and reflecting the workings in the mint: so far, it has gone unrecognised that during the period of use of Faustina's Type I on coins, predominantly unmarked pupils were superseded by predominantly marked (dotted) pupils, commonplace on all succeeding types. By analogy with the dated coin portraits of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius, where this change had already taken place in

---

<sup>106</sup> Cf. also Fittschen 1982, 38 under F-Type 1 (Type I) for further arguments.

<sup>107</sup> For the conferral of the title and the birth of Faustina's first child see: *Fasti Ostienses* Pb 13–15, Vidman 1982, 51, 128: *pr. k. Dec. Aurelio Caesar(i) [ex A]nnia Faustina filia nata est. K. Decem. Aurelius Caesar [trib(uniciam)] pot(estatem) iniit et Faustina Aug(usta) cognominata est.* – For the name of the daughter, most probably Domitia Faustina, see Fittschen 1999, 2 with n. 14 for further references.

<sup>108</sup> For the subdivision of the type on coins see Fittschen 1982, 34–35.

A.D. 139/40, the emergence of this feature must be considered chronologically significant.<sup>109</sup> Especially on *aurei*, it becomes apparent that this change coincides with the shift from one stylistic group of portraits to another that shall be named 'Design Group 1' (Fig. 11) and 'Design Group 2' (Fig. 12). These two groups refer to the same model but vary it stylistically, that is, they do not change the motifs or design elements of the portrait type but the way they are rendered (style). 'Design Group 1' of coin portraits on *aurei* features, in the majority, unmarked pupils, while 'Design Group 2' shows predominantly marked pupils.

The style of 'Design Group 1' (Figs. 11, 13–15) can be described as 'naturalistic', with a clear interest in the structural connection of the different parts of the coiffure. The portraits feature an 'organic' understanding of the hairstyle, interestingly especially explicit on some otherwise rather schematic *denarii* (Fig. 15). On some dies of this group, even an attempt to go beyond the limitation of a strict profile view can be observed, as the centre parting and part of the flanking hair loop are transferred into the side view (Fig. 13).<sup>110</sup> This detail suggests that the portraits follow, in one way or another, three-dimensional models. The feature is missing on the later 'Design Group 2', as it was most probably abandoned in favour of a more refined rendering of the hair loops.

'Design Group 2' (Figs. 12, 16–17) features a more ornamental understanding of the hair loops, rendered with parallel inverse S-shaped lines. In addition, the thin braid now often looks like a decorative hairband, as the connection with the bun is frequently no longer indicated. However, together with the predominantly marked pupils, these coin portraits display a visually very convincing rendering of the characteristics of the type and have more 'life' conferred to them than 'Design Group 1'.

---

<sup>109</sup> Cf. Strack 1937, 9; BMCRE IV, p. xxxviii for the occurrence of dotted pupils.

<sup>110</sup> Cf. Trillmich 1971, 189 for the same phenomenon in the first century A.D.; Trunk 1999, 223 n. 32; Beckmann 2014, 41–42.

Portraits of ‘Design Group 1’ are most clearly observable on *aurei* and *denarii* with the reverse type LAETITIAE PVBLICAE with Laetitia (Figs. 11, 13–14); however, despite an often hasty and/or less skilful carving, the *denarii* appear to be more progressive in rapidly adopting the marked pupil (Fig. 15).<sup>111</sup> The more refined portraits of ‘Design Group 2’ are best seen on *aurei* and *denarii* with the reverse type VENUS showing the goddess with rudder (Figs. 12, 16–17), that appears late in the sequence of reverse types and is also die-linked to portraits of Type II, as confirmed by M. Beckmann.<sup>112</sup> Between the two stylistic groups there is some shift and overlap, especially if we consider the change in all denominations. However, the transition from one group to the other is clearly observable.

*Work-models.* These two groups most probably reflect distinct and influential conversions of the model into coin-format (‘die designs’) that were ‘copied’ by various die-cutters. The resemblance of the portraits on the dies in the two groups with each other is high enough, while still clearly being cut by different hands, to consider that these ‘die designs’ were set in ‘work-models’, either two-dimensional (graphic) or in relief, for the die-cutters to achieve this level of consistency. These ‘work-models’ reflect a level below the common model of the type available to or at the mint. They are probably the models directly in front of the eyes of the individual carvers when they cut the dies.

*Birth of children.* The connection of Type I, or more precisely, predominantly ‘Design Group 1’ on coins with the reverse types IVNONI LVCINAE, VENERI GENETRICI (Fig. 18) (frequently depicting the goddess with a baby on her arm) and LAETITIAE PVBLICAE clearly hints at the birth of a child in the imperial house.<sup>113</sup> These first coin issues for Faustina were most probably meant to commemorate the birth of her first child; however, they do not inform us when and why the connected portrait type was created.

---

<sup>111</sup> *Denarii* could probably quicker adapt to (stylistic) changes, as large numbers of dies were needed. – *Laetitia Publicae*: BMCRE IV, 160, no. 1047, pl. 22. 15; Strack 1937, pl. 7. 491.

<sup>112</sup> Beckmann 2014, 42, confirming my own observations.

<sup>113</sup> Strack 1937, 112–13; Fittschen, 1982, 38; cf. also Alexandridis 2004, 24 for the reverse types. – *Iunoni Lucinae*: BMCRE IV, 159, no. 1045, pl. 22. 14; Strack 1937, pl. 7. 490. – *Veneri Genetrici*: BMCRE IV, 161, no. 1059, pl. 22. 18; Strack 1937, pl. 7. 497–98.

*Size of issue.* The quantity of coins preserved with a portrait of Type I in all denominations suggests that they constituted a substantial group with a large output. In our sample of *aurei*, 12 different obverse dies with Type I have been identified. The type was also popular in sculpture, as will be shown in the next chapter.

### **Second portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type II)**

Literature and designation of type: Strack 1937, 15 n. 26: 'T. b'; Wegner 1939, 49: '*Stirnschuppenfrisur*'; Fittschen 1982, 35, 39: '*2. Bildnistypus*' (F-Type 2).

The second portrait type on coins (Fig. 19) again shows a tripartite hairstyle converted into coin-format: forehead and temple are framed by three to four tight rows of hair, indicated on the dies by sickle-shaped incisions, leaving the ear uncovered. As under Type I, a thin braid separates the front section of the coiffure from the intermediate part. The hair behind the braid is most frequently indicated as combed undivided to the back of the head; however, on bronzes it can occasionally also consist of ridged segments reminiscent of Type I (Fig. 20). In comparison to the previous type, the coiled bun formed of several rows of braids is larger and sits higher above the nape, taking up the hair from the back of the head. The thin, separating braid resembles a 'decorative hair-band' and most frequently shows no visible connection to the bun; however, on some *denarii* it does run into the bun (Fig. 21), as we might expect it also did in the underlying coiffure.<sup>114</sup>

*Chronology.* The relative chronological position of Type II has been ascertained by Strack, as mentioned above. In relation to Type I, it is also supported by the marked pupils that now occur on the vast majority of coins. The obverse legend stays unchanged as FAVSTINAE AVG PII AVG FIL. In terms of absolute chronology, an *as* of Antoninus Pius with a portrait of Faustina Type II on the reverse, dated from the 10th of December A.D. 148 to the 9th of December A.D. 149 (TRP XII) provides a *terminus ante quem* for the introduction of the type in the mint (9th December

---

<sup>114</sup> Strack 1937, 15 n. 26 (T. b); Wegner 1939, 49; Fittschen 1982, 35.

A.D. 149).<sup>115</sup> Given the quite substantial issue of coins with a portrait of Type I, we are safe to assume that Type II was introduced in the mint A.D. 148/49.

*Variation.* It has recently been argued by Beckmann that this type is probably a variation of Type I, a ‘simplification through abstraction’.<sup>116</sup> However, Type II is in itself very consistent, showing hardly any variation besides the exceptional ridged segments of hair on bronzes. As a type, it is also distinctively different from the other types, and especially the tight rows of hair, the more mature physiognomy of the ‘young mother’ mentioned above, and the higher bun clearly distinguish it from Type I. In addition, Beckmann’s argument that the hairstyle ‘has no solid connection to reality in its details’ has to be rejected. It is too close a reading of the numismatic evidence, as the conversion of a portrait into coin-format naturally involves, to a variable degree, a simplification of details. In consequence, Type II has to be accepted as an independent type.

Fittschen divided the type into two Variants (a and b) depending on the number of tight rows of hair (four or three) (Figs. 19, 21). These variants reflect, as under Type I, not a real change in the underlying motif of curls but a variation around this design element. As Variant b with three rows of curls apparently only occurs on *denarii* (Fig. 21), Fittschen assumed that this reflects probably a simplification of the motif by the die-cutters.<sup>117</sup> He is certainly correct, as the coins of Marcus Aurelius, discussed in Chapter 5, confirm: there, a reduction of the complexity of the portraits can frequently be observed, especially of the hair- and beard-styles, suggesting an ‘economy of production’ for the dies of *denarii*, as they were needed in large quantities.<sup>118</sup>

---

<sup>115</sup> For the *as* of Antoninus Pius see: BMCRE IV, 301, no. 1843, pl. 51. 15; Fittschen 1982, 25 n. 17; 39; pl. 1. 9. The *as* is today unique but was most probably part of a (small) regular issue. In consequence, and despite its exceptional character, it has to be regarded as chronologically indicative.

<sup>116</sup> Beckmann 2014, 42, fig. 1. According to Beckmann, this process happened in stages. However, the observed ‘changes’ of Type I are probably better understood as variation around design elements of the type.

<sup>117</sup> Fittschen 1982, 35 with n. 13.

<sup>118</sup> Cf. BMCRE IV, p. xliii for the relation of quantity and quality of work of the *denarii*.

*Birth of children.* No reverse types alluding to the importance of producing heirs appear on coins connected with portraits of Faustina's Type II.<sup>119</sup> Furthermore, *aurei* of Type II are die-linked with Type I by several reverse dies with the legend VENVS, depicting Venus with a rudder (Fig. 19), an important reverse type for Type II in all denominations.<sup>120</sup> Type II was apparently introduced in the mint without a clear change of reverse types.

*Size of issue.* The quantity of coins preserved with a portrait of Type II suggests that they constituted a rather small group with a limited output. Four different obverse dies have been identified in our sample of *aurei*. The lack of medallions with a portrait of Type II, however, is probably only a gap in the surviving evidence, as Types I and III are also only known from very few examples.<sup>121</sup> No sculptured versions of Type II are known.

### **Third portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type III)**

Literature and designation of type: Strack 1937, 15 n. 26: 'T. b1/T. c'; Wegner 1939, 49: '*abgesetzte Stirnwellenfrisur mit hohem Nest*' or '*Stirnwellenfrisur mit großem Nest*'; Fittschen 1982, 35–36, 39–40: '*3. Bildnistypus*' (F-Type 3).

The third portrait type on coins (Fig. 22) again features a tripartite hairstyle: forehead and temple are framed by a waved section of hair combed from the front to the back of the head and covering (in the majority of cases) half of the ear. Frequently, a small lock partly escaping the wave in front of the ear is depicted. Behind this frontal composition, the (mostly) slightly undulated hair runs undivided to the back of the head. There it is braided into a large coiled bun formed from rows of plaits at the back of the head, as the depicted rows of beads (Fig. 22) or (less frequently) bands of criss-cross pattern (Fig. 23) indicate. Likewise, the front wave and the hair on the neck are taken up and run into the bun, with a few short locks escaping and falling onto the nape on most dies of good quality.<sup>122</sup>

---

<sup>119</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1982, 39 with n. 8.

<sup>120</sup> Beckmann 2014, 42.

<sup>121</sup> Type I: GNECCHI II, pl. 67. 10. – Type III: GNECCHI II, pl. 67. 5; 71. 1.

<sup>122</sup> Strack 1937, 15 n. 26 (T. b1; T. c); Wegner 1939, 49; Fittschen 1982, 35–36.

*Chronology.* The position of Type III in the typological sequence is secured by the change of the obverse legend from the dative case FAVSTINAE AVG PII AVG FIL to the nominative FAVSTINA AVG ANTONINI AVG PII FIL during its usage, as Strack ascertained.<sup>123</sup> An absolute chronological date for the introduction of the type in the mint would have to build on two hypotheses: first, our absolute date for Type II is applicable (A.D. 148/49). Second, Strack's and H. Mattingly's assumption that Faustina's amended filiation ANTONINI AVG PII FIL coincides with the identical filiation common on coins of Marcus Aurelius Caesar from A.D. 150 to 152 is correct.<sup>124</sup> If both hypotheses hold, Type III must have been introduced later than Type II (A.D. 148/49), probably in A.D. 149/50, as we have to assume, by analogy with Marcus, that Faustina's filiation subsequently changed to ANTONINI AVG PII FIL.<sup>125</sup> Given that coins with a portrait of Type II constituted a rather small group with limited output, nothing speaks against this rapid succession of types. It is likely that in A.D. 152 the obverse legend finally changed to FAVSTINA AVG PII AVG FIL during the period of use of Type III.

*Variation.* Two variants were first suggested by Strack, who then thought they represent variations of different portrait types. They were later taken up by Wegner and further discussed by Fittschen as Variants a and b of F-Type 3 (Type III).<sup>126</sup> Most readily, they are distinguishable by the bun, either indicated as a distinct double row of large plaits (Variant a) (Fig. 23) or as a more loosely coiled feature, in comparison to the former sitting lower at the back of the head (Variant b) (Fig. 22).<sup>127</sup> Both variants first occur with the earliest obverse legend connected with Type III, FAVSTINAE AVG PII AVG FIL (Figs. 23, 25). Variant a is only known from a few *aurei* and all examples familiar to Strack and Wegner featured this initial legend. In consequence, they thought that Variant a was superseded by Variant b.<sup>128</sup> However, the existence of *aurei* with a portrait of Variant a combined with the

---

<sup>123</sup> Cf. also Fittschen 1982, 39–40 under F-Type 3 (Type III).

<sup>124</sup> Strack 1937, 13, 19; BMCRE IV, p. xlv with n. 2. On the coins of Marcus Aurelius this variant of the filiation first appears in A.D. 149 (TRP III) and ceases in A.D. 152 (TRP VI).

<sup>125</sup> Cf. table 'Coins – Group 1' above for the correlation between obverse legends and portrait types.

<sup>126</sup> Strack 1937, 15 with n. 26 (T. b1 and T. c); Wegner 1939, 49; Fittschen 1982, 35, 39 n. 9.

<sup>127</sup> They can also be distinguished, but less easily, by the presence (Variant a) or absence (Variant b) of a recess between the frontal waved section and the back of the head.

<sup>128</sup> Strack 1937, 15 n. 26; Wegner 1939, 49.

obverse legend FAVSTINA AVG PII AVG FIL (Strack's first variant of his third legend type) (Fig. 24) proves beyond doubt that Variant a was used in the mint parallel to Variant b up to this chronologically latest obverse legend of Type III.

A distinctively different rendering of the frontal waved section of Variant b as a double-wave of hair on some dies (Fig. 25), observed by Beckmann, might be interpreted as a further 'variant'. However, he most probably gives the variation of the design element of the frontal waved section too much importance by assuming that these portraits might reflect 'differences in Faustina's real appearance'.<sup>129</sup> These variations relate to a known type, not to real life.

*Work-models.* Between these variants, or rather groups each clustering around a set of common features, a certain shift is perceivable, and it becomes obvious that we can observe a stylistic variation of the design elements of a common model, not a real change of the underlying motif.<sup>130</sup> However, by analogy with Type I, the consistency of details of the coin portraits representing the different groups suggests different 'die designs' set in 'work-models' used by the die-cutters, as proposed above.

*Birth of children.* According to Beckmann's observation and interpretation of die-linkage, the emergence of Type III on *aurei* most probably coincides with the introduction of two new reverse types, although, he had to admit, that a break in the die-link chain makes this connection 'less than fully certain'. One of these new types carries the legend IVNO (Fig. 25), showing the goddess seated with two girls and, therefore, alluding to the importance of producing heirs.<sup>131</sup> Beckmann's findings are supported by the connection of this reverse with the earliest obverse legend of Type III in the

---

<sup>129</sup> Beckmann 2014, 42–43.

<sup>130</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1982, 35 with n. 14 for the stylistic variation.

<sup>131</sup> Beckmann 2014, 42. His full evidence has not yet been published. – *Iuno*: BMCRE IV, 159, no. 1043, pl. 22. 13; Strack 1937, pl. 7. 492. – The other reverse type with the legend CONCORDIA shows Concordia standing (Strack 1937, pl. 7. 488).

dative case (FAVSTINAE AVG PII AVG FIL).<sup>132</sup> However, the coins do not inform us when and why the connected portrait type was created.

*Size of issue.* The large quantity of coins preserved in all denominations that were issued with a portrait of Type III and the obverse legend changing twice suggest that they constituted a substantial group with a considerable output over several years.<sup>133</sup> In our sample of *aurei*, 23 different obverse dies with Type III are represented. Sculptured versions of the type, however, are rare, as will be demonstrated in the following chapter.

#### **Fourth portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type IV)**

Literature and designation of type: Strack 1937, 15 n. 26: 'T. c1'; Wegner 1939, 49–50: disregarded as a rare variation; Fittschen 1982, 36, 40: '4. Bildnistypus' (F-Type 4).

The fourth portrait type on coins (Fig. 26) shows the conversion into coin-format of a coiffure that only consists of two parts: the undulated hair at the front and the side forms a tight 'finger-wave' style with ridges running horizontally towards the back. It is combed down towards the nape, covering half of the ear. At the back of the head the hair is taken up into a large coiled bun formed from rows of plaits. A few short strands and locks escape and fall onto the nape.<sup>134</sup>

*Chronology.* The position of Type IV in the chronological sequence is secured by the obverse legend that now exclusively appears in the nominative case but still always features the filiation. It was introduced in the mint later than Type III and earlier than Type V, as Strack observed.<sup>135</sup> Within these limits, the position can be further narrowed down: on *aurei*, Type IV is only used with the reverse type CONCORDIA with a standing dove (Fig. 26), a reverse type first occurring under Type III, most

---

<sup>132</sup> Fittschen 1982, 40.

<sup>133</sup> For the quantitative size of this group cf. Beckmann 2014, 42.

<sup>134</sup> Strack 1937, 15–16 n. 26 (T. c1); Wegner 1939, 49–50; Fittschen 1982, 36. – 'Finger-wave' style is an entirely modern term reflecting modern hairdressing practices (Stephens 2008, 111 with n. 4), here and in the following only used to describe the shape of the undulated hair with its distinct ridges.

<sup>135</sup> Cf. also Fittschen 1982, 40 under F-Type 4 (Type IV).

frequently connected with it and quickly vanishing under Type V.<sup>136</sup> Moreover, Beckmann's preliminary results of an unpublished die study reveal that Type IV emerged suddenly on *aurei* and was discontinued after a short period of use. According to him, the evidence of die-linkage further shows that Type III was employed 'before, after and even during' the use of Type IV.<sup>137</sup>

At the time Type IV (and Type III) was in use, the obverse legend changed from FAVSTINA AVG ANTONINI AVG PII FIL to FAVSTINA AVG PII AVG FIL (or F).<sup>138</sup> This transition is of importance for our absolute chronology: because of the common occurrence of the filiation ANTONINI AVG PII FIL on the coins of Marcus Aurelius from A.D. 150 to 152, an absolute date for the introduction of Faustina's Type III in A.D. 149/50 has been made plausible above and its disappearance on Marcus' coins in A.D. 152 helps us here to date Faustina's Type IV. Her filiation changes at some point to PII AVG FIL (or F). In consequence, Type IV with its supposedly short period of use, was probably introduced in the mint in A.D. 151/52 with the older filiation ANTONINI AVG PII FIL and continued in A.D. 152 for a (brief) while with the new filiation PII AVG FIL (or F).

*Birth of children.* The few reverse types used in connection with Type IV on coins cannot be associated with the birth of a child or any allusion to the importance of producing heirs.<sup>139</sup>

*Size of issue.* The short usage of the type is confirmed by its general rare occurrence in all denominations. Type IV is only represented by a single obverse die in our sample of *aurei*.<sup>140</sup> Likewise, the lack of medallions could in this case probably be seen as indicative of its short employment. Furthermore, no sculptured versions of the type are known.

---

<sup>136</sup> *Concordia* with dove: Strack 1937, pl. 7. 503.

<sup>137</sup> Beckmann 2014, 43. My own studies confirm a die-link between Type III and IV.

<sup>138</sup> For the obverse legends cf. table 'Coins – Group 1' above. – FAVSTINA AVG ANTONINI AVG PII FIL: Strack 1937, pl. 7. 503.

<sup>139</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1982, 40 confirming my own observations.

<sup>140</sup> More than one die for *aurei* existed. See for example Strack 1937, pl. 7. 503; Fritz Rudolf Künker GmbH & Co. KG, Auction 304, 19 Mar 2018, Lot 1183; cf. also Beckmann 2014, 43.

### **Fifth portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type V)**

Literature and designation of type: Strack 1937, 15 n. 26: 'T. d/T. d1'; Wegner 1939, 50: '*Langsträhnenfrisur mit kleinem Knoten*'; Fittschen 1982, 36, 40–41: '*5. Bildnistypus*' (F-Type 5).

The fifth portrait type on coins (Fig. 27) also features, as the previous type, a coiffure that only consists of two parts: the slightly wavy hair, forming a loose 'finger-wave' style with ridges running towards and fading at the crown of the head, is combed all the way back from the forehead and crown and taken up together with the hair on the neck into a bun at the nape. The ear is almost completely covered by the hair with only the earlobe visible. On many coins, a small lock in front of the ear partly escapes the combed back hair of the very plain coiffure, and most of the coins show short locks that fall onto the nape.<sup>141</sup>

*Chronology.* The position of Type V in the sequence of types is secured by the discontinuation of Faustina's filiation during its period of use, as Strack ascertained.<sup>142</sup> The first *aurei* issued with portraits of Type V and the obverse legend FAVSTINA AVG PII AVG FIL (Fig. 28), with a very distinct and large bun, are still linked to TYPE III by at least one reverse die with the legend CONCORDIA and a standing dove (Fig. 22), so dominant under Type III but now running out of usage and superseded by a reverse type with the legend VENVS showing the goddess with an apple and a staff.<sup>143</sup> *Aurei* featuring Type V with the Venus reverse initially still carry the obverse legend FAVSTINA AVG PII AVG FIL, which is subsequently replaced by the legend FAVSTINA AVGVSTA AVG PII FIL (Fig. 27). When the next reverse type is introduced on the *aurei*, the obverse legend reads simply FAVSTINA AVGVSTA, while the filiation is moved to the new reverse depicting Diana, where the legend now reads AVGVSTI PII FIL (Fig. 29). From then on, the obverse legend of the *aurei* (of Type V and all succeeding types) uniformly reads FAVSTINA AVGVSTA until the death of the empress. Finally, the filiation on the reverse disappears when the reverse type with Diana is discontinued, probably not too long after it

---

<sup>141</sup> Strack 1937, 15–16 n. 26 (T. d; T. d1); Wegner 1939, 50; Fittschen 1982, 36.

<sup>142</sup> Cf. also Fittschen 1982, 40–41 under F-Type 5 (Type V).

<sup>143</sup> Cf. Beckmann 2014, 43 referring to his unpublished study of die-linkage. The linkage between Type III and Type V is confirmed by my own observations (see here Figs. 22, 28). – *Venus* with apple and staff: Strack 1937, pl. 7. 511.

was moved to the back of the coins.<sup>144</sup> The same chronological development of the obverse legend, exemplified here by *aurei*, can also be observed on other denominations.

An absolute chronological date for the introduction of Type V can hardly be assessed on an objective basis.<sup>145</sup> Probably the best circumstantial evidence we have is an undisturbed hoard of 60 *aurei* from Egypt, containing as the latest-dated pieces six coins from A.D. 156 and 29 coins from A.D. 157. The hoard also contained five *aurei* of Faustina the Younger with the filiation AVGVSTI PII FIL on the reverse depicting Diana and three *aurei* of Type V without filiation and the reverse FECVNDITATI AVGVSTAE with three children (Fig. 30), all eight coins with the simple obverse legend FAVSTINA AVGVSTA.<sup>146</sup> The large number of coins dated to A.D. 156 and 157 suggest that the *aurei* of Faustina without filiation were probably already used (and of course minted) as early as A.D. 157.<sup>147</sup> Considering that Type V changed the obverse legend twice and used several succeeding reverse types before the Fecunditas issue (FECVNDITATI AVGVSTAE), it must have already been employed for a while. On the other hand, it was most probably introduced in the mint later than A.D. 152, when Type IV presumably vanished but Type III was still used. A date of A.D. 153/54 for the introduction of Type V appears in this light plausible.<sup>148</sup> This is also supported by *dupondii* and *asses* of Faustina the Younger with a portrait of Type V and the obverse legend FAVSTINA AVG PII AVG FIL, that D. R. Walker dated to A.D. 154/55.<sup>149</sup>

From the point of its introduction onwards, Type V was used for a long period of time up to and parallel to Type VII in the A.D. 160s. This is proven by distinct shared reverse types, as for example SAECVLI FELICIT(AS) with two boys on a throne (Fig. 31), described below.

---

<sup>144</sup> Beckmann 2014, 43–44 with die-link chain fig. 2.

<sup>145</sup> For an outdated attempt see Strack 1937, 17–19.

<sup>146</sup> Strack 1937, 18, pl. 7. 517, 520 c.

<sup>147</sup> Strack 1937, 18; BMCRE IV, p. xlv.

<sup>148</sup> This date corresponds well with the chronological transition of Mattingly's Group 3 to Group 4 (BMCRE IV, p. xlv).

<sup>149</sup> Walker 1988, 293–96, esp. 295, 299, pl. 38. 436–51, pl. 39. 453–54. According to Walker, these coins are closely connected for archaeological reasons with dated *dupondii* and *asses* of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius as Caesar, all forming an issue that was supplied to Britain and almost entirely circulated there.

*Variation.* The size, shape, structure and exact position of the bun can especially vary. However, it is suggested that its diverse rendering and design on coins probably only reflects a variation around two different perceptions of the underlying basic composition of this feature: a bun encircled by a braid (Figs. 27–31) versus strands of hair tied into a bun (Fig. 32). In either case, it is no longer the nest-like feature of the preceding Types I–IV with the typical ‘vertical’ braid(s) leading up to the coiled rows of plaits, but a tight and compact rounded bun, as is also characteristic for the succeeding types (VI–X). In chronological terms, there is a shift towards the depiction of a low, tied bun during the period of use of Type V, especially when it runs parallel to Type VII, but the bun encircled by a braid, often very ornamentally rendered in a partly beaded design, stays dominant. The original underlying meaning of these different designs, however, seems to slowly vanish during the later period of use of the type, as they appear to be more and more interchangeable.

Three medallions from two different obverse dies feature an interesting ‘variant’ of Type V (Figs. 33–34): the hair combed back from the forehead and the crown shows a slight division into two segments instead of only one undivided part, both running into a very flat bun. The obverse legend FAVSTINA AVG PII AVG FIL indicates a very early relative chronological position in the period of use of Type V.<sup>150</sup> What we observe is a variation or interpretation of the design elements of the underlying model by the die-cutters.

Another conspicuous but very rare coin portrait of Faustina (Fig. 35), also carrying the obverse legend FAVSTINA AVG PII AVG FIL and only known from a single *aureus* die, would well fit into this ‘variant’ of Type V. The bun is slightly different and the hair probably a bit more undulated, but it features the same division into two segments. However, the portrait on the obverse is linked to Type III by the

---

<sup>150</sup> GNECCHI II, pls. 68. 1, 5; 69. 10. This variation was first observed by Strack 1937, 15–16 n. 26 (T. d1 = GNECCHI II, pl. 68. 5); Fittschen 1982, 36 with n. 20 under F-Type 5 (Type V) only mentioned the flat bun of GNECCHI II, pl. 68. 1, 5 and on some coins.

CONCORDIA reverse with a dove and, according to Beckmann, appeared long before Type V.<sup>151</sup> The die-linkage chain is still unpublished and for the moment it cannot be assessed how firm this connection with Type III is and how the linkage has to be interpreted. Beckmann states, that ‘the main linked die group forms more of a spider-web than a chain’ and suggests a ‘die-box model of production’ with several reverse dies used discontinuously, that is, returned to a ‘die-box’ shared by other reverse dies and re-employed later. However, a linkage diagram that looks ‘more like a spiderweb’, with multiple crossings, suggests an extremely discontinuous use of reverse dies and normally does not justify many chronological deductions, if we follow W. Esty’s theory of linkage.<sup>152</sup> For the time being, this problem cannot be resolved satisfactory, but a connection of the portrait with the early variation of Type V rather than with Type III, seems to be more plausible.

*Birth of children.* What has just been said under the chronology of Type V proves beyond doubt that it was neither connected with reverses alluding to the importance of producing heirs when it was introduced, nor for the following years until the discontinuation of the filiation on the reverse (AVGVSTI PII FIL with Diana). This point is marked by the introduction of the new reverse type FECVNDITATI AVGVSTAE on *aurei* (Fig. 30), most probably still in A.D. 157, alluding to the birth of a child. The reverse shows a standing or seated female personification holding a naked boy on the arm or on the lap, surrounded by two further children.<sup>153</sup>

The suggested date for the introduction of the Fecunditas issue as well as the conspicuously prominent and distinct rendering of the boy allow the reverse type to be connected with the birth of a son of unknown name in late A.D. 157, the only birth of a boy after T. Aelius Antoninus in A.D. 152

---

<sup>151</sup> Beckmann 2014, 43.

<sup>152</sup> Esty 1990, esp. 207–10. These models normally presume a continuous usage of obverse dies; however, if we were to assume a discontinuous use, the situation would be even more complicated, allowing virtually no chronological deductions from die-linkage.

<sup>153</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1982, 40–41 for the discontinuation of the filiation and the reverse types; Beckmann 2014, 44, fig. 2 for the introduction of new reverse types. – *Fecunditati Augustae*: BMCRE IV, p. 398 (standing); p. 399 (seated); Strack 1937, pl. 7. 520 c (seated), 520 d (standing).

and before the twin brothers L. Aurelius Commodus and T. Fulvus Aurelius Antoninus in A.D. 161.<sup>154</sup> It is very likely that the birth of the boy led to the dropping of the filiation, as Beckmann also suggested.<sup>155</sup> By analogy with the conferral of the title Augusta, this could be seen as a further advance in rank following a birth.

Later in the chronology of Type V, the reverse type IVNONI LVCINAE (Fig. 36) was introduced, showing the standing goddess with a girl on her arm, surrounded by two further children, a type shared between coins carrying portraits of Type V and Type VI ('New Type') on the obverse.<sup>156</sup> Further reverse types alluding to imperial offspring were to follow, depicting four children with the legend FECVND(ITAS) AVGVSTAE (Fig. 37) and later six children with the legend TEMPOR(VM) FELIC(ITAS) (Fig. 38) or two boys on a throne with the legend SAECVLI FELICIT(AS) (Figs. 31–32). The latter two reverse types, discussed in more detail below under Type VII, are shared between Type V and Type VII.<sup>157</sup> These shared reverse types, especially, make it doubtful that the birth of a new child could have been directly associated with a specific portrait type.

*Size of issue.* The large number of coins preserved with a portrait of Type V and the observed change are indicative of a substantial group with a considerable output over many years.<sup>158</sup> The type is represented by 20 different obverse dies in our sample of *aurei*. It was also popular in sculpture, as will be shown in Chapter 3.

---

<sup>154</sup> The single evidence for the birth of this son of unknown name is IGRR IV, 1399 = IK 24, 1 (Smyrna) 600. He was still unknown to Fittschen 1982; see however Fuchs 1986, 856; Ameling 1992, 159; Fittschen 1999, 8 with nn. 73–76 for further detailed references. – For the chronology of births see Fittschen 1999, 2–9.

<sup>155</sup> Beckmann 2014, 44.

<sup>156</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1982, 41–42 for the shared type, however, wrongly attributed to F-Type 6 (Type IX) instead of Type VI ('New Type'): pl. 3. 10 (Type VI); pl. 3. 11–12 (Type V). – *Iunoni Lucinae*: BMCRE IV, 401, no. 117, pl. 55. 12 (Type VI); Strack 1937, pl. 7. 520 f (Type V).

<sup>157</sup> *Fecunditas Augustae* (four children): BMCRE IV, 398, no. 89, pl. 55. 5; Strack 1937, pl. 20. 1337. – *Temporum Felicitas* (six children): BMCRE IV, 405, no. 155, pl. 56. 4; Strack 1937, pl. 20. '\*'. – *Saeculi Felicitas*: BMCRE IV, 403, no. 139, pl. 55. 19.

<sup>158</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1982, 41 for the period of use.

### **Sixth portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type VI or ‘New Type’)**

Literature and designation of type: Strack 1937: not mentioned or described in the text but listed on p. 167 without further explanation as variation ‘T. d2’; Wegner 1939: not recognised; Fittschen 1982: not recognised; Beckmann 2014, 44: mistaken for Fittschen’s Type 7.

The hairstyle of this previously unidentified portrait type (Fig. 39) is difficult to comprehend in the form it is rendered on coins. Its exact structure and composition is not entirely clear. Most conspicuous are the strong, wavy lines arranged parallel to one another and running from the front to the crown and back of the head, where they fade out. They indicate a strongly waved and complicated frontal composition, as the wavy lines are tighter towards the front, as well as some connection of the frontal composition to the hair behind, where the unbroken wavy lines become looser and fade. At the nape, the hair runs into a bun. The ears are almost completely covered by the coiffure and on some dies small locks fall onto the neck.

These findings are clearly supported by a medallion (Fig. 40) featuring a portrait of Type VI (‘New Type’), however, with a slightly different rendering of the coiffure: forehead and temple are framed by a wavy segment of hair, indicated by a strongly waved line as seen on succeeding types, with curls running into it from the back. The portrait on the medallion, therefore, represents a stylistic variation of Type VI.<sup>159</sup>

The ‘New Type’ was not recognised by Strack, Wegner or Fittschen, but a number of coins depicting portraits of Type VI were erroneously attributed by Fittschen to Type IX (F-Type 6).<sup>160</sup> This resulted in a mistake on both typological and numismatic-chronological criteria. Unfortunately, this has

---

<sup>159</sup> The low hanging bun of the portrait together with the filiation does not allow this medallion to be connected with any other type: it is neither of Type V nor earlier, because of the low hanging bun, or later, because of the filiation; it is not differentiated enough from Type VI to constitute an independent type. Most likely, the obverse of the medallion is from the same die as GNECCHI II, pl. 67. 7; 69. 6, 9 (Type VI).

<sup>160</sup> For example, Fittschen 1982, 41, pl. 3. 10 and the two ‘exemptions’ p. 41 n. 14 feature a portrait of Type VI. The same is true for p. 29 n. 45: ‘Mattingly Taf. 55, 12’ and ‘Gneccchi II Taf. 69, 6. 9’; p. 28 n. 38 b; GNECCHI II, pl. 70. 1, featuring Type VI, was regarded as tooled (modern reworking) and representing Type IX (F-Type 6) by Fittschen 1982, 36 n. 22; in the same note (p. 36 n. 22) a few more coin portraits were wrongly attributed, and the mistake can be followed through Fittschen’s monograph.

obscured the evidence and can be followed through subsequent publications.<sup>161</sup> Most importantly, besides now knowing of ten portrait types of Faustina, the reverse type IVNONI LVCINAE with three children (Fig. 41) has to be connected with Type VI ('New Type') instead of Type IX (F-Type 6), with the consequence that the Type IX can no longer be associated with child-related reverse types, as shown below.

*Chronology.* The relative chronological position of Type VI ('New Type') in the sequence of Faustina's types on coins is clearly defined by the reverse legend: while the obverse legend of *aurei* with Type VI always reads simply FAVSTINA AVGVSTA, the reverse first shows the depiction of Diana connected with the filiation AVGVSTI PII FIL (Fig. 39). Subsequently, the filiation on the reverse of the *aurei* is abandoned when the old reverse with Diana is discontinued and superseded by the reverse types DIANA LVCIF(ERA) with Diana (Fig. 42) and later IVNONI LVCINAE (Fig. 41), showing the standing goddess with three children. The short obverse legend as well as the shared reverse type of Diana with the filiation and its discontinuation closely connect Type VI with Type V and define its position precisely in the chronological sequence: the new portrait type never appears with the (outdated) obverse legends FAVSTINA AVG PII AVG FIL or FAVSTINA AVGVSTA AVG PII FIL (or F) of the early issues with portraits of Type V. In consequence, Type VI made its appearance when Type V had already been in use for a while and was subsequently employed alongside it for an unknown period of time.<sup>162</sup>

Building on the evidence of the Egyptian hoard mentioned above under Type V and the inference that *aurei* of Faustina without filiation were probably already used as early as A.D. 157, an approximate date for its introduction in the mint can be suggested: considering that the 'New Type' was already employed for a while (with filiation), it is likely that it was introduced A.D. 156/57.

---

<sup>161</sup> See for example Fittschen 1999, 8 n. 75 with further references.

<sup>162</sup> For the relative chronological position of the type cf. Strack 1937, 167 with pl. 7. 517, who did not mention or describe it in the text but listed it as variation 'T. d2' already in the correct position; cf. also Beckmann 2014, 44 with die-link chain fig. 2, however, mistaking Type VI for F-Type 7 (Type VII).

*Separate production of Type VI in the mint.* Beckmann suggested that two different ‘workshops’ were operating in parallel roughly around the time of the discontinuation of the filiation. This assumption is based on the observation of two separate die-link chains of *aurei*, featuring portraits of Type V and Type VI, respectively. These chains are chronologically linked by the disappearance of the filiation from the reverse. According to Beckmann, both ‘workshops’ first use the reverse type AVGVSTI PII FIL with Diana and subsequently introduce new reverse types that are kept separate, at least at the beginning.<sup>163</sup>

We should probably avoid the term ‘workshop’, not clearly defined by Beckmann and influenced too much by modern perceptions, and simply focus on the possibility of a parallel but separate production of Types V and VI. The evidence of die-linkage alone is not sufficient to support such a separate production, as die-links between the two chains might simply not yet have been identified or are not preserved due to the chances of survival. However, it is conspicuous that only medallions and gold denominations were minted with a portrait of Type VI and this might support the assumption that they were produced separately from the main group of contemporary coins (and medallions) with portraits of Type V. In practice this could mean that coins with a portrait of Type VI were minted in a separate, physically distinct ‘production unit’ (section) within the mint, or, as this was not necessarily the case, with dies that were kept separately, only employed on demand.

*Birth of children.* The reverse type connected with the ‘New Type’ when it first appeared on coins (AVGVSTI PII FIL with Diana) (Fig. 39), cannot be associated with the birth of a child.<sup>164</sup> Only after a while, when the filiation disappeared from the back of the coins and the reverse types DIANA LVCIF(ERA) (Fig. 42) and later IVNONI LVCINAE (Fig. 41), showing the standing goddess with a girl on her arm, surrounded by two further children, were introduced, do we observe an allusion to the

---

<sup>163</sup> Beckmann 2014, 44 with die-link chain fig. 2.

<sup>164</sup> Strack 1937, pl. 7. 517.

importance of producing heirs in the imperial house.<sup>165</sup> The latter reverse type is also shared with Type V.

*Size of issue.* Type VI is known from medallions, *aurei* and gold *quinarii* but appears to be completely absent on *denarii* and bronze denominations. The seven different obverse dies represented in our sample of *aurei* suggest a quite substantial output and illustrate that the type is not rare. Sculptured versions of Type VI, however, are unknown.

### **Seventh portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type VII)**

Literature and designation of type: Strack 1937: described on p. 20 but not recognised as an independent type; Wegner 1939, 50: '*unterteilte Wellenfrisur*'; Fittschen 1982, 36–37, 42: '*7. Bildnistypus*' (F-Type 7).

The seventh portrait type on coins (Fig. 43) features a hairstyle that consists of only two parts: the main section of the hair is combed from the front to the back of the head in several undulated segments, forming a tight 'finger-wave' style. The coiffure (on the dies) is not as meticulously rendered as under Type IV but the 'finger-waves' of the individual segments are indicated much more schematically, as strongly waved, deeply cut lines over less wavy and more shallow incisions – an effective stylistic conversion of tightly waved hair into coin-format that also dominates the rendering of comparable parts of the coiffure of the succeeding two types (VIII–IX). In accordance with the previous two types (V–VI), the ear is almost completely covered by the hair. In front of the ear a small lock is depicted and behind, a short curl falls onto the neck, constant features also of the succeeding types. At the nape the hair is depicted as tied into a bun.<sup>166</sup>

*Chronology.* The technical-stylistic feature of large letters surrounding the portrait, described in more detail in Chapter 5 on the coinage of Marcus Aurelius, and observable on his coins from ca. A.D. 161–163, gives a first hint that we most probably have some sort of overlap of the period of use of Type

---

<sup>165</sup> Cf. Beckmann 2014, 44 for the chronological development of the reverse types.

<sup>166</sup> Wegner 1939, 50; Fittschen 1982, 36–37.

VII with this approximate timespan, as this feature also appears on some of the coins of Faustina (Fig. 44).<sup>167</sup> Moreover, an absolutely convincing historical interpretation of a very distinctive reverse type pointing (beside others) at the birth of children helps to further narrow down the introduction of Type VII in the mint: the reverse type with the legend SAECVLI FELICIT(AS) (Fig. 45) depicts two naked boys on a throne – clearly the twins L. Aurelius Commodus and T. Fulvus Aurelius Antoninus born on the 31st of August A.D. 161.<sup>168</sup> As these coins associated with the new births formed substantial issues, judging from the preserved evidence, and no clearly earlier issues exist, it is almost certain that Type VII was introduced in the mint A.D. 161, most probably shortly after the birth of the twins. However, it cannot be completely ruled out that it was already employed (and therefore already created) slightly earlier with reverse types like HILARITAS or CONCORDIA, in the period after the 7th of March A.D. 161, when Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus advanced to the rank of Augustus immediately after the death of Antoninus Pius.<sup>169</sup>

*Birth of children.* Type VII on coins is clearly connected with two reverse types commemorating the birth of the twin brothers L. Aurelius Commodus and T. Fulvus Aurelius Antoninus: SAECVLI FELICIT(AS) (Fig. 45), described above, and TEMPOR(VM) FELIC(ITAS) (Fig. 46), showing a standing personification with six children.<sup>170</sup> The latter reverse type reveals an interest in keeping the number of children up to date, as it increases from four, in connection with Type V (Fig. 37), to six after the birth of the twins.<sup>171</sup> The portrait type was most probably introduced in the mint in connection with the two new child-related reverse types praising the happiness of the era. However, they are shared

---

<sup>167</sup> Strack 1937, 11, 20. On the coinage of Faustina this feature only appears occasionally; in consequence, its occurrence is regarded as chronologically indicative in contrast to its absence.

<sup>168</sup> For the birth of Commodus and Antoninus see: SHA, vita Comm. 1. 2; IGRR I, 1509 (Inscription from Gortys). – Interpretation of reverse type: Fittschen 1982, 30–31, 42; Fittschen 1999, 9 with further reference. On some coins, the twins are associated with the Dioscuri by the representation of two stars above their heads, further supporting the identification.

<sup>169</sup> Cf. Smith 1983, 229; Ameling 1992, 163 for a possible creation of the type in connection with the accession.

<sup>170</sup> Fittschen 1982, 42, pl. 5. 1–3.

<sup>171</sup> Four children also appear on the reverse of dated coins of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius in A.D. 160 and 161 until the death of Antoninus Pius (Fittschen 1982, 29–30 with n. 48). – Antoninus Pius (Pietas with four children): BMCRE IV, 151, no. 1012, pl. 21. 19; Strack 1937, pl. 4. 384. – Marcus Aurelius (Personification with four children): BMCRE IV, 153, no. 1019; Strack 1937, pl. 5. 377, 390.

between Type V and Type VII and it remains doubtful, as already argued under Type V, that the new birth was directly associated with a specific portrait type.

*Size of issue.* A large number of coins in all denominations are preserved with a portrait of Type VII, suggesting a substantial output. In our sample of *aurei*, 16 different obverse dies have been identified. Moreover, in sculpture, Type VII was the most common type, as will be shown in the next chapter.

### **Eighth portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type VIII)**

Literature and designation of type: Strack 1937, 19–20: ‘T. e/T. f’; Wegner 1939, 50: ‘*abgesetzte Stirnwellenfrisur*’; Fittschen 1982, 37, 42: ‘8. *Bildnistypus*’ (F-Type 8).

Type VIII on coins (Fig. 47) features a tripartite hairstyle: forehead and temple are framed by a waved section of hair, combed back from the front of the head. It is undulated in a tight ‘finger-wave’ style, almost entirely covering the ear, as the majority of coins suggest. The frontal composition of the coiffure is separated from the hair on the crown and the back by a braid that runs towards the nape, not visible when the portrait is depicted with a stephane. The braid is most frequently indicated by one or two rows of beads or bands with a pattern of diagonal lines. Behind the braid, the slightly wavy hair is combed from the crown back to the nape, where it is taken up together with the waved sections of hair and the braid into a bun. The bun can be depicted as tied from strands of hair (Fig. 47) or encircled by a braid (Fig. 48), indicated, more ‘naturalistically’, by a pattern of curved lines or highly ornamented by a beaded design (Fig. 49). An original underlying meaning of these different designs and their variation on the coins is at this stage most probably lost, and different ornamental designs for depicting a braid seem to be used interchangeably side by side.<sup>172</sup>

*Chronology.* As under Type VII, some coins with a portrait of Type VIII also feature the described large letters surrounding the portrait (Fig. 48) and give a first hint that there is most probably some

---

<sup>172</sup> Strack 1937, 20 with n. 38 (T. e; T. f); Wegner 1939, 50; Fittschen 1982, 37.

overlap of the period of use of Type VIII with the timespan of approximately A.D. 161–163. Furthermore, the earliest dated Alexandrian coinage with a portrait of Type VIII provide a terminus ante quem of A.D. 163/64 for the creation of the type in Rome. Considering the date of A.D. 161 we determined for the introduction of Type VII and the substantial first issues commemorating new birth, it is likely that Type VIII was introduced in the mint A.D. 162/63.

*Birth of children.* Fittschen had assumed in 1982 that the reverse type FECVNDITAS depicting the personification with a boy on her arm is exclusively connected with portraits of Type VIII (Fig. 49), the only exemption being a *dupondius* with a portrait of Type VII.<sup>173</sup> Today it is clear from the evidence of the many newly published coins since then that the reverse type is regularly shared between Type VII (Fig. 50) and VIII (Fig. 49). Whichever way we interpret the evidence, either as successive issues of Type VII and VIII or as concurrently used portrait types sharing the reverse type, the implication is the same: the reverse type was not exclusively used for Type VIII and it is doubtful that there was any sort of direct association of the birth of a new child with a specific portrait type.

*Size of issue.* A substantial number of coins with a portrait of Type VIII are known, suggesting a large output. It was also very popular in sculpture, second only after Type VII. However, only two obverse dies with a portrait of Type VIII have been identified in our sample of *aurei*, suggesting that it is probably under-represented in the sample.<sup>174</sup>

### **Ninth portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type IX)**

Literature and designation of type: Strack 1937: not recognised; Wegner 1939: not recognised; Fittschen 1982, 36, 41–42: ‘6. *Bildnistypus*’ (F-Type 6).

The ninth portrait type on coins (Fig. 51) features again a tripartite hairstyle: forehead and temple are framed by a tightly waved section of hair that is combed from the front to the nape, almost

---

<sup>173</sup> Fittschen 1982, 42 with n. 20. – *Fecunditas*: BMCRE IV, 398, no. 95, pl. 55. 6.

<sup>174</sup> Already Beckmann’s partial die-link chain features four different obverse dies with Type VIII (Beckmann 2014, fig. 3).

completely covering the ear with only the earlobe visible. Behind the frontal composition the hair is slightly undulated, standing almost at a right angle to the tightly waved section of hair. The structural connection of this part of the coiffure to the frontal section and especially the bun is not entirely clear. Its relation to real hairstyles is better reflected by sculptured 'private' portraits (Fig. 52): they reveal that the hair runs from the crown to the tightly waved section of hair, where it is taken up and directed towards the compact bun at the nape.<sup>175</sup>

Type IX was not identified by Strack and Wegner, probably because it is rare on coins and when poorly preserved hard to distinguish from Types V–VIII.<sup>176</sup> Fittschen also faced these difficulties when he mistook coins with a portrait of Type VI ('New Type') for Type IX (F-Type 6). The (numismatic) consequence of the necessary corrections made here is that the reverse type IVNONI LVCINAE with three children can no longer be connected with Type IX.

*Chronology.* The relative chronological position of Type IX is difficult to assess. As the obverse legend uniformly reads FAVSTINA AVGVSTA and no filiation appears on the reverse, the type was introduced in the mint certainly later than Type VI ('New Type') and earlier than Type X, because it is not employed for the deified empress. The absence of large letters surrounding the portrait on the obverse is in this case not chronologically indicative, as this feature occurs only occasionally on the coins of Faustina (on Types V and VII–VIII).

However, the broad sequence of reverse types on *aurei* might provide a further hint on the position in the sequence of types: the reverse type SALVTI AVGVSTAE (Fig. 51) is introduced under Type V later in its period of use, probably at the same time as on coins with portraits of Type VII (as they run parallel), and it is an especially popular reverse for *aurei* with portraits of Types VII–VIII, not continued under Type X. As the *aurei* with a portrait of Type IX predominantly feature the SALVTI

---

<sup>175</sup> See Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 83, no. 113, pls. 142–43 (here Fig. 52) for a 'private' portrait with a comparable hairstyle; Fittschen 1982, 53 n. 34 for further examples.

<sup>176</sup> Fittschen 1982, 36, 53.

AVGVSTAE reverse, there is most likely a connection or overlap of usage with Types VII–VIII in some way.

This has been confirmed by Beckmann's die studies and my own observations. He published part of a die-linkage chain of *aurei* that does not indicate a clear chronology, as it is very complex with multiple crossings, but supports Type VIII being in use when Type IX was also employed at the mint.<sup>177</sup> This is further underpinned by a tiny but significant bit of evidence: a reverse die-link between *aurei* of Type VIII (Fig. 53) and Type IX (Fig. 54) with a die deterioration and recut of the die (upper left part of backrest, as seen by the viewer) that proves that these particular coins with a portrait of Type IX were struck later than the particular coins of Type VIII, supporting Types VIII and IX being used at approximately the same time.<sup>178</sup> As Type VIII was probably introduced only a year or two after Type VII (A.D. 162/63), it is likely that Type IX was introduced in the mint slightly later than Type VIII, probably around A.D. 163/64.

*Birth of children.* The single reverse type alluding to the importance of producing heirs that was thought to be connected with Type IX, IVNONI LVCINAE showing the standing goddess with three children, was only erroneously related with this portrait type but is actually connected with Type VI ('New Type'), as demonstrated above, and shared with Type V. With this correction made, no reverse types connected with Type IX can be associated with the birth of a child.

*Size of issue.* Type IX is only known from a few dies for medallions, *aurei* and bronzes but appears to be completely absent on *denarii* and is missing in sculpture. In our sample of *aurei*, it is represented by four obverse dies.

---

<sup>177</sup> Beckmann 2014, 44 with die-link chain fig. 3.

<sup>178</sup> Type VIII: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 31, 26 Oct 2005, Lot 58; Auktionshaus H. D. Rauch GmbH, Auction 102, 7 Nov 2016, Lot 97. – Type IX: Classical Numismatic Group, Electronic Auction 167, 27 Jun 2007, Lot 161; Hess-Divo AG, Auction 314, 4 May 2009, Lot 1570.

## Tenth portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type X)

Literature and designation of type: Strack 1937, 19: 'T. g'; Wegner 1939, 50: 'Drehsträhnenfrisur'; Fittschen 1982, 37, 42–43: '9. Bildnistypus' (F-Type 9).

The tenth portrait type on coins (Fig. 55) also features a tripartite coiffure: on all coins forehead and temple are framed by a design that is best interpreted as rows of tight spiral curls converted into coin-format. They are tightly set parallel to each other, extending towards the back of the head. The hair behind this frontal composition is always combed at an angle towards the rows of spiral curls. Apart from that, it is not uniformly rendered on the coins. It varies from slightly wavy hair, indicated by wavy lines, to a design closely resembling the long rows of parallel spiral curls of the frontal hair. At the nape the hair is tied into a heavy bun, on most coins clearly larger than seen with the previous types (V–IX). The almost entirely covered ear, a small lock in front of it and a curl falling onto the neck behind also remain characteristic for Type X.<sup>179</sup>

*Chronology.* The position of Type X in the relative chronology is secured by the mention of the title *diva* in the obverse legend of the latest issues with this portrait type, as ascertained by Strack.<sup>180</sup> Furthermore, Beckmann suggested that Type X was probably only introduced after the preceding types had already disappeared from the coins some time previously.<sup>181</sup> This is supported by a missing connection of reverse types between the preceding Types VIII–IX and Type X and the predominance in all denominations of the reverse MATRI MAGNAE (Fig. 55) depicting Cybele seated for Type X, introducing a completely new theme. In addition, according to Beckmann, all known *aureus* dies with the reverse type MATRI MAGNAE link into a single chain of dies.

---

<sup>179</sup> Strack 1937, 19 (T. g); Wegner 1939, 50; Fittschen 1982, 37.

<sup>180</sup> Cf. also Fittschen 1982, 42 for the position.

<sup>181</sup> Beckmann 2014, 45.

An absolute chronological date for the introduction of Type X in the mint could up to now not be assessed.<sup>182</sup> However, if the chronological conclusions directly above and under Type IX are correct, we can expect that Type X was only introduced some time after A.D. 163/64.

*Birth of children.* The *aurei* as well as the other denominations for the living empress with portraits of Type X are in the majority associated with the reverse type MATRI MAGNAE depicting Cybele; neither these nor the other reverse types, in all denominations, allude to imperial offspring.<sup>183</sup>

*Size of issue.* The large number of coins preserved with a portrait of Type X suggests a substantial output, both for the living empress and for the deified Diva Faustina after her death. Ten different obverse dies have been identified in our sample of *aurei*. In contrast, only a single sculptured version of Type X is known.

#### D. ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

After the typology of the portraits on coins and the connection of the individual types with child-related reverse types have been reassessed, the portrait types, their functioning in the mint and the real births of Faustina's children must be correlated to allow a methodologically sound decision as to whether or not Fittschen's theory of 'portrait types for births' works. To relate the actual births of Faustina's children to the portrait types on coins, two intermediate steps are necessary: first, the real births of Faustina's children will be related, if possible, to the reverse types alluding to imperial offspring. Second, we should try hard to see if the portrait types on coins can be related to these reverses reflecting specific births. This is preceded by an outline of the employment of the portrait types on coins in chronological terms.

---

<sup>182</sup> Fittschen 1982, 42.

<sup>183</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1982, 42–43 for the absence of an allusion to imperial offspring; see Beckmann 2014, 45 for the reverse type Mater Magna.

<b>Adjusted absolute chronology of portrait types and their connection with child-related reverses</b>				
Adjusted typology	Introduction in mint	F-Type	Chronology Fittschen	Child-related reverses
Type I	A.D. 147	1	A.D. 147	Yes (at introduction)
Type II	A.D. 148/49	2	A.D. 149	No
Type III	A.D. 149/50	3	A.D. 150	Yes (at introduction)
Type IV	A.D. 151/52	4	A.D. 151	No
Type V	A.D. 153/54	5	A.D. 152	Only later during use
Type VI/New Type	A.D. 156/57	–	–	Only later during use
Type VII	A.D. 161	7	A.D. 161	Yes (at introduction)
Type VIII	A.D. 162/63	8	A.D. 162	at introduction?
Type IX	A.D. 163/64	6	A.D. 159	No
Type X	after A.D. 163/64	9	after A.D. 162	No

### **Chronological employment of portrait types on coins**

The portrait types of Faustina the Younger on coins exhibit an almost linear chronological sequence up to Type III, with only some overlap between them when a new type was introduced on the coins. This is supported by Strack's finding of the chronological correlation of the changing obverse legends with the portrait types as well as by Beckmann's observation of apparently more or less linear linkage chains of *aurei* in this period, suggesting a sequential production.<sup>184</sup> Type IV was most probably only employed for a short time during the period of use of Type III. This is underpinned by the sole reverse type CONCORDIA with a standing dove on *aurei*, otherwise predominantly connected with Type III and quickly vanishing under Type V, as well as by die-linkage.<sup>185</sup> The short usage of the type in the mint is further confirmed by its general rarity in all denominations. Type VI, the previously unidentified type, was used parallel to Type V and vanished during the latter's period of use.

<sup>184</sup> Strack 1937, 14–16; Beckmann 2014, esp. 43 with preliminary results of an ongoing study.

<sup>185</sup> Beckmann 2014, 43, confirmed by my own studies.

From that time onwards, a more complicated situation arose that is best reflected both by reverse types shared between different portrait types and by the complex die-linkage during this period: interestingly, of the total of six portrait types that are connected with child-related reverse types at some point of their usage (Types I, III, V–VIII), either at the beginning or during their period of employment, four share at least one of these reverses with another portrait type (Types V–VIII). Type V is exceptional, as it runs for a long period of time and shares child-related reverses with Type VI and Type VII.<sup>186</sup> All of this indicates considerable overlap and shift in the usage of the portrait types and makes it doubtful that reverse types alluding to imperial offspring were associated with specific portrait types.











What has just been said is clearly confirmed by die-linkage: while sound chronological interferences from complex die-linkage without any supporting evidence are problematic, the linkage of the later types of Faustina the Younger proves beyond reasonable doubt that several different portrait types could coexist at the same time – whether it be in parallel (simultaneous) or overlapping or discontinuous (with interrupted die-usage).<sup>187</sup> There appears to be little consistency in the way the imperial image is controlled in the mint during the period of use of Types V (after Type VI vanished) and VII–IX.

Finally, Type X was probably only introduced after Types VIII and IX had already vanished from the coins for some time, as it appears to be neither connected by die-linkage nor by common reverse types to the preceding types. This reminds us not to take it for granted that the coins of Faustina were minted every year, as those of the emperor certainly were (Antoninus Pius and later Marcus Aurelius).

---

<sup>186</sup> These irregularities (from the point of Fittschen's model) were already observed by Fittschen 1982, 40–42.

<sup>187</sup> Beckmann 2014, 43–45, fig. 3; for the possibilities and limitations of the theory of linkage see Esty 1990.

Estimated period of use of the portrait types from A.D. 147–175/76	
A.D. 100s	47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75
Type I	 (ca. end of A.D. 147–148/49)
Type II	 (ca. A.D. 148/49–149/50)
Type III	 (ca. A.D. 149/50–153/54)
Type IV	 (ca. A.D. 151/52–152)
Type V	 (ca. A.D. 153/54–161/62)
Type VI	 (ca. A.D. 156/57–159)
Type VII	 (ca. A.D. 161–162/63?)
Type VIII	 (ca. A.D. 162/63–164?)
Type XI	 (ca. A.D. 163/64–164?)
Type X	 (some time after A.D. 163/64–175/76)

Overall, this suggests a flexible and not strictly linear and continuous employment of the portrait types, especially after Type VI vanished, making it doubtful, as already mentioned, that specific reverse types could be associated with specific portrait types. That we could, however, expect a more rigid control of the imperial image in the mint if it were intended or thought important, is suggested by the obverse legends: in contrast to the portrait, the obverse legend with the title(s) of the empress was apparently more closely monitored. We would observe no chronological correlation of the changing obverse legends with the portraits of Types I–VI if the former had randomly changed. In addition, to give a further example, none of the latest obverse dies with filiation and a portrait of Type V for *aurei* were accidentally used with the reverse type with filiation featuring Diana or later reverse types, after the filiation has completely vanished on the coins.

Furthermore, while we have no proof that Faustina's portrait types on coins did change in connection with important events, the evidence strongly suggests that the title and/or the reverse type(s) could

do so. We are not only informed by the *Fasti Ostienses* that the title *Augusta* was conferred on Faustina the day after her first child was born in A.D. 147, reflected by the obverse legend and the earliest reverse types of the coinage, but also the eventual cessation of the filiation is likely to be connected with the birth of a child in A.D. 157, as the coins strongly suggest: the discontinuation of the filiation is marked by the introduction of the reverse type *FECVNDITATI AVGVSTAE* on *aurei*, prominently depicting *Fecunditas* with a naked boy (Fig. 30). By analogy with the conferral of the title *Augusta*, this can be seen as a further advance of the empress in rank following a birth.

### **Relation of the real births of Faustina's children to child-related reverse types**

Doubtless, the birth of children was of primary importance for the dynastic conception of Antoninus Pius, assuring the continuity of the dynasty, as the conferral of the title *Augusta* upon the birth of Faustina's first child and the many child-related reverse types on imperial coins prove.<sup>188</sup> The imperial offspring and the motherhood of Faustina were addressed and commemorated on the coins in an extent and quantity never seen before.<sup>189</sup> However, despite a clear tendency to keep the child-related reverse types on coins of Faustina the Younger, Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius to a certain degree up to date by a changing number of depicted children and the introduction of new types, they should not be taken at face value in every detail.<sup>190</sup> For example, the reverse type *FECVNDITAS* (Figs. 49–50), connected with portraits of Type VII and VIII, shows the personification with only one child on her arm, despite the fact that at the time of its introduction (ca. A.D. 162/63) several children were alive. The reverse type alludes to the (new) birth of a child without any relation to other children of Faustina, as on previous issues of the empress.<sup>191</sup> Furthermore, S. Börner has

---

<sup>188</sup> Cf. Strack 1937, 123; Fittschen 1982, 67; Ameling 1992, 147–49; Fittschen 1999, 7 for the importance of children.

<sup>189</sup> Alexandridis 2004, 25.

<sup>190</sup> Ameling 1992, 157; Alexandridis 2004, 22, 25. The latter pointed out that even childless empresses such as Sabina could, on coins, be connected with child-related reverse types (*Pietas* with two children), expressing a more general care for the family. – The iconography of the reverse types can be shared or divided to a variable degree between Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius and Faustina.

<sup>191</sup> Ameling 1992, 157.

stressed that reverse types with a divergent number of children could overlap in use.<sup>192</sup> In consequence, the reverse types alluding to imperial offspring or the importance of producing heirs often allow for a wide range of interpretation and the evidence on coins for new births is not so strong. At some points, however, they do correspond well with the births of Faustina's children. In these cases, as will be shown, we may assume a more 'precise' meaning of the reverse types.

Of course, absolute certainty cannot be reached, as the number, order and date of birth of Faustina's many children are still disputed and some of these basic details depend to a variable degree on the numismatic evidence, causing the risk of a circular argumentation. A brief mention of the most essential evidence for the births (ancient texts, inscriptions, coins) is given below, but much rests on a combination of different sources and the probability of complex – and often competing – assumptions to be found in the referenced secondary literature.<sup>193</sup> The following section relates the real births of Faustina's presumably 14, or possibly even 15 children to reverse types alluding to imperial offspring, based on Fittschen's revised absolute chronology of births (Fittschen 1999, 2–9), adjusting his treatment of the topic where necessary. For clarity of explication, the up to 15 births/children are preceded by Arabic numbers in parentheses.

### **Faustina's children**

The date of birth of Faustina's first child, most probably (1) Domitia Faustina, on the 30th of November A.D. 147 is secured by the *Fasti Ostienses* and reflected on the earliest coinage for Faustina with portraits of Type I.<sup>194</sup> As shown above, the firstborn is commemorated with the reverse type *VENERI GENETRICI* (Fig. 18), frequently depicting the goddess with a baby on her arm, in

---

<sup>192</sup> This can best be proven by coins of Antoninus Pius from obverse dies dated to A.D. 160 and 161 (TRP XXIII–XXVIII) connected with undated child-related reverse types with three and four children in both years (Börner 2012, 141–42; cf. also Fittschen 1982, 29 nn. 44, 48). Moderately worn dies were probably not immediately taken out of use and/or the 'old' reverse types were still regarded as appropriate.

<sup>193</sup> See Manson 1976; Fittschen 1982, 22–33; Bol 1984, 31–45; Ameling 1992, 150–61; Fittschen 1999, 2–9, esp. 2 with nn. 10–12; Alexandridis 2004, 29 with n. 261. All with further references. The list of Faustina's children in Kienast 1996, 139–40 was made without knowledge of Fittschen 1982 and Bol 1984 and is on this matter without further value.

<sup>194</sup> Date of birth: *Fasti Ostienses* Pb 13–15, Vidman 1982, 51, 128. – Fittschen 1982, 23; Fittschen 1999, 2–3.

combination with the reverses IVNONI LVCINAE and LAETITIAE PVBLICAE. The birth of twins in A.D. 149, probably (2) T. Aurelius Antoninus and (3) T. Aelius Aurelius, is suggested by dated coins of Antoninus Pius, featuring the conspicuous reverse type TEMPORVM FELICITAS with two crossed *cornucopiae* with boys' heads atop (Fig. 56). On the coinage for Faustina, however, there is no allusion to this presumed birth of twin boys.<sup>195</sup> The proposed date of birth of (4) Lucilla on the 7th of March A.D. 150 was associated by Fittschen with the reverse type IVNO with the goddess and two girls (Fig. 25).<sup>196</sup> However, this reverse only appears with the earliest obverse legend of Type III in the dative case FAVSTINAE AVG PII AVG FIL, which we would expect, according to our adjusted chronology, to coincide with the introduction of Type III in the mint in A.D. 149/50 and change to FAVSTINA AVG ANTONINI AVG PII FIL soon after that in A.D. 150. An introduction of the IVNO reverse type (together with Type III) after the 7th of March A.D. 150 appears, in this light, doubtful but not impossible. Alternatively, we could consider that the reverse was not associated with a specific birth but more generally alludes to imperial offspring and the importance of producing heirs. This can be supported by the fact that the birth of (5) Annia Galeria Aurelia Faustina, probably in A.D. 151 (less likely in A.D. 153), cannot be associated with any child-related reverse types.<sup>197</sup> Likewise, the birth of (6) T. Aelius Antoninus in A.D. 152, the year secured by the *Fasti Ostienses*, is (contrary to Fittschen) not reflected on coins.<sup>198</sup>

An intensified and more distinct commemoration of the *Fecunditas Augusta(e)* on coins only seems to start in A.D. 157 with the birth of (7) a boy of unknown name.<sup>199</sup> This birth is most likely addressed by the reverse type FECVNDITATI AVGVSTAE (Fig. 30) with a female personification holding a naked

<sup>195</sup> *Temporum Felicitas*: BMCRE IV, 97, no. 678, pl. 14. 13; Strack 1937, pl. 2. 198. – Fittschen 1982, 23–24; Fittschen 1999, 6–8. These coins are the only evidence for the birth of twins. For a critical but unconvincing point of view see Ameling 1992, 152–56.

<sup>196</sup> The exact year of birth is unknown, day and month are secured by an inscription from Gortys: IGRR I, 1509. – Fittschen 1982, 26; Fittschen 1999, 3; cf. also Manson 1976, 185 n. 14.

<sup>197</sup> Fittschen 1982, 27; Fittschen 1999, 4.

<sup>198</sup> Birth of a boy (most probably T. Aelius Antoninus) in A.D. 152: *Fasti Ostienses* Qa 11, Vidman 1982, 51, 131–32. Fittschen 1982, 27–28; Fittschen 1999, 8. – The reverse type FECVNDITATI AVGVSTAE, connected by Fittschen with the birth of T. Aelius Antoninus, was only introduced in A.D. 157, as has been demonstrated above under Type V.

<sup>199</sup> See above under Type V. The single evidence for the birth is IGRR IV, 1399 = IK 24, 1 (Smyrna) 600.

boy, surrounded by two further children, a reverse type only connected with portraits of Type V. From that time onwards up to ca. A.D. 162, it appears that new imperial births were commemorated in quick succession with reverse types for (to a variable degree) Faustina, Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius. The sequence of births of (8) Fadilla (A.D. 159), (9) Cornificia (A.D. 160), the twin boys (10) L. Aurelius Commodus and (11) T. Aurelius Fulvus Antoninus (A.D. 161), and (12) M. Annus Verus (A.D. 162) is supported by the increasing number of children depicted on the succeeding reverse types up to the birth of the twin boys: three, four and six, respectively.<sup>200</sup> The suggested year of birth of Fadilla (A.D. 159) and Cornificia (A.D. 160) solely rests on the interpretation of dated coins of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius, featuring on the reverse *Pietas* with three or four children, respectively.<sup>201</sup> The corresponding issues of Faustina, however, show *Iuno Lucina* with three children (Figs. 36, 41) and *Fecunditas Augusta(e)* with four children (Fig. 37), the former reverse type connected with portraits of Type V and VI, the latter only with Type V.<sup>202</sup> The following birth of the twin boys Commodus and Antoninus on the 31st of August A.D. 161, commemorated in connection with Type V and VII with the reverse types SAECVLI FELICIT(AS) with two boys on a throne (Figs. 31–32, 45) and TEMPOR(VM) FELIC(ITAS) with six children (Figs. 38, 46), is absolutely sure because of its mention in the *Historia Augusta* and in an inscription from Gortys.<sup>203</sup> Finally, the birth of Annus Verus in A.D. 162 is probably reflected by the reverse type FECVNDITAS with a standing personification holding a naked boy on her arm (Figs. 49–50), shared between Types VII and VIII.<sup>204</sup>

<sup>200</sup> Fittschen 1982, 29–31; Fittschen 1999, 4–5, 9.

<sup>201</sup> The earliest appearance of these reverse types on coins is regarded as indicative for the respective birth as a *terminus ante quem*. The majority of these coins, however, was only minted in the (tribunician) year following the presumed birth. Fittschen 1982, 29–30 with nn. 44, 48; Fittschen 1999, 4–5; cf. also Börner 2012, 141–42 for the overlap in use of these reverse types. – Three children: Strack 1937, pl. 4. 365 (Antoninus Pius). – Four children: BMCRE IV, 151, no. 1012, pl. 21. 19 (Antoninus Pius); Strack 1937, pl. 4. 384 (Antoninus Pius); BMCRE IV, 153, no. 1019 (Marcus Aurelius); Strack 1937, pl. 5. 377, 390 (Marcus Aurelius).

<sup>202</sup> Fittschen 1982, 29–30; Fittschen 1999, 4–5.

<sup>203</sup> Birth of Commodus and Antoninus: SHA, vita Comm. 1. 2; IGRR I, 1509 (Gortys). – Fittschen 1982, 30–31; Fittschen 1999, 9.

<sup>204</sup> His year of birth is ascertained by the mention of his death in the *Historia Augusta*: he died at the age of seven, shortly after his uncle and brother-in-law Lucius Verus (SHA, vita Marci 21. 3); Fittschen 1982, 31; Fittschen 1999, 9.

The later births of (13) Hadrianus (after A.D. 162?), (14) Vibia Aurelia Sabina (A.D. 166 or 171/72?) and possibly (15) a further daughter of unknown name are not reflected on coins. Their dates of birth are disputed as the evidence is ambiguous.<sup>205</sup>

<b>Chronology of births of Faustina's children and their relation to reverse types</b>					
No.	Date of birth	Name	Evidence for date of birth	Reflected on coins of Faustina	Connected portrait type
(1)	A.D. 147	Domitia Faustina	Fasti Ostienses Pb 13–15 <sup>206</sup>	Yes	Type I
(2+3)	A.D. 149	T. Aurelius Antoninus, T. Aelius Aurelius	Coins	No	
(4)	A.D. 150	Lucilla	Combination of different sources	Doubtful	Type III
(5)	A.D. 151	Annia Faustina	Combination of different sources	No	
(6)	A.D. 152	T. Aelius Antoninus	Fasti Ostienses Qa 11 <sup>207</sup>	No	
(7)	A.D. 157	Boy of unknown name	IGRR IV, 1399 = IK 24, 1 (Smyrna) 600	Yes	Type V
(8)	A.D. 159	Fadilla	Coins	Yes (presumably)	Type V, VI
(9)	A.D. 160	Cornificia	Coins	Yes (presumably)	Type V
(10+11)	A.D. 161	L. Aurelius Commodus Fulvus Antoninus	SHA, vita Comm. 1. 2 IGRR I, 1509	Yes	Type V, VII
(12)	A.D. 162	M. Annius Verus	SHA, vita Marci 21. 3 (mention of death)	Yes	Type VII, VIII
(13)	after A.D. 162	Hadrianus	inconclusive	No	
(14)	?	Vibia Sabina	inconclusive	No	
(15)	?	Daughter of unknown name?	inconclusive	No	

As can be demonstrated, of the maximum of 15 births of Faustina (1–15), seven are most likely reflected on her coinage by reverse types alluding to imperial offspring (1, 7–12). For two of those seven, however, the births of Fadilla and Cornificia (8 and 9), the coins are the only evidence we have for their date of birth, making the argument less certain in these cases. Concerning the birth of Lucilla

<sup>205</sup> Fittschen 1982, 31–32, 43; Fittschen 1999, 5–6, 9.

<sup>206</sup> Vidman 1982, 51, 128.

<sup>207</sup> Vidman 1982, 51, 131–32.

(4), it is probably better not to press the evidence too far, the reverse type IVNO with the goddess and two girls should for the moment be better seen as a general allusion to imperial offspring.

In other words, only about half of the births of Faustina's children are reflected on her coinage and the reverse types alluding to imperial offspring reveal no clear pattern or system as to which imperial births were commemorated on the coins. However, the chronological distribution of the new births reflected on the coins of Faustina is conspicuous. Clearly, the birth of Faustina's first child and the conferral of the title *Augusta* mark the outset of her coinage and are referred to on the coins issued for her. An intensified commemoration of the *Fecunditas Augusta(e)*, however, with distinct reverse types reflecting the new birth of imperial offspring only seems to start in A.D. 157 with the boy of unknown name and last until ca. A.D. 162, when Annius Verus was born. The reverse types reflecting these seven births are connected with portraits of Types I and V–VIII during some point of the portrait types' usage and it remains to relate these reverse types to the portrait types.

#### **Relation of the portrait types on coins to birth-related reverse types**

Of the ten portrait types discussed above (Types I–X), three types (Types I, III and VII) were most probably introduced in the mint in connection with reverse types alluding to imperial offspring. For Type VIII this is possible but unsure, as the reverse type *FECVNDITAS* with a standing personification holding a naked boy (Figs. 49–50) may already have been introduced under Type VII. A further two types (Types V and VI) are only connected with child-related reverse types some time after they were introduced. This is absolutely certain, as reverses alluding to imperial offspring only appear on the coins after the filiation was dropped during their period of use. The remaining four types (Types II, IV, IX, X) show no connection with reverse types alluding to imperial offspring at all.

To put it simply, for a total of at least six out of ten types (Types II, IV, V, VI, IX, X) it is not possible to be connected at all with reverse types alluding to imperial offspring when they were introduced in

the mint, simply because the coins either feature no child-related reverses or they appear only later, after the type was already employed for a while. If we now compare the remaining four types (Types I, III, VII and VIII) and their connected reverses alluding to imperial offspring to the reverse types reflecting real births of Faustina, we observe that only three of those four portrait types relate at their introduction in the mint to reverse types reflecting real births (Types I, VII, VIII), while the child-related reverse type connected with Type III most probably alludes more generally to imperial offspring and the importance of producing heirs. In ancient historical terms that means that most probably only the births of Domitia Faustina (A.D. 147), Commodus and Antoninus (A.D. 161), and possibly Annius Verus (A.D. 162) were commemorated on coins at the same time as a new portrait type was introduced in the mint.<sup>208</sup>

In the light of the new evidence presented above, it can be established that an overlap and shift in the usage of the portrait types as well as child-related reverse types shared between them make it doubtful that reverse types alluding to imperial offspring were associated with specific portrait types. Moreover, only about half of the births of Faustina are reflected on coins during some point of the usage of the connected portrait types and no clear pattern or system is discernible as to which births are commemorated. Finally, and most importantly, only three out of ten portrait types can be connected with reverse types reflecting real births of Faustina's children at their introduction in the mint. In consequence, Fittschen's hypothesis that most, if not all, types were created successively to coincide with the birth of Faustina's children, has to be rejected. This also reduces the probability that the remaining three portrait types (Types I, VII and VIII) were created to commemorate new births.

Since it can be demonstrated that at least seven, if not all, portrait types of Faustina were not conceived to commemorate the birth of Faustina's children, we need to come back to the basic

---

<sup>208</sup> In the case of Type VIII, the reverse associated with the birth of a child could already have been introduced under Type VII.

question of when and why the types were created. While it can be argued that at least some portrait types of the empress reflect more than just a changing fashion of female hairstyles, it is far from sure that they were created to commemorate specific occasions.<sup>209</sup> Possible explanations will have to be found later, after the typology of the sculptured portraits of Faustina has been reassessed.

### **Production of dies**

Extremely fine-cut dies, the majority for gold and bronze denominations, even indicating the hair on the eyebrow, are not uncommon up to Type V. From the later usage of Type V onwards, a clear decrease in elaboration and detail is discernible compared to the earlier types – the hairstyle especially is rendered in a more simplified manner.

On *denarii*, a reduction of the complexity of the portraits, and especially of the hairstyles, can frequently be observed from Type I onwards. This is often combined with hasty and careless carving, both suggesting a certain ‘economy of production’ for the dies of *denarii*, as they were needed in large quantities.<sup>210</sup>

The large quantity of *denarii* and their variable quality offer further insights into the workings of the mint: independent of the care taken and time used for cutting the dies (as far as this can be deduced from the coins), a wide variation in the skill of the die-cutters is observable, as even a hastily carved die can reveal an experienced hand by the fluent use of the engraving tool, and the most careful die of an unexperienced die-cutter may still look heavy-handed. Furthermore, the varied rendering suggests that at any given time a considerable number of die-cutters must have been involved in the production of dies in the Antonine mint.

---

<sup>209</sup> For the hypothesis of types for specific occasions see Fittschen 1982, 18; Fittschen 2010, 228–32.

<sup>210</sup> Cf. BMCRE IV, p. xliii for the relation of quantity and quality of work of the *denarii*. The large quantities are also confirmed by the fact, that it is rarely possible to identify pieces from the same dies.

### **Adjustment of portrait types in the mint**

The slight forward lean of the neck and head of all types of Faustina on coins (Fig. 6) can also be observed on sculptured busts. The coin portrait of Marcus Aurelius (Figs. 1–5), in contrast, follows different rules: despite a forward tilt of the neck and head of his sculptured busts, this feature is not transferred into coin-format. Instead, Marcus Aurelius is (almost) always depicted with a straight neck and head. A second feature of sculptured busts of Faustina and Marcus Aurelius, a (slight) turn of the head, shows the exact opposite distribution on coins: it is frequently indicated by a diagonal indentation on the neck of Marcus Aurelius (also defining the position of the neck and the head in relation to the shoulder) but never occurs on coins of Faustina.

These differentiations reflect media-specific practices that further distinguish female portraits on coins from male portraits. The careful adjustments conferring life and movement to sculptured portraits find their equivalent in coin-format, however, clearly not running completely parallel, as can be demonstrated. Marcus' coin portrait is energetic, he is depicted upright and vigilant, with his head slightly turned, from the first portraits up to A.D. 180, despite changing portrait types and a gradual advance in age. The portrait of Faustina on coins, however, follows different perceptions. Her likeness features a smooth and fluent transition between bust, neck and head. The neck frequently displays 'Venus rings'. Movement is indicated by the slight forward lean of the neck and the head, all of this underlining the female beauty of the young mother and matron.

### **The imperial portrait in the mint of Rome: models**

It is generally thought that portrait types introduced in the mint are based on three-dimensional models or prototypes, equally employed for sculpture and coins.<sup>211</sup> This is almost certain for the types of Faustina's portrait that are firmly established in sculpture by reliable 'core-groups' of closely 'copied' examples (Types I, V, VII, VIII) that also well correspond to coin portraits. It is fairly certain

---

<sup>211</sup> See for example Fittschen 1971, 220–22; Fittschen 1977, 7; Fittschen 2015, 53.

for the two portrait types that are only known from one or two sculptured versions each (Types III, X) but closely correspond to the coins and, furthermore, share distinct physiognomic features with other sculptured types.

For the remaining four types on coins (Types II, IV, VI, IX) it is not so certain that they existed in the round, as will be demonstrated in the following chapter: all sculptured portraits previously suggested have to be excluded from the portrait list of Faustina. This should most probably not be ascribed to the chances of survival or insufficient publication, as will be shown. Other explanations have to be found as to why these types are well established on coins but missing in sculpture.

It is possible that some adjustments or modifications of the image were put through the mint only, without making the model available for a distribution in the round as it might not have been considered sufficiently important for a sculptured 'replication'. Such 'coin portrait types' in a literal sense could have been based on three-dimensional or two-dimensional (graphic) models. The latter option is especially likely if only the hairstyle changed in comparison to the preceding type. Instead of an impetus from outside the mint, such changes could equally have originated within the mint and stayed there.<sup>212</sup> This would imply that the creation of portrait types was not restricted to 'official' commissions, with some sort of 'Palatine involvement', but that a new type could also be conceived in the mint, by the mint administration.

If we return to the portrait types that were almost certainly based on three-dimensional models equally employed for sculpture and coins (Types I, III, V, VII, VIII, X), we may assume the following intermediary steps preceding the actual cutting of the dies: most probably an official three-dimensional model ('Palatine model') was first converted into a relief or two-dimensional model ('authorised mint model'), as the portraits on the dies were almost certainly not cut directly from a

---

<sup>212</sup> This idea was first sketched by Smith 1983, 229.

life-size three-dimensional model.<sup>213</sup> It appears, that this 'authorised mint model' was the basis, the point of reference, for 'work-models', either two-dimensional (graphic) or in relief, that set the conversions of the portrait into coin-format, that is, its rendering on the die ('die design'). Some of these 'die designs' could be influential and were 'copied' by various die-cutters, as set out above under Type I and also observed under Type III. These 'work-models' reflect a level below the 'authorised mint model', and several of them must have existed at any time. They were probably the models directly in front of the eyes of the individual die-cutters when they engraved the dies.

For the remaining four types (Types II, IV, VI, IX), however, we have to expect a slightly different scenario, as they were probably only put through the mint or even originated within the mint and stayed there. In both cases the 'original' model or design could simply have been two-dimensional, rather than three-dimensional, as only the profile view was needed. It was then converted into an 'authorised mint model'. The other steps of the procedure would have been the same as before.

---

<sup>213</sup> If they were engraved directly from a three-dimensional model, we would have to expect a much higher level of variability as the portrait had to be turned into profile view, reduced in size and adapted to the small scale (with the inevitable loss of detail) – all in one step and by each die-cutter.

## CHAPTER 3

### Faustina: Marble Portraits

#### A. RESEARCH HISTORY AND STATE OF RESEARCH

The outset of modern study of Faustina's sculptured portraits is marked by J. J. Bernoulli's *Römische Ikonographie II. 2* (1891).<sup>214</sup> The publication compiled a number of portraits out of the vast quantity of likenesses regarded to depict or resemble Faustina, and Bernoulli attempted to group them as well as to assess, predominantly by coin comparison, how likely it is that they indeed represent the empress. Because of the varied coin portraits and the variability of sculptured likenesses as well as the general resemblance with Lucilla and other contemporary portraits in the round, he concluded that any attribution involves (considerable) uncertainties.<sup>215</sup> Some 40 years later, further progress was made with a brief discussion of the sculptured portraits by F. Poulsen in 1932.<sup>216</sup>

Essential for the typology and chronology of Faustina's sculptured portraits was P. Strack's aforementioned *Untersuchungen zur römischen Reichsprägung des zweiten Jahrhunderts. Teil III* (1937) on imperial coinage under Antoninus Pius.<sup>217</sup> His classification of the coin portraits by hairstyle and the proposed chronological sequence of the types was the foundation for further research on sculptured portraits of Faustina the Younger.<sup>218</sup>

M. Wegner's re-evaluation of Strack's typology in his study on Antonine portraiture *Die Herrscherbildnisse in antoninischer Zeit* (1939) resulted in a partial reclassification and in a renaming of all the types after the respective hairstyle. Wegner's main achievement, however, was his ability

---

<sup>214</sup> Bernoulli 1891, 189–98.

<sup>215</sup> Bernoulli 1891, 196–97.

<sup>216</sup> Poulsen 1932, 83–89.

<sup>217</sup> Strack 1937, 14–21.

<sup>218</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1982, 34 with nn. 1–2 for further remarks.

to convincingly relate five out of his seven types on coins to portraits in the round, for most of them plausibly identifying several versions. Still, Wegner failed to clearly set forth the typological features a sculptured portrait requires to be considered a version of a type under his classification.<sup>219</sup>

Fundamental for every preoccupation with the subject and based on a clearly set out method is K. Fittschen's short treatment of Faustina's sculptured portraits in the *Katalog der antiken Skulpturen in Schloss Erbach* (1977) and in the third volume of the Capitoline portrait catalogue (1983).<sup>220</sup> The most comprehensive study on the subject, however, remains his influential publication *Die Bildnistypen der Faustina minor und die Fecunditas Augustae* (1982).<sup>221</sup> Based on an adjustment of Strack's and Wegner's typology, using the sole criterion of hairstyle he identified nine portrait types and their variations on coins and related them to portraits in the round, identifying sculptured versions of up to eight of these types with a varying degree of certainty.<sup>222</sup>

## B. PORTRAIT TYPES

In his above-mentioned monograph, Fittschen collected 70 surviving sculptured marble portraits – heads, busts and statues – and divided them between eight of his nine portrait types of Faustina (F-Types 1–9).<sup>223</sup> His study of Faustina's sculptured portraits is complicated by the fact that non-imperial 'private' portraits frequently resemble portraits of imperial women. In consequence, the attribution of a portrait in the round to a type and the identification (naming) of the subject depicted by the type is in some case problematic and a strict, methodologically explicit approach is vital.

---

<sup>219</sup> Wegner 1939, 48–55.

<sup>220</sup> Fittschen 1977, 84–88; Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 20–24.

<sup>221</sup> Fittschen 1982.

<sup>222</sup> Fittschen 1982, 34–65; Smith 1983, 228–29.

<sup>223</sup> Fittschen 1982, 44–65 including p. 45 no. 6 a and the addendum p. 65; cf. also Wegner 1980, 12–37 for an earlier list of Faustina the Younger's portraits.

Only for some of Fittschen's nine types of Faustina have a sufficiently large number of portraits survived to establish a reliable 'core-group' of closely 'copied' examples ('replicas') that allows conclusions to be drawn on the design, appearance and style of the underlying model. Clustering around these 'core-groups' are freer versions of the types that can only be attributed with a varying degree of certainty, making it in some cases probable but not provable that these portraits depict the same person.<sup>224</sup> To other types, Fittschen only attributed a few less certain versions, while for one type (his F-Type 2) he was not able to detect sculptured examples at all, as will be seen below. The uncertainties involved in this classification make it worth reassessing the prevalent typology of sculptured portraits.

The identification of the empress (naming of the subject) depends for every type in sculpture primarily on the comparison of the respective 'core-group', usually comprising versions of high quality, with coin portraits of Faustina the Younger on imperial coins and medallions.<sup>225</sup> The main criterion for this comparison is the accordance of the hairstyle between the two media (coins and sculpture). However, in several cases the hairstyle does not completely conform, as a certain variability in both media has to be taken into account.

The reassessment of the prevalent typology of sculptured portraits is based on the adjusted typology of coin portraits, including the previously unidentified portrait type ('New Type'), set out in the preceding chapter on Faustina's coinage. As already stated there, the adjusted typology and the modified type names (Types I–X) are kept throughout this study. Only where necessary for clarity, Fittschen's corresponding types (F-Types 1–9) are quoted. Portrait lists for all of Faustina the Younger's sculptured types can be found in the Appendix.

---

<sup>224</sup> Smith 1983, 228.

<sup>225</sup> Poulsen 1932, 85; Wegner 1939, 51; Smith 1983, 228. Besides coin comparison, typologically set physiognomic features such as the hanging upper eyelids of Types VII, VIII and X also assist the identification of the subject.

### First portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type I)

Literature and designation of type: Strack 1937, 15 n. 26: 'T. a/T. a1'; Wegner 1939, 49, 51–52: '*S-Löckchen-Melonenfrisur*' or '*Typus Museo Capitolino, Imperatori 39*' (currently 32); Fittschen 1977, 84–88: '*Typus Erbach*'; Fittschen 1982, 34–35, 38–39, 44–48: '*1. Bildnistypus*'; Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 20–21: '*1. Bildnistypus*' (F-Type 1).

A total of 11 sculptured portraits have been attributed to the earliest portrait type of Faustina by Fittschen.<sup>226</sup> A portrait sold at Sotheby's New York (Fig. 57) and a veiled marble head from a statue in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York (Fig. 58), presumably from Asia Minor, have to be added.<sup>227</sup> The majority of them (nine versions) originate from Italy.<sup>228</sup> From the remaining four versions of provincial (non-Italian) origin, the attribution of two pieces, a portrait in Tripoli from the theatre in Leptis Magna (Fig. 59) and a marble head in Munich, Glyptothek 535 (reportedly from Jordan) (Fig. 60), is doubtful and they would be better excluded from the portrait list of Faustina, as will be demonstrated below.<sup>229</sup> This leaves us, despite the adjustments, with an unchanged number of 11 sculptured versions for Type I.

Four metropolitan portraits, one each in the Vatican Museums, Braccio Nuovo 54 (Fig. 61), the Palazzo Spada (Fig. 62), and at Schloss Erbach (Fig. 63), as well as a complete bust of extraordinary quality in the Capitoline Museum, Stanza degli Imperatori 32 (Fig. 64) from Hadrian's Villa at Tivoli, allow us to establish a reliable 'core-group'.<sup>230</sup> The careful work on all sides of the portraits in combination with the high level of correspondence between each other and their similarity in size

---

<sup>226</sup> Fittschen 1982, 44–47, nos. 1–10 (including 6 a); Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 20 with n. 7.

<sup>227</sup> Sotheby's New York, Sale 5 June 2013, Lot 50; not seen by author. – New York, Metropolitan Museum, accession no. 1986.40; Zanker 2016, 218–19, no. 82, figs. pp. 218–19.

<sup>228</sup> Fittschen 1982, 44–46, nos. 1–5, 7, 9–10 and the portrait sold at Sotheby's New York. In accordance with Fittschen's approach for the portraits of Marcus Aurelius (Fittschen 1999, 13 n. 115), it is here and in the following assumed that portraits from old European collections without established provenance most likely originated from Italy; in many cases this can be supported on stylistic grounds.

<sup>229</sup> Head in Munich, Glyptothek 535: Fittschen 1982, 46, no. 8, pl. 12. 3–4. – Portrait from Leptis Magna, Tripoli, museum inv. 483: Caputo – Traversari 1976, 95, no. 73, pls. 78–79; Fittschen 1982, 45, no. 6 a.

<sup>230</sup> Rome, Vatican Museums, Braccio Nuovo 54, inv. 2193: Fittschen 1982, 44, no. 2, pl. 9. 1–4. – Rome, Palazzo Spada (Galleria Spada): Fittschen 1982, 44, no. 4, pl. 10. 1–4. – Schloss Erbach: Fittschen 1977, 84–88, no. 31, pls. 34. 3–4; 36; Fittschen 1982, 45, no. 5. – Rome, Museo Capitolino, Stanza degli Imperatori 32, inv. 449: Fittschen 1982, 44, no. 1, pl. 8. 1–4; Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 20–21, no. 19, pls. 24–26; tip of nose and bust-foot restored.

show that they stand close to a single model.<sup>231</sup> This ‘core-group’ secures the identification of the type (naming of the subject) by coin comparison.<sup>232</sup>

The underlying type can be described as follows, starting with the elaborate hairstyle: forehead and temples are framed on both sides of the centre parting by four overlapping rows of flattened hair loops each, the lowest covering the upper part of the ear. The ends of these hair loops are woven into a thin braid that separates the front section of the coiffure from the rear. The rear part features a division of the hair into three segments on each side, running to the back of the head like ridges (‘melon-hairstyle’ or ‘Melonenfrisur’) and braided into several plaits forming a small coiled bun right above the nape that is held together by a vertical plait. Moreover, the hair in the neck is taken up and woven into the thin braid that runs into the bun. The centre parting is covered by a strand of hair that runs from the forehead to the nape.<sup>233</sup> The face is rounded but, on the majority of versions, lean. The brows are raised; the eyes are large but not bulging. The nose, where preserved, is straight; the mouth is small with full lips. The chin is hardly pronounced and in relation to the head, the neck is comparatively thin – in combination with the hairstyle conferring the youthful appeal of a ‘marriageable girl’ to the type.

*Adjustments to the portrait list.* Most of the metropolitan versions show a high degree of accordance with respect to the hairstyle with only minor variation of details. However, the physiognomy of some portraits already seems to look slightly more mature with a fuller face, as the youthful type of the ‘marriageable girl’ was in some cases probably superimposed by the perception of Faustina as young mother and matron.<sup>234</sup>

---

<sup>231</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1977, 85–86; Fittschen 1982, 45; Smith 1983, 228 for the typological connection.

<sup>232</sup> Fittschen 1977, 86 with n. 8; Fittschen 1982, 45–46; Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 20.

<sup>233</sup> Wegner 1939, 51; Fittschen 1977, 85; Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 20. The ‘melon-hairstyle’ is a coiffure that derives from the Classical Greek era. In the Roman imperial period it was especially popular for the representation of girls and young women, here combined with the contemporary elements of hairstyle framing the forehead and a coiled bun. The low position of the bun is explained by the melon-hairstyle and its tradition (cf. Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 20–21 with nn. 14–15).

<sup>234</sup> For the variable physiognomy cf. Fittschen 1977, 86; Fittschen 1982, 47.

The attribution of the veiled portrait in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York (Fig. 58), supposedly from Asia Minor, to Faustina's Type I has recently been questioned by P. Zanker because of the fuller and more rounded face and the more mature look in relation to the type.<sup>235</sup> However, the first portrait type of Faustina (Type I), so popular on provincial coins and used on Alexandrian coinage until A.D. 160/61, was most probably still employed and adapted in the provinces for sculptured versions when newer types were already available in Rome.<sup>236</sup> In the present case, this is clearly supported by the more mature physiognomy and the slightly hanging upper eyelids resembling later portrait types of Faustina – the portrait should be accepted as a likeness of the empress.

More problematic is the attribution of the two provincial portraits in Tripoli from the theatre in Leptis Magna (Fig. 59) and in Munich, Glyptothek 535 (Fig. 60), reportedly from Jordan. Their connection with Faustina's Type I has to be reassessed. The first of them, the portrait in Tripoli, is accepted to have been part of an imperial portrait group including Marcus Aurelius (Type III), Faustina the Younger (Type VII), Lucius Verus in his main type and Lucilla in her first type.<sup>237</sup> It was thought to depict Faustina the Younger in her first type (Type I).<sup>238</sup> However, as Faustina the Younger would in that case have been represented in the statue group twice and the portrait discussed here is of considerably smaller scale than her portrait of Type VII, this is an unlikely assumption. Therefore, Fittschen suggested that the head represents a further daughter of Marcus Aurelius and Faustina, possibly Annia Galeria Aurelia Faustina.<sup>239</sup> Nevertheless, he maintained his attribution to Faustina's

---

<sup>235</sup> Zanker 2016, 219.

<sup>236</sup> Alexandrian coinage: cf. Strack 1937, 16 with n. 27; Fittschen 1982, 39 n. 7 a. – Continued use of older portrait types: Fittschen 2010, 231–32 with n. 39.

<sup>237</sup> For the group see Caputo – Traversari 1976, 92–97, nos. 71–75, pls. 74–83; Fittschen 1999, 116, no. 25; Deppmeyer 2008, 287–90, no. 137.

<sup>238</sup> Caputo – Traversari 1976, 95, no. 73; Fittschen 1977, 85, no. 8; Wegner 1980, 35.

<sup>239</sup> Fittschen 1982, 45; Fittschen 1999, 116 under no. 25.

Type I, arguing that an (at the time of the deployment) outdated type of the empress (Type I) was used for the statue group to represent one of her daughters.<sup>240</sup>

However, a variation of the arrangement of the frontal hair in relation to Faustina's Type I was observed by him and Wegner before him.<sup>241</sup> Especially the sides of the portrait reveal distinct differences: the four overlapping segments of hair on both sides of the centre parting do not form flattened hair loops with their ends pointing upwards but wavy sections of hair that are combed towards the back. Furthermore, on the top of the head to either side of the centre parting, a conspicuous, flattened 'pin curl' is visible, underlining a conception of the hairstyle that differs from Faustina's coiffure in her Type I.<sup>242</sup> Clearly, the head has to be excluded from the portrait list of Faustina.

The second portrait with a problematic attribution, the head in Munich, Glyptothek 535 (Fig. 60), from Jordan, only takes the frontal composition of the flattened hair loops from the official Type I of Faustina.<sup>243</sup> The physiognomy is of a too generic youthful appearance to securely connect it with portraits of Faustina, and the eyes with the distinct shift to her right, following the turn of the head, do not appear on any other version of the empress's first type. In addition, the hair on the crown of the head behind the circlet, combed back straight and loosely falling onto the nape underneath the circlet, has no connection with the type.<sup>244</sup> If the portrait is indeed meant to represent Faustina in her first type, which is not provable, it was heavily adapted for a local context. Again, we probably do better in excluding it from Faustina's portrait list.<sup>245</sup>

---

<sup>240</sup> Fittschen 1982, 45–46. – Elsewhere Fittschen argued that 'old portrait types did not lose their validity' (Fittschen 2010, 231–32 with n. 39).

<sup>241</sup> Wegner 1980, 35; Fittschen 1982, 45.

<sup>242</sup> 'Pin curl' is an entirely modern term reflecting modern hairdressing practices (Stephens 2008, 111 with n. 4), here only used to describe the shape of the hair.

<sup>243</sup> This kind of hairstyle was not restricted to imperial portraits but frequently also occurs in 'private' portraiture (see Fittschen 1982, 48 with n. 17, pl. 14. 1–4; Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 20 with n. 15 for further examples).

<sup>244</sup> Cf. Wegner 1980, 23; Fittschen 1982, 46 for the adjustments.

<sup>245</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1977, 87 n. 5, who was still hesitant to accept the portrait as a likeness of Faustina because of the deviations from the type but considered a 'provinzielle Vereinfachung des Haupttypus'.

*Variation and subdivision of the type.* As the head in Munich, Glyptothek 535 (Fig. 60), is also one of only two examples of Fittschen's so-called 'Variante b' of Faustina's Type I, we need to review if his classification of the type can be sustained: in his monograph, he subdivided Type I by variations of the hairstyle into three variants ('Variante a–c') – in his view reflecting characteristics of different marble workshops.<sup>246</sup> Fittschen's Variant b is characterised by four flattened hair loops and a small lock in front of the right ear. Both examples, the head in Munich, Glyptothek 535, and the likeness of Faustina of the famous statue group of Faustina and Marcus Aurelius depicted like Venus and Mars in the Capitoline Museum (Fig. 65), are portraits adapted for a specific context (assuming we accept the attribution of the head in Munich for the sake of the following argument).<sup>247</sup> However, the portrait head of Faustina depicted like Venus (Fig. 66) only features in relation to Faustina's Type I the addition of two long, loose curls falling onto her shoulders and a stephane as an attribute to emphasise Faustina's Venus-like appearance, but keeps the main typological features of the hairstyle of her first type.<sup>248</sup> The only typological connection between the portrait of Faustina depicted like Venus and the head in Munich, Glyptothek 535, is the number of flattened hair loops and a small lock in front of the right ear.<sup>249</sup> That means, even if we were to accept the head in Munich as a likeness of the empress, the two portraits could be described as adaptations in relation to Type I, but in relation to each other they would hardly constitute a consistent variant of the type, other than on a very theoretical level of modern typology. As a result, Variant b should be dismissed.

Variant a, characterised by four flattened hair loops (without a small lock in front of the right ear), might be better not seen as a variant, as it is Fittschen's 'Hauptversion' ('main version'), comprising of his 'core-group' of Type I around the bust in the Capitoline Museum (Stanza degli Imperatori 32) (Fig. 64) and considered to stand close to the underlying model.<sup>250</sup>

---

<sup>246</sup> See Fittschen 1982, 44–47, esp. 46 for Variant b.

<sup>247</sup> Capitoline group, Museo Capitolino, Salone 34, inv. 652: Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 69–70, no. 64, pls. 74–75.

<sup>248</sup> This is also the reason why Fittschen 1977, 85 still grouped the portrait under his 'main type'.

<sup>249</sup> Fittschen 1982, 46.

<sup>250</sup> See Fittschen 1977, 84–88; Fittschen 1982, 44–45.

Lastly, Fittschen's Variant c comprises of two versions in Munich, Glyptothek 408 (Fig. 67) and in Rome, Palazzo Colonna (Fig. 68).<sup>251</sup> It is characterised by only three rows of flattened hair loops instead of four on either side of the centre parting in the front and four ridged segments of hair each instead of three in the back.<sup>252</sup> The fourth ridged segment on either side towards the neck of both versions, however, is not very distinct and probably better described as the hair 'filling' the gap between the lowest ridge and the thin separating braid.

Because of the four ridged segments and the agreement in the number of rows of flattened hair loops, it could be argued that Variant c should perhaps be accepted and the two versions might indeed reflect specific workshop characteristics. However, a closer look at the evidence casts general doubts on the subdivision of types, that necessitate a few general methodological remarks, here exemplified by versions of Faustina the Younger's Type I: variations in the rendering of the hair, especially of the flipped ends of the hair loops towards the braid were first described by Fittschen in 1977.<sup>253</sup> He noticed that this feature was worked in extraordinary detail and relief on the Capitoline bust (Stanza degli Imperatori 32) (Fig. 64) while on many other versions the overlapping of the individual hair loops is indicated as less articulated. The way these flipped ends of the hair loops and their overlapping are worked is regarded a stylistic difference, while the number of loops, four versus three, and the existence (or non-existence) of a small lock in front of the right ear, are thought to be variations of motif – variations that constitute Fittschen's Variants a–c (Variante a–c).

To what extent these differentiations between style and motif and between different motifs depend on the modern viewer is easily demonstrable: in the differentiation and rendering of the third and fourth hair loop, a portrait of Faustina's Type I in Rome, Vatican (Museo Chiaramonti) (Fig. 69) (Variant a), has a closer resemblance to the portrait in Munich, Glyptothek 408 (Fig. 67) (Variant c)

---

<sup>251</sup> Head in Munich, Glyptothek 408: Fittschen 1982, 46, no. 9, pl. 13. 1–2. – Bust in Rome, Palazzo Colonna: Fittschen 1982, 46, no. 10, pl. 13. 3–4; Trunk 1999, 221, pl. 52 a–d.

<sup>252</sup> Fittschen 1982, 46–47.

<sup>253</sup> Fittschen 1977, 86.

with only three hair loops than to the Capitoline bust (Stanza degli Imperatori 32) (Fig. 64) (Variant a).<sup>254</sup> The Capitoline bust shows a distinct differentiation between the third and the fourth loop, carefully articulated in raised relief with a clear recess between them towards the face, while the former two portraits in Rome and Munich subdivide one large segment of hair, hanging down in a continuous wave towards the face but internally further differentiated with grooves and ridges. The differences between the versions further blur if we also take into account the portrait in Rome, Palazzo Colonna (Fig. 68) (Variant c). By modern definition it shows three loops of hair on either side, but one could also argue for four or five, as the internal subdivision of the third loop shows further distinctive ridges. The final and probably most compelling example is the portrait head sold at Sotheby's New York (Fig. 57), linking together Fittschen's Variants a and c. This version is characterised by a variation of the flattened hair loops that blurs a clear distinction between three or four hair loops by adding further ridges representing overlapping segments of hair.<sup>255</sup>

*Discussion.* The point of these comparisons should have become sufficiently clear: style and motif are not clearly distinguishable and the subdivision of the type gives minor variations greater importance than they deserve. There is no clear system or pattern behind the variants: we are not observing a real change of motifs but a variation around design elements that do not reveal insights into the ancient processes behind it. Fittschen's labelling of the versions into Variants a–c (Variante a–c) mirrors an attempt to closely connect the sculptured portraits with the variations observed by him on coins (Variante a–d).<sup>256</sup> This match between coins and sculpture is too closely pressed throughout Fittschen's monograph, as will be demonstrated in this study. Both coins and sculptured portraits show a variation around certain design elements of the type, but the coin and sculpture variations appear to be independent of one another.

---

<sup>254</sup> Rome, Vatican, Museo Chiaramonti XXXV 8, inv. 1740: Fittschen 1982, 44, no. 3, pl. 11. 1–2; Head on modern bust, bun and part of the adjoining hair restored; it now features four ridged segments of hair in the back but shows modern reworking in this area!

<sup>255</sup> In the back, behind the frontal hair-scheme, the portrait features three ridged segments on either side.

<sup>256</sup> Variations of Type I on coins: Fittschen 1982, 34–35.

## Second portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type II)

Literature and designation of type: Strack 1937, 15 n. 26: 'T. b'; Wegner 1939, 49, 52: '*Stirnschuppenfrisur*'; Fittschen 1982, 35, 39, 48: '*2. Bildnistypus*' (F-Type 2).

No sculptured versions of this portrait type have been identified so far. This is not thought significant by Fittschen but rather seen as a random gap in the survival of the archaeological evidence or a lack in (sufficient) publication of extant material, in his reasoning supported by the existence of sculptured versions for all the remaining eight of his nine types (F-Types 1–9).<sup>257</sup>

*Discussion.* Fittschen's argumentation has to be reassessed at a later point, as it will be demonstrated below that several types found on coins seem not to exist in sculpture, making it unlikely that all of them are missing due to the chance of survival or a lack of publication. Furthermore, the example Fittschen gives as an illustration of what the hair framing the forehead and temples could have looked like in the round, a 'private' portrait in the Vatican (Fig. 70), is not convincing, as the loosely overlapping rows of flattened hair loops stand closer in appearance to the sculptured portraits and coin portraits of Type I than to the coin portraits of Type II.<sup>258</sup>

## Third portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type III)

Literature and designation of type: Strack 1937, 15 n. 26: 'T. b1/T. c'; Wegner 1939, 49, 52: '*abgesetzte Stirnwellenfrisur mit hohem Nest*' or '*Stirnwellenfrisur mit großem Nest*'; Fittschen 1982, 35–36, 39–40, 48–49: '*3. Bildnistypus*' (F-Type 3).

Only two portraits have been attributed by Fittschen to the third portrait type of Faustina.<sup>259</sup> Both versions: two heads in Rome, in the Vatican, Museo Chiaramonti (Fig. 71) and in the Palazzo Spada (Fig. 72), are of metropolitan origin.<sup>260</sup>

---

<sup>257</sup> Wegner 1939, 52; Fittschen 1977, 87 n. 9; Fittschen 1982, 48. However, cf. Smith 1983, 229.

<sup>258</sup> Fittschen 1982, 48 with n. 17, pl. 14. 1–4 for the 'private' portrait in Rome, Vatican.

<sup>259</sup> Fittschen 1982, 48–49, no. 1–2.

<sup>260</sup> Rome, Vatican, Museo Chiaramonti XV 9, inv. 1416: Fittschen 1982, 49, no. 1, pl. 15. 1–4; nose and part of the bun restored, bust does not belong. – Rome, Palazzo Spada, Galleria Spada: Fittschen 1982, 49, no. 2, pl. 16. 1–4; nose restored and face reworked, bust does not belong.

The level of accordance between the two marble heads is high, securing them as versions of the same type, but the number of versions is too low to establish a reliable 'core-group'. The naming of the type (identification of the subject) is suggested by coin comparison and is fairly certain, although the bun of the two sculptured versions appears to sit slightly higher on the head in relation to the majority of the coin portraits.<sup>261</sup>

The description of the type is oriented on the two extant versions, keeping in mind that they are no substitute for the model but in some way or another adjusted: forehead and temples are framed on both sides of a centre parting by a waved section of hair combed from the front to the back of the head and covering half of the ear. A small lock partly escapes the wave in front of the ear on either side. Behind this frontal composition, the hair runs undivided to the back of the head, where it is braided into a large coiled bun formed from a double row of plaits over the crown of the head. Likewise, the two front waves and the hair on the neck are taken up and run into the bun; only a few short strands and locks escape and fall onto the nape.<sup>262</sup>

The description of the physiognomy of the type is problematic as the face of the head in the Palazzo Spada (Fig. 72) is heavily reworked and most of the observations have to rely, in consequence, particularly on the head in the Museo Chiaramonti (Fig. 71): the face is rounder and fuller compared to Type I. The brows are raised, the eyes large and probably slightly bulging. The nose is not preserved on either version; the mouth is small with full lips and the chin is hardly pronounced.

*Discussion.* As can be shown, even a low number of portraits can suffice to establish the existence of a sculptural type and to identify (name) it with reasonable certainty if the accordance between the versions and their correspondence with the coin portraits is high enough.

---

<sup>261</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1982, 49 for the level of accordance and naming of the type; see also Smith 1983, 229. The position of the bun on the coins is still within a range of variation we should allow for the identification. See, however, Beckmann 2014, 42–43 for a more critical position but unconvincing conclusions.

<sup>262</sup> For a brief description of the hairstyle cf. Fittschen 1982, 49.

#### Fourth portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type IV)

Literature and designation of type: Strack 1937, 15 n. 26: 'T. c1'; Wegner 1939, 49–50: disregarded as rare variation; Fittschen 1982, 36, 40, 49–51: '4. Bildnistypus' (F-Type 4).

A female statue from the Nymphaeum of Herodes Atticus in Olympia, with a portrait head that resembles portraits of Faustina, was long thought to represent the empress (Figs. 73–74). After it had to be excluded from her portrait list for archaeological reasons, it ceased to be a possible candidate for a version of Faustina's Type IV. The portrait, also known from two further versions, is now thought to represent Athenais, a daughter of Herodes Atticus, but Fittschen suggested that the type imitates Faustina's portraits of Type III and especially Type IV.<sup>263</sup> Instead, he put forward two portraits, in Rome, Villa Albani (Fig. 75) and in Athens (Fig. 76), considered by him to be sculptured versions ('Repliken') more suitable for representing Type IV.<sup>264</sup> Both portraits have to be excluded from the portrait list of Faustina, as will be shown below.

*Adjustments to the portrait list.* Besides a general resemblance, the two portraits have little to do with one another and even less so with Faustina's Type IV, as is easily demonstrable.<sup>265</sup> While the coiffure of the two heads with its 'finger-wave' style corresponds well in frontal view, the sides show a clear difference in the number and total height of the towering rows of braids forming the bun on the crown of the head. Moreover, the back of the two portraits and in particular the way the hair is braided and taken up (in)to the bun, reveal a distinctively different conception of the hairstyles. The head in Rome (Fig. 75) features an early Antonine plain 'tower-hairstyle' ('Turmfrisur') with the braided hair on either side of the head combined into a single plait at the back of the head that leads

---

<sup>263</sup> Fittschen 1982, 49–50; Bol 1984, 180–82, no. 43, pls. 48–50. Fittschen 1977, 88 n. 15 still regarded it as a possible version of Type IV. – The most important reason for the exclusion and renaming of the portrait statue is its size: it is too small in relation to the other portraits of the group to represent Faustina as Augusta (Bol 1984, 181 with n. 571).

<sup>264</sup> Fittschen 1982, 50–51; cf. however Fittschen 2012, 108 n. 37 for a sceptical remark. – Rome, Villa Albani, inv. 152: Fittschen 1982, 50, no. 1, pl. 17. 2–4; nose and chin restored, set on a modern bust. – Athens, National Museum, inv. 442: Fittschen 1982, 50, no. 2, pl. 18. 1–4.

<sup>265</sup> Cf. previously Smith 1983, 229 for a sceptical remark on the two portraits.

vertically up to the top of the high bun.<sup>266</sup> In contrast, the hair on the sides of the head in Athens (Fig. 76), showing a variation of the 'tower-hairstyle', appears to be loosely braided towards the back and directly integrated into the bun. These features are significant because – in contrast to male portraiture – the versions of female portrait types with complicated hairstyles also 'copy' the back of the head rather faithfully.<sup>267</sup> Beyond doubt, the two portraits are not versions of the same type.

It remains to eliminate, by comparison with coins and versions in the round of other types of Faustina, the possibility that one of these portraits is the only extant sculptured example of Type IV. Both of them can be ruled out for several reasons: first, the 'tower-hairstyle', with the bun sitting high on the crown of the head of both sculptured portraits, is neither consistent with the coin portraits of Faustina's Type IV nor does it appear on any other types, on coins or in the round. Second, the undulated hair on the coins (Fig. 26) leaves much of the forehead visible and is combed down towards the nape, where it appears to be taken up into the bun on the back of the head. The hair forms a tight 'finger-wave' style with ridges running horizontally towards the back. In contrast, the undulated hair on the two sculptured portraits (Figs. 75–76) covers most of the forehead and is combed back more horizontally towards the back of the head, where it is braided and taken up (in)to the bun. Correspondingly, the ridges of the 'finger-wave' style run towards the crown of the head. Finally, the brows of both portraits are distinctively different from the sculptured versions of Faustina's other types: the head in Rome features (in frontal view) straight brows sitting low above the eyes and running almost in a right angle into the bridge of the nose. The portrait in Athens appears to have brows that are slightly more curved, but also sitting low above the eyes. In contrast, most of the sculptured versions of Faustina show her with arched brows with a soft rounded transition into the bridge of the nose. In consequence, both portraits must be excluded from the portrait list of Faustina. So, no sculptured versions of Type IV are known.

---

<sup>266</sup> For a comparable 'tower-hairstyle', however, with the bun sitting slightly further on the front of the head and without the two thin braids ('Drehsträhnen') dividing the bun from the wavy sections of hair, see Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 68, no. 89, pl. 110 (with further examples).

<sup>267</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1977, 82; Fittschen 2012, 112.

*Discussion.* It has been demonstrated above that a general resemblance of sculptured portraits is not enough to establish a type. Furthermore, for an identification (naming) of a type by coin comparison, the correspondence of the sculptured versions with the coin portraits has to be high enough.

### **Fifth portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type V)**

Literature and designation of type: Strack 1937, 15 n. 26: 'T. d/T. d1'; Wegner 1939, 50, 52–53: '*Langsträhnenfrisur mit kleinem Knoten*'; Fittschen 1982, 36, 40–41, 51–53: '*5. Bildnistypus*' (F-Type 5).

A total of six sculptured portraits have been considered by Fittschen to be versions of the fifth portrait type of Faustina.<sup>268</sup> The majority of them (five versions) originate from Italy; the remaining version in the British Museum (Fig. 77) was found together with other imperial portraits in the so-called House of Jason Magnus in Cyrene.<sup>269</sup> One of the metropolitan versions has to be excluded from the portrait list of Faustina, as will be demonstrated below, leaving us with a total of five known versions for Type V.

According to Fittschen, all six portraits considered by him show a high level of correspondence between each other with respect to hairstyle and physiognomy, as far as verifiable even replicating the pattern of the bun, and they have to be considered close versions of the same type.<sup>270</sup> Furthermore, he correctly pointed out that the affiliation of one of those six portraits, the bust in the British Museum (Fig. 77), with the group of imperial portraits from the House of Jason Magnus in Cyrene strongly suggests that the subject of the type comes from the imperial family, most likely being Faustina the Younger or Lucilla.<sup>271</sup>

---

<sup>268</sup> Fittschen 1982, 51–52, nos. 1–6.

<sup>269</sup> Italian versions: Fittschen 1982, 51–52, nos. 1–5. – Bust from Cyrene: London, British Museum 1468: Rosenbaum 1960, 67, no. 76, pl. 49. 1–2; Fittschen 1982, 52, no. 6, pl. 22. 1–4; found together with portraits of Antoninus Pius, Faustina the Elder, Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus (Rosenbaum 1960, 57–58, 60; nos. 46, 48–49, 54; pls. 33, 35. 1–2, 37. 1–2; Fittschen 1999, 115 under no. 22; Deppmeyer 2008, 278–80, no. 131).

<sup>270</sup> Fittschen 1982, 51–52; Smith 1983, 228.

<sup>271</sup> Fittschen 1982, 52.

The usual procedure of coin comparison for naming the subject of a type precisely is in this particular case difficult, as Faustina the Younger and her daughter Lucilla are depicted on coins in a very similar way (Figs. 78–79), further complicated by a certain variability of details of the hairstyle.<sup>272</sup> Faustina's fifth portrait type (Type V) is so close to Lucilla's second portrait type, that it can hardly be distinguished from it.<sup>273</sup> Fittschen's sole typological criterion for the division between sculptured portraits of mother and daughter is a difference in the extent of the undulation of the hair – slight undulation for Faustina and a stronger undulation for Lucilla – as observed by him on the majority of coins.<sup>274</sup> Although his argument appears to be sensible and broadly correct, it is methodologically not particularly sound and needs to be reviewed closely.

What has so far almost completely been missed, is a significant detail of the hairstyle of Faustina the Younger on imperial coins that offers decisive arguments for the attribution to and the identification (naming) of the type. The first *aurei* issued with coin portraits of Type V (Fig. 28), still featuring the obverse legend FAVSTINA AVG PII AVG FIL and die-linked to coin portraits of Type III by at least one reverse die with a standing dove and the legend CONCORDIA (Fig. 22), show a distinct feature of the bun clearly differing from Lucilla's coin portraits: a braid, or rather rows of braids, encircling a group of rounded curl-like elements.<sup>275</sup> It is the stylistic conversion into coin portrait of a bun encircled by a braid, a feature also detectable on the surviving sculpture and most likely a characteristic of the original model.<sup>276</sup> A portrait in Rome, Vatican (Braccio Nuovo 48) (Fig. 80), for example, shows a plait braided from the hair on the right side of Faustina's nape, encircling a (most likely) tied bun clockwise.<sup>277</sup> That the internal part of the bun is not entirely formed from this braid is proven by the

---

<sup>272</sup> Fittschen 1982, 51.

<sup>273</sup> Smith 1983, 228.

<sup>274</sup> Fittschen 1982, 52, 78; Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 25.

<sup>275</sup> This feature can also regularly be seen on later issues of *aurei* and on most other denominations, but often much less clearly; cf. also Beckmann 2014, 43–44 for this feature. – In contrast, Lucilla's coin portraits most frequently feature a coiled bun formed from a double or triple row of braids and a distinctive vertical plait leading from the neck to the top row of these braids.

<sup>276</sup> Of course, the bun on the sculptured versions is flatter in comparison with the coin portraits, however, cf. for the variability of the coin portraits Fittschen 1982, 36 n. 20, pl. 3. 8.

<sup>277</sup> Rome, Vatican, Braccio Nuovo 48, inv. 2195: Fittschen 1982, 51, no. 1, pl. 19. 1–4.

hair surrounding the bun on the back of the head, as it is leading radially towards the bun and disappearing underneath the encircling braid, without doubt forming part of the bun's internal structure. A braid encircling the bun is also indicated sufficiently clearly but in the most simplified way possible on a portrait in Rome, Vatican (Museo Chiaramonti) (Fig. 81).<sup>278</sup> The roughly worked bun only features a recessed line, clearly indicating the same braid as on the former portrait. Two further portraits in the British Museum, from Pozzuoli (Fig. 82) and from the House of Jason Magnus in Cyrene (Fig. 77), are directly linked to the portrait in Rome, Vatican (Braccio Nuovo 48) (Fig. 80), by a clearly 'replicated' pattern of the bun.<sup>279</sup> However, the braid was in these cases not correctly understood or simply omitted or not executed by the marble carvers, as this detail at the back of the head is likely to get blurred in a 'chain of copied versions', that is, versions being the model for further versions.<sup>280</sup>

These four portraits allow us to establish a 'core-group' for Faustina's fifth portrait type (Type V). The underlying type, oriented on these portraits as a point of departure, can be described as follows, best seen in the two metropolitan versions in Rome, Vatican (Braccio Nuovo 48) (Fig. 80) and at the British Museum, from Pozzuoli (Fig. 82): the slightly wavy hair of this type, forming a loose 'finger-wave' style with ridges running towards and fading at the crown of the head, is on either side of a centre parting combed all the way back from the forehead and tied into a rather flat bun at the nape. Most likely, the bun of the prototype featured a braid coiled around it, as argued above. The ears are almost completely covered by the hair with only the earlobes visible. On Faustina's left side, a small lock in front of the ear partly escapes the combed-back hair, enlivening the portrait. Likewise, short locks that fall onto the nape of some versions were probably part of the original model, as the consistency of this feature on coins might suggest.<sup>281</sup>

---

<sup>278</sup> Rome, Vatican, Museo Chiaramonti XXXI 9, inv. 1676: Fittschen 1982, 51, no. 2, pl. 20. 1–3.

<sup>279</sup> Head on modern bust from Pozzuoli: London, British Museum 1905: Fittschen 1982, 52, no. 6, pl. 22. 1–4.

<sup>280</sup> Cf. Boschung 1989, 31 for the methodology.

<sup>281</sup> For a brief description of the hairstyle see Fittschen 1982, 52.

The brows of Type V are raised, the eyes are large and slightly bulging, possibly already with slightly hanging upper lids, as the two versions in the British Museum, from Pozzuoli (Fig. 82) and in Rome, Museo Torlonia 408, might suggest.<sup>282</sup> The nose is probably straight or slightly curved; the mouth is rather small with full lips, the chin hardly pronounced. The even and smooth face is, compared to the previous types, now more rounded and fuller, visually conferring the aspect of the ‘young matron’ to the type. In sculpture, this development probably already started with some versions of Type I, but it is more clearly observable from Type III onwards. These facial features also remain decisive for the physiognomy of the succeeding types. Likewise, the bun stays from Type V through to Type X at the nape and the ears remain almost covered.<sup>283</sup>

*Variation and adjustments to the portrait list.* The portrait statue in Rome, Villa Doria Pamphilj (Fig. 83), has to be excluded from Fittschen’s portrait list of Faustina’s Type V as the strongly undulated ‘finger-wave’ style of the coiffure is not consistent with the characteristics of the ‘core-group’: the ridges of the ‘finger-waves’ distinctively run towards the bun instead of running and fading towards the crown of the head.<sup>284</sup>

The remaining five versions of Fittschen’s portrait list are, as far as ascertainable, very consistent, with a high level of correspondence between one another.<sup>285</sup> Minor variations concern the existence (or non-existence) of short locks falling onto the nape, or the sometimes slightly hanging upper eyelids – this high level of correspondence is conspicuous and suggests that more versions probably

---

<sup>282</sup> Rome, Museo Torlonia 408: Fittschen 1982, 51, no. 3, pl. 20. 4. – Alternatively, the (slightly) hanging upper lids of these two versions might indicate that they are possibly chronologically later and influenced by succeeding types of Faustina.

<sup>283</sup> Fittschen 1982, 52.

<sup>284</sup> Rome, Villa Doria Pamphilj: Calza 1977, 288–89, no. 358, pl. 196 a–c; Fittschen 1982, 51, no. 4.

<sup>285</sup> The version in Rome, Museo Torlonia 408, is unfortunately inadequately published with only the frontal view available.

exist but are archaeologically not provable, especially considering the fact that this hairstyle was very popular in 'private' portraiture, a number of them even imitating the physiognomy of the empress.<sup>286</sup>

Fittschen's exclusion of a portrait statue with the body of Venus in Dresden (Fig. 84) from the portrait list of Faustina the Younger is still valid, as is the exclusion of further portraits that are typologically closely connected. The hairstyle of these portraits with its stronger undulation and the different course of the 'finger-waves' is not consistent with the 'core-group' established here. His identification of this type as Lucilla's second portrait type is absolutely plausible.<sup>287</sup>

*Discussion.* It is very likely, that an assimilation of the portrait identity for Faustina the Younger in her fifth type (Type V) and Lucilla in her second type was intended, and it is probable that the two types were also confused or interchanged by the workshops, especially in the provinces.<sup>288</sup>

### **Sixth portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type VI or 'New Type')**

Literature and designation of type: Strack 1937: not mentioned or described in the text but listed on p. 167 without further explanation as variation 'T. d2'; Wegner 1939: not recognised; Fittschen 1982: not recognised; Beckmann 2014, 44: mistaken for Fittschen's Type 7.

No sculptured versions of this previously unidentified (coin) portrait type have been identified so far. Furthermore, Fittschen's so-called Variant b (Variante b) of Type VII, in fact an independent type, as will be demonstrated below, cannot convincingly be identified with Faustina's new (coin) portrait type.<sup>289</sup>

---

<sup>286</sup> Fittschen 1982, 53 with nn. 32–33 for examples; these 'private' portraits could also have been influenced by Lucilla's second portrait type (Fittschen 1982, 80 with n. 44).

<sup>287</sup> Wegner 1939, 52–53 (Faustina the Younger); Fittschen 1982, 78–80; Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 25–26. The identification of the portrait statue with the body of Venus in Dresden (and in consequence of the whole type) as Lucilla has most recently been questioned by F. Sinn in her catalogue entry on the statue (Skulpturensammlung, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, inv. Hm 394: Knoll – Vorster 2013, 328–34, no. 74, fig. 74. 1–8). She argues that the 'recht unspezifische Frisur' stands too close to 'private' portraiture and that the statue would be the only remaining example of an empress depicted completely nude.

<sup>288</sup> Fittschen 1982, 79.

<sup>289</sup> This has been attempted by Beckmann, however, in the erroneous belief that these coin portraits represent F-Type 7 (Beckmann 2014, 44).

## Seventh portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type VII)

Literature and designation of type: Strack 1937: described on p. 20 but not recognised as independent type; Wegner 1939, 50, 54–55: *'unterteilte Wellenfrisur'* or *'Typus Louvre 1144'*; Fittschen 1982, 36–37, 42, 55–59: *'7. Bildnistypus'*; Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 21–22: *'7. Bildnistypus'* (F-Type 7).

The seventh portrait type of Faustina is known from a total of 22 extant versions listed by Fittschen.<sup>290</sup> Four of them are of provincial (non-Italian) origin.<sup>291</sup> Further examples, constituting Fittschen's Variants a and b, should be excluded from Faustina's portrait list for reasons argued below.<sup>292</sup>

The number of portraits surviving and the level of correspondence between them is so high that closely 'copied' examples emerge, as far as verifiable even replicating the pattern of the bun. They allow us to establish a reliable 'core-group' standing close to the original model.<sup>293</sup> This 'core-group' secures the identification of the type (naming of the subject) by coin comparison.<sup>294</sup>

Two of the 'core versions' of particularly high quality, a bust in the Capitoline Museum in Rome (Galleria 56) (Fig. 85) and a bust in Paris at the Louvre (MA 1144) (Fig. 86), well illustrate the description of the underlying type, starting with the hairstyle:<sup>295</sup> the hair is on either side of a centre parting combed from the front to the back of the head in five undulated segments, forming a tight 'finger-wave' style with ridges running towards the crown of the head, that creates from a frontal view a distinct depression along the centre parting. The waved coiffure is enlivened by breaks in the wave pattern where the segments overlap or meet each other. At the nape, the hair is tied into a heavy bun, approximately at the same position as under Type V but more voluminous. In front of the

---

<sup>290</sup> Fittschen 1982, 55–57, nos. 1–21 and addendum p. 65 (bust at Hampton Court Palace); Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 21 with n. 3 (under no. 20), supplement 13 d.

<sup>291</sup> Fittschen 1982, 57, nos. 18–21.

<sup>292</sup> Variant a: Fittschen 1982, 58, no. 22. – Variant b: Fittschen 1982, 59, nos. 23–28.

<sup>293</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1982, 57 for the typological correspondence; Smith 1983, 228. – Quality, condition and level of restoration of these portraits vary considerably; possible versions for a 'core-group' are: Fittschen 1982, 55–57, nos. 1, 3, 5–8, 11, 17.

<sup>294</sup> Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 21 with n. 6.

<sup>295</sup> Bust in Rome, Capitoline Museum, Galleria 56, inv. 250: Fittschen 1982, 55, no. 1, pl. 24. 1–2; Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 21–22, no. 20, pls. 27–29; the bust features a measuring point on the bun, not removed after 'copying'. – Bust in Paris, Musée du Louvre, MA 1144: Fittschen 1982, 56, no. 11, pl. 26. 1–4; pattern of bun differs because of modern restoration.

almost entirely covered ears small locks partly escape the combed back hair, enlivening the portrait. Behind the ears on the neck, a short spiral curl is visible on either side.<sup>296</sup>

Faustina's Type VII introduces a formal element of Marcus Aurelius' typologically set physiognomy into Faustina's portrait image: the bulging eyes with hanging upper lids clearly recall the emperor's later types. This phenomenon is most readily and consistently observable on high-quality metropolitan versions and therefore not accidental but clearly a carefully planned typologically set feature of the original model.<sup>297</sup> The considered assimilation to Marcus Aurelius' image visually expressed Faustina's position and relation to the emperor.<sup>298</sup>

*Variation and adjustments to the portrait list.* Most metropolitan versions show just minor variations, for example, of the nose (straight/curved), the eyes (extent of hanging lids), the brows (raised/higher curved) and the face (fuller/less full). The existence of a stephane can result in a slight modification of the arrangement of hair immediately in front of this attribute.<sup>299</sup>

The conversion of the type into colossal scale is most likely the cause for a less individual physiognomy of two further versions, one in Rome, Museo delle Terme, from the Via Merulana (Fig. 87) and the other, of provincial origin, in the Louvre from Markouna (Fig. 88).<sup>300</sup> Likewise, a modified physiognomy can also be seen on other provincial versions.<sup>301</sup>

Compared to these rather minor variations, Fittschen's Variants a and b require a more detailed discussion. First, Variant a (Variante a), comprising solely of a colossal head from Sperlonga (Fig. 89),

---

<sup>296</sup> Wegner 1939, 54; Fittschen 1982, 57–58; Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 21.

<sup>297</sup> Cf. Smith 1985, 214 for this phenomenon.

<sup>298</sup> Smith 1985, 215.

<sup>299</sup> For the modification of the arrangement of hair see, for example, Fittschen 1982, pl. 33. 1.

<sup>300</sup> Fittschen 1982, 58 with n. 40. – Colossal head in Rome, Museo Nazionale Romano – Museo delle Terme, inv. 691: Fittschen 1982, 55, no. 2, pl. 32. 1–3. – Colossal head from Markouna, Paris, Musée du Louvre, MA 1175: Fittschen 1982, 57, no. 18, pl. 31. 1–4; this head also features a modified pattern of the bun.

<sup>301</sup> See for example Fittschen 1982, pl. 30. 3 (Tripoli, from the theatre in Leptis Magna); pl. 30. 4 (Carthage, from the Antonine baths).

has to be reassessed:<sup>302</sup> The frontal hair with the partly visible hair hoops cannot directly be connected with the coiffure of Faustina's Type VII. Stephane and veil further complicate a comparison with typologically set features of the type. Finally, the upward gaze of the eyes and the absence of hanging upper lids is not consistent with the type. The attribution of the portrait to Faustina's Type VII has to be rejected.

The connection of the portraits constituting Variant b (Variante b) with Faustina's Type VII is even more problematic.<sup>303</sup> There can be little doubt that five of the six portraits collected by Fittschen, four of them from Greece, are of the same type, here represented by two portraits in Athens from Greece (Figs. 90–91), as the accordance between them is very high.<sup>304</sup> The sixth portrait in Rome, Museo Torlonia 81 (Fig. 92), however, should most probably be excluded as the strands of undulated hair falling onto the neck, the straight, sharply defined classical-looking brows, and the lack of engraved eyes are not consistent with the type. Furthermore, the turn of the head and the distinct position of the neck as well as the mural crown rather suggest a statue of a personification or Tyche, possibly following or adapting the seated Antiocheia-type.<sup>305</sup>

Returning to the five remaining portraits of the same type (Figs. 90–91), it is clear that their typological features are distinctively different from Faustina's Type VII. Their connection with Type VII has to be rejected for three main reasons: firstly, as Fittschen correctly observed, the hairstyle differs significantly in the interwoven waves of hair framing the forehead and temples and in the hair hoop partly visible in the centre directly above.<sup>306</sup> In addition, the number of undulated segments of

---

<sup>302</sup> Colossal head from Sperlonga, 'Villa of Tiberius': Fittschen 1982, 58 no. 22, pl. 34. 1.

<sup>303</sup> This 'variant' was first observed by Wegner 1939, 55 with pl. 38; more systematically described by Fittschen 1982, 59, nos. 23–28; see also p. 59 n. 41 for a possible further version; Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 21 with n. 4. Unfortunately, not all of these portraits are adequately published in all relevant detail.

<sup>304</sup> Fittschen 1982, 59, nos. 24–28. – Portrait in Athens, National Museum inv. 1687, from Ambelokipi: Wegner 1939, 210–11, pl. 38 c–d; Fittschen 1982, 59, no. 25. – Athens, National Museum inv. 4536: Wegner 1939, 211, pl. 38 b; Fittschen 1982, 59, no. 26.

<sup>305</sup> Rome, Museo Torlonia 81: Fittschen 1982, 59, no. 23, pl. 34. 2. For the Tyche of Antioch see LIMC I, 840–51 s.v. Antiocheia (Jean Ch. Balty)

<sup>306</sup> Fittschen 1982, 59.

hair is reduced and a distinct long ‘corkscrew-curl’ is depicted on either side behind the ears. Secondly and previously unobserved, the bun is not tied from strands of loose hair, as seen on many versions of Faustina’s Type VII, which even repeat the pattern of the knot, but coiled from plaits of hair, reminiscent of earlier types of Faustina (Types I–IV).<sup>307</sup> Compared to sculptured versions of Type VII, the bun also sits higher on the back of the head. Thirdly, these portraits do not feature the hanging upper eyelids that are so characteristic for the physiognomy of this and the succeeding types of Faustina.<sup>308</sup> In consequence, the portrait type represented by these five portraits cannot be related to Faustina’s Type VII (or any other of her known types).<sup>309</sup>

However, the high number of five versions and the origin of four of them from different places in Greece is conspicuous. The fifth example from Ostrov near Silistra/Durostorum (Fig. 93) on the Danube is evidence for an even wider geographic distribution.<sup>310</sup> Clearly, the portraits represent an important woman of the Roman elite, possibly of Greek origin and unknown to us, or the type shows an unidentified member of the imperial family. In either case, the hairstyle and especially the position and structure of the bun point towards the later early to middle Antonine period (ca. A.D. 150s–160s). In the case that an imperial person is depicted, we would probably have to assume the representation of a different, unknown underlying portrait type of Faustina the Younger or another Antonine princess. A possible candidate for a different portrait type of Faustina is the previously unidentified portrait type on coins (Type VI or ‘New Type’) presented in the preceding chapter (Fig. 94). However, the sculptured versions do not match the coin portraits particularly well and we would face exactly the same problems of correspondence of the position and structure of the bun and conception of the hairstyle that have led us to exclude other portraits above from the portrait list of Faustina.

---

<sup>307</sup> For the repetition of the pattern of the bun of Type VII see Fittschen 1982, 57.

<sup>308</sup> For the hanging upper lids of sculptured versions of Types VII, VIII and X see Fittschen 1982, 58, 62, 64.

<sup>309</sup> Fittschen’s explanation that Variant b is the modification of Faustina’s Type VII by a local marble workshop in Greece is not convincing (Fittschen 1982, 59).

<sup>310</sup> From Greece: Fittschen 1982, 59, no. 24; no. 25 (from Ambelokipi); no. 26; no. 27 (from Marathon). – Ostrov: Bordenache 1962, 489–95, figs. 1, 2 a, 3 a; Fittschen 1982, 59, no. 28, pl. 34. 4.

If we move on to Faustina's daughters, the external date of the portrait (A.D. 150s–160s) and the represented age level of a young woman make it clear that of Faustina's daughters only Lucilla or Annia Galeria Aurelia Faustina could have been meant.<sup>311</sup> Lucilla's hairstyles on the coins and her portraits in the round, however, look distinctively different, so that only Annia Galeria Aurelia Faustina would remain as a hypothetical possibility.<sup>312</sup> At the moment, there is no satisfactory solution to this problem and the five portraits are better seen more generally as the representation of someone imperial or a Roman elite woman.

### **Eighth portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type VIII)**

Literature and designation of type: Strack 1937, 19–20: 'T. e/T. f'; Wegner 1939, 50, 53–54: '*abgesetzte Stirnwellenfrisur*' or '*Typus Thermenmuseum 728*'; Fittschen 1982, 37, 42, 60–63: '*8. Bildnistypus*'; Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 22–23: '*8. Bildnistypus*' (F-Type 8).

The eighth portrait type of Faustina is known from a total of 17 extant versions, 15 of them listed by Fittschen in his monograph.<sup>313</sup> Three of these portraits are of provincial (non-Italian) origin.<sup>314</sup>

As with the preceding type, the number of portraits and the level of correspondence between them is so high that closely copied examples emerge, as far as verifiable, also replicating the pattern of the bun. They allow us to establish a reliable 'core-group' of four versions of particularly high quality.<sup>315</sup> The identification of the type is confirmed by comparison of coin portraits with these 'core versions'.<sup>316</sup>

---

<sup>311</sup> For the proposed dates of birth of Lucilla and Annia Faustina see above in Chapter 2. Faustina's eldest daughter, Domitia Faustina, died too young to be represented (for her death see Fittschen 1982, 26 with n. 27; Bol 1984, 32 with n. 126; CIL VI, 995 = ILS I, 385).

<sup>312</sup> For the portrait types of Lucilla see Fittschen 1982, 69–81.

<sup>313</sup> Fittschen 1982, 60–61, nos. 1–15; Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 22 with n. 1 (with the addition of a version in the Uffizi Gallery in Florence, inv. 1914. 194). A further addition to this list is a high-quality metropolitan marble head sold at Christie's New York, Sale 8 June 2012, Lot 236.

<sup>314</sup> Fittschen 1982, 61, nos. 13–15.

<sup>315</sup> Fittschen 1982, 60–61, nos. 1, 3, 9, 10; 63; Smith 1983, 228. – Only the bun of a version in Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek 709 features a modification of the pattern (Fittschen 1982, 61, no. 9).

<sup>316</sup> Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 22 with n. 4.

Two of these 'core versions', a bust in the Capitoline Museum in Rome (Salone 46) (Fig. 95) and a head in the Museo delle Terme in Rome from the House of the Vestals at the Forum (Fig. 96), well represent the underlying type and may serve as an illustration for its description:<sup>317</sup> forehead and temples are framed on either side of a centre parting by a waved section of hair, undulated in a tight 'finger-wave' style and combed back from the front of the head. The frontal composition of the coiffure is separated from the hair on the crown and the back by a braid that runs from either side of the centre parting towards the nape, where it disappears under the waved section of hair. Behind the braid, the slightly wavy hair is combed from the crown back to the nape, where it is tied together with the waved sections of hair into a heavy bun. The small locks in front of the almost entirely covered ears and the spiral curls behind are features already familiar from the preceding type.<sup>318</sup> Likewise, the basic facial type stays the same. Yet, the subtle, formal evocation of Marcus Aurelius' portrait goes a step further compared to the preceding type: besides the bulging eye with hanging upper lids, Faustina's brows are now also clearly designed to recall the emperor's image, as they are more arched.<sup>319</sup>

However, this is not the only alteration of Faustina's physiognomy: the mouth is now slightly opened, almost breathing, and the eyes are asymmetrical, with the lid of the left eye hanging further down, all of this conferring life and movement to the portrait.<sup>320</sup> In addition, the hair on the sides behind the braid is not designed symmetrically: on Faustina's right side it runs at a steep angle towards the braid, while it is combed parallel to the braid towards the nape on the left – a minor 'imperfection' that enlivens the coiffure.<sup>321</sup>

---

<sup>317</sup> Rome, Capitoline Museum, Salone 46, inv. 666: Fittschen 1982, 60, no. 1, pl. 35. 1–2; Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 22–23, no. 21, pls. 29, 30; nose, part of the chin and bust-foot with tabula restored – Rome, Museo Nazionale Romano – Museo delle Terme, inv. 642: Fittschen 1982, 60, no. 3, pl. 36. 1–4.

<sup>318</sup> Wegner 1939, 53; Fittschen 1982, 61–62; Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 22.

<sup>319</sup> Cf. Smith 1985, 214 for this phenomenon.

<sup>320</sup> Fittschen 1982, 62; Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 22. These features are consistently seen on high-quality versions.

<sup>321</sup> Cf. Beckmann 2014, 45 for this detail.

These careful adjustments of the type and the considered asymmetry are not confined to the physiognomy and the hairstyle of the head alone but are carried through in the composition of the bust support, as the complete bust in the Capitoline Museum in Rome (Salone 46) (Fig. 95) strongly suggests: the left shoulder is hanging down further than the right, counterbalanced by a slight turn of the head to the right and a light downward look.<sup>322</sup> This is further supported by the only other portrait of Type VIII that preserves its original bust support, in Istanbul, from Kandilli (Fig. 97), that besides a varied drapery appears to be a scale version of the Capitoline bust (Salone 46) – height without base 0.567 m for the former and 0.56 m for the latter – both in exactly the same posture and most probably reflecting the underlying type.<sup>323</sup> The same turn to the right is also indicated by many heads without their support, as the eyes shift slightly in the same direction. All together this is strong and important evidence that Faustina's Type VIII was created and issued as a 'bust type', with the head, neck and bust part typologically set.

*Variation.* Most metropolitan versions show only minor variations of the physiognomy, for example, of the eyes, nose and brows, or of details of the hairstyle such as the rendering of the separating braid.<sup>324</sup> The provincial versions also repeat the type faithfully, with only some variation of the physiognomy or other minor details.<sup>325</sup>

### **Ninth portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type IX)**

Literature and designation of type: Strack 1937: not recognised; Wegner 1939: not recognised; Fittschen 1982, 36, 41–42, 53–55: '6. *Bildnistypus*' (F-Type 6).

---

<sup>322</sup> Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 22.

<sup>323</sup> Bust from Kandilli, Istanbul, Museum inv. 5130: Inan – Rosenbaum 1966, 77–78, no. 46, pls. 28. 3–4; 29. 2; Fittschen 1982, 61, no. 15, pl. 41. 3–4; cf. also Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 22 with n. 2 (under no. 21).

<sup>324</sup> For the variation of the braid see Fittschen 1982, 62.

<sup>325</sup> See for example Fittschen 1982, pl. 42. 1–2 (from the agora of Cyrene); pl. 42. 3 (from the temple of Zeus in Cyrene). Cf. however the bust from Kandilli, faithfully 'replicating' the type (except for the adapted drapery).

Three portrait heads, in Stockholm (Fig. 98), Cambridge (Fig. 99) and from Dyrrachion in Albania (Fig. 100), have been considered by Fittschen to represent the ninth portrait type of Faustina.<sup>326</sup> All of them have to be excluded from the portrait list of Faustina for reasons argued below.

*Adjustments to the portrait list.* The portraits have little to do with one another and with Faustina's Type IX as known from coins.<sup>327</sup> It is clearly observable that the heads in Stockholm (Fig. 98) and Cambridge (Fig. 99) are not versions of the same type, as the level of correspondence between them does not go beyond a general resemblance. The same is true for the portrait from Dyrrachion (Fig. 100), despite being inadequately published.<sup>328</sup> The way the segments of hair are structured, undulated in a 'finger-wave' style and combed back on either side of a centre parting, as well as the position, shape and pattern of the bun at the back (of the heads in Stockholm and Cambridge) distinctively differ from one another. On the head in Stockholm the undulated segments of hair are divided into several curly strands towards the back, on the Cambridge head the segments become narrower and are twisted towards the bun while on the head from Dyrrachion the segments seem to run back in one wide wave. All of this is evidence for different conceptions of the hairstyles. Accordingly, the bun on the head in Cambridge sits deeper on the nape and is less voluminous in comparison to the head in Stockholm.

It still has to be demonstrated that none of these portraits is the only extant sculptured example of Type IX. For all of them this can be ruled out for two simple but convincing reasons: first, the imperial coins with a portrait of Faustina's Type IX show a small lock in front of the ear (Fig. 101). This feature is seen consistently on coins from Type VII through to Type X and on sculptured versions (in front of both ears) of Types VII, VIII and X – accordingly, we most probably also would have to expect a small lock in front of the ears of the sculptured versions of Type IX. None of the portraits suggested by

---

<sup>326</sup> Fittschen 1982, 53–55, nos. 1–3. – Stockholm, National Museum, inv. 85: Fittschen 1982, 55, no. 1, pl. 23. 1–2. – Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, inv. GR.27.1850: Budde – Nicholls 1964, 72–73, no. 116, pl. 39; Fittschen 1982, 55, no. 2, pl. 23. 3–4. – Head from Dyrrachion: Korkuti 1971, 9, pl. 110; Fittschen 1982, 55, no. 3.

<sup>327</sup> Cf. already Smith 1983, 229 for a sceptical remark on the portraits.

<sup>328</sup> Only a three-quarter view of the head from Dyrrachion is available, the bun is not clearly visible.

Fittschen show this characteristic. Second, the sculptured versions of Types VII, VIII and X feature throughout distinctively hanging upper eyelids, completely absent on the portrait heads in Stockholm, Cambridge and from Dyrrachion.<sup>329</sup> Furthermore, at least the former two portraits are too lean in the lower face, not consistent with the full and rounded face especially from Faustina's Type V onwards. In consequence, all three heads have to be excluded from the portrait list of the empress. So, no sculptured versions of Faustina's Type IX are known.<sup>330</sup> This is the fourth and final out of the ten types 'missing' in sculpture, and reasons will have to be found later as to why they are apparently not represented in the round.

### **Tenth portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type X)**

Literature and designation of type: Strack 1937, 19: 'T. g'; Wegner 1939, 50, 55: '*Drehsträhnenfrisur*'; Fittschen 1982, 37, 42–43, 63–64: '*9. Bildnistypus*'; Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 23–24: '*9. Bildnistypus*' (F-Type 9).

Only two portraits have been attributed by Fittschen to the tenth and final portrait type of Faustina.<sup>331</sup> One of them (Fig. 102), a limestone head found in a temple of the *vicus* of the Roman military camp Pfünz/*Vetoniana* in the province of Raetia, has to be ruled out for several reasons.<sup>332</sup> Firstly, the physiognomy has no connection with Faustina's typologically set features as known from previous types, but this alone would be no decisive reason to reject the head. Secondly, the hairstyle only shows a vague general resemblance with the coin portraits of Type X.<sup>333</sup> Thirdly, the fact that Faustina was the first empress to be worshipped as *mater castrorum* in combination with the find location is no convincing argument for an identification of the head.<sup>334</sup> However, the final and probably main argument for the rejection of the head is its size: from the bottom of the neck to the top of the stephane it measures ca. 19.5 cm, from the chin to the crown of the head only

---

<sup>329</sup> This finding had to remain concealed until the adjustment of the typology due to the wrong chronological position of F-Type 6 (Type IX) in the 'old' typological sequence.

<sup>330</sup> In contrast, the coiffure is very popular in 'private' portraiture; see Fittschen 1982, 53 n. 34 for examples.

<sup>331</sup> Fittschen 1982, 63, nos. 1–2.

<sup>332</sup> Fittschen 1982, 63, no. 2; first published in: von Sarwey et al. 1901, 43, no. 6, pl. 11 (B 1, 3); the head is now missing (Fittschen 1982, 63 with n. 56 a).

<sup>333</sup> For both the physiognomy and the hairstyle it could be argued that a closer resemblance might not have been expected.

<sup>334</sup> Cf. for this argument Wegner 1939, 212; Fittschen 1982, 64 with n. 57.

approximately 15.3 cm. With an average ratio of head to body of 1:7 to 1:7.5, the statue it was probably part of would have measured only 107–115 cm, clearly too small for a public honorific monument of the empress.<sup>335</sup> Most likely, the head was not even part of a portrait but represents a goddess or personification, as size and find spot suggest.<sup>336</sup>

The second portrait to discuss is a marble head in the Capitoline Museum in Rome (Fig. 103).<sup>337</sup> The hairstyle of the portrait with its rows of tight spiral curls roughly corresponds with the coin portraits of Faustina's Type X. Furthermore, although the sides and especially the back of the head are only schematically rendered, we still find other features familiar from both the coins of Faustina and sculptured versions of preceding types: the position and size of the bun, the almost entirely covered ears with the small locks in front of them and the short curls on the neck behind. The decisive argument for the identification of the subject, however, is the physiognomy of the portrait: the full and rounded face, the small mouth with full lips, the slightly curved nose and the little pronounced chin, but first and foremost the highly arched brows and the bulging eyes with hanging upper lids, even repeating the conspicuous asymmetrical eyes that Type VIII introduced to the typologically set physiognomy of Faustina – there can be little doubt that the portrait represents the empress.<sup>338</sup>

It remains to describe the hairstyle of the portrait, to complete the illustration of what the type would have looked like in sculpture: the coiffure of Type X features rows of tight spiral curls to either side of a centre parting. They frame the forehead and the temples, densely packed next to each other and extending towards the back of the head. The slightly wavy hair on the top and the crown of the head is on either side combed towards the rows of spiral curls. At the nape the hair is tied together into a heavy bun. As already mentioned, the ears are almost entirely covered and the locks

---

<sup>335</sup> The measurements and proportions are approximations, sufficient for the argument.

<sup>336</sup> Under life-size limestone statues of gods and personifications are frequently found in the north-western provinces of the empire, while portraits are generally rare.

<sup>337</sup> Rome, Museo Capitolino, Stanza degli Imperatori 33, inv. 310: Fittschen 1982, 63, no. 1, pl. 43. 3–4; Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 23–24, no. 23, pl. 32; bust support restored.

<sup>338</sup> Fittschen 1982, 63–64; Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 24; Smith 1983, 229.

in front of them are also present. Instead of the spiral curls behind the ears of the preceding types, this type possibly featured a short lock on either side.<sup>339</sup> The schematic rendering of the hairstyle on the sides and especially at the back as well as the stephane do not allow any further interpretation of the depicted coiffure.

### C. ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

The reassessment of the prevalent typology of sculptured portraits of Faustina the Younger necessitated a substantial adjustment of her portrait list with significant consequences for the interpretation of her types. A total of 16 of the 70 pieces considered by Fittschen to be versions of Faustina's types had to be excluded from the portrait list of the empress because they neither correspond to the portraits on the coins, nor can they be connected with other sculptured portraits of her. Four pieces, unknown to Fittschen in 1982, were added. This leaves us with a total of 58 portraits of the empress that can be divided between six of the ten portrait types of the adjusted typology (Types I–X).

As clearly demonstrated in this chapter, only for Faustina's Types I, V, VII, and VIII have a sufficiently large number of portraits in the round survived (11, 5, 22 and 17 respectively) for a reliable 'core-group' of faithfully 'copied' examples to emerge, closely corresponding with the coin portraits and firmly establishing these four types in sculpture. Two further types (Types III and X) are known from only one (Type X) or two (Type III) sculptured examples respectively. The number of versions of each is too low to establish a reliable 'core-group', but the accordance between the heads (Type III), distinct physiognomic features as the hanging upper eyelids (Type X) shared with other sculptured types of Faustina, and a close correspondence with the coin portraits make them near-certain.<sup>340</sup> For the remaining four types on coins (Types II, IV, VI, IX), all portraits suggested by Fittschen had, we

---

<sup>339</sup> Wegner 1939, 55; Fittschen 1982, 63–64; Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 24.

<sup>340</sup> Cf. Smith 1983, 228–29 for closely corresponding results.

saw, to be excluded from the portrait list of Faustina for good reasons. No sculptured versions of these types are known. This could be ascribed to the chances of survival of the archaeological evidence or a lack in (sufficient) publication at a time when it still appeared plausible that only a single type (Type II) is 'missing' in the round.<sup>341</sup> However, a total of four out of ten types (40 %) not represented in sculpture makes this assumption very unlikely. Accordingly, it is not certain that Types II, IV, VI and IX existed in the round.

### **Creation of types**

It must be emphasised that the evidence presented casts important doubts on the implicit assumption of the prevailing model of an imperial portrait 'system' that all portrait types were commissioned by the court and made available to both the mint and the marble workshops. It has already been argued in the previous chapter that some types (Types II, IV, VI, IX) were probably put through the mint only or originated within the mint and stayed there. In the following, arguments will be deployed to suggest that not all types known in sculpture (Types I, III, V, VII, VIII, X) were necessarily 'officially' commissioned, that is, with some kind of 'Palatine involvement'.

Types VII and VIII are particularly telling in this respect because they allow us to compare two succeeding types of Faustina that are firmly established in sculpture each by a number of examples. The basic facial type of both portrait types is the same.<sup>342</sup> What did change is first and foremost the hairstyle, although it is almost identical in frontal view (Figs. 85, 96). Besides that, details of the physiognomy were adapted with remarkable subtlety and sophistication. In contrast to Type VII, Type VIII features a slightly opened, almost breathing mouth, carefully modelled asymmetrical eyes and highly arched brows.

---

<sup>341</sup> Fittschen 1977, 87 n. 9; Fittschen 1982, 48, 66.

<sup>342</sup> Smith 1983, 228.

Type VIII has been called an ‘important creation’ and an ‘authentic representation’ of the empress and, indeed, compared to Type VII and other earlier types, it has a livelier and more individual appeal conferred to it.<sup>343</sup> However, this is owed to the careful adjustment of the type, not to a new conception or re-think of the whole portrait image of Faustina. The primary point of reference for the adapted physiognomy of Type VIII is not the actual changing appearance of the empress but other images.<sup>344</sup> The arched brows and the bulging eyes with hanging lids are formal elements of Marcus Aurelius’ typologically set physiognomy, the slightly opened mouth is a design element known since Hellenistic times and asymmetries of facial features are a stylistic means commonplace in Roman portraiture. The main feature referring to real life is the hairstyle.

The creation of the original three-dimensional model of Type VIII did not necessarily involve a portrait sitting; it would probably have been sufficient to have a drawing of the hairstyle from different angles and sides and, of course, access to a model (or version) of the preceding type.<sup>345</sup> This is possibly also true for other portrait types of Faustina, as for example Type X, that only feature some variations in image in relation to the preceding type, like (small) changes in hairstyle or minor adjustments of the physiognomy.

Without the necessity of a portrait sitting for all sculptured portrait types of the empress, we have to pose the question whether it is possible that some portrait images like Types VIII or X were not commissioned by the court but originated in the sculpture workshops and were further disseminated. This possible way of interpreting the evidence would be comparable to the types on coins discussed in the preceding chapter, that arguably originated within the mint. However, in contrast to these portrait images on coins, that were largely restricted to their medium by the small format, profile view and simplification of details, the portrait types originating in the workshops

---

<sup>343</sup> Fittschen 1982, 62.

<sup>344</sup> Cf. Pfanner 1989, 208–10 for the technical aspect of such adjustments.

<sup>345</sup> For paintings from different angles as models for sculpture cf. Fittschen 1974, 494. – We have to expect that the marble workshops were capable of a whole range of variations and adjustments without involvement of the sitter.

could be much more influential. Possibly, these suggested non-court types were ‘officially approved’ but we most probably should not expect the involvement of the emperor (or the empress) for every (small) change in the portrait image.

### **Excursus – types in female ‘private’ portraiture and aristocratic self-styling**

So far, our focus has been on the many different types of the imperial image of Faustina. However, the sculptured portrait image of the empress is not an isolated phenomenon but has to be understood in the wider context of (metropolitan) female ‘private’ portraiture, outlined in the following. This will finally allow us to approach the question of why so many types of the empress were created and what they were for, as it was demonstrated in the previous chapter that most, if not all, portrait types of Faustina were not made to commemorate the birth of Faustina’s children. Moreover, it is in general far from sure that portrait types were conceived to celebrate and commemorate specific occasions. Possible alternative explanations for their creation have to be found, as someone, clearly, thought Faustina’s changing hairstyles important. The coiffure as the most conspicuous feature of female portraiture is also the best point of departure for the following discussion, leading up to the relation of the imperial image to aristocratic metropolitan ‘private’ portraiture and back to our question.

If we extend our focus beyond the portrait image of the empress to (metropolitan) female portraiture of the second century A.D. in general, it becomes immediately evident that far more female hairstyles are known to us from the surviving ‘private’ portraits than represented in imperial portraiture. Some of these coiffures, such as for example the complex early Antonine ‘tower-hairstyles’, are much more elaborate than their imperial counterparts.<sup>346</sup> One wants to know who these women were and how the represented hairstyles relate to the coiffure of the empress.

---

<sup>346</sup> Bernoulli 1891, 40; Fittschen 1996a, 44–46; Fittschen 2012, 106.

The vast majority of these portraits are today nameless and their original context is unknown. In most cases, we do not even know the social standing of the women represented, as the quality of a portrait does not necessarily indicate the social class of the depicted person. The few pieces connected with an inscription clearly demonstrate that portraits of considerable quality can represent individuals from the middling-class.<sup>347</sup> This is well illustrated by the Hadrianic Chatsworth bust of the freedwoman Sozusa (Fig. 104) and the Trajanic bust of Claudia Olympias (Fig. 105), probably also a freedwoman, in the British Museum.<sup>348</sup> We have to assume that whoever was able to afford it could commission a sophisticated portrait even with the leading (metropolitan) marble workshops. The same is most probably true for the underlying real-life hairstyles: whoever had the qualified staff and the time for prolonged hairdressing sessions, could have had created even the most complicated female coiffures.<sup>349</sup>

A number of portrait images of unnamed women survive in a few versions after the same type each.<sup>350</sup> The habit of multiple (honorific) portraits for the same person was not restricted to the Roman elite but also common among local nobilities.<sup>351</sup> However, if the versions come from different sites, it is very likely that the depicted women were of supra-regional importance and probably from the Roman elite. Several of these 'private' portrait types from the second century A.D. collected by Fittschen match this criterion and we may be fairly certain that the represented women were either

---

<sup>347</sup> Fittschen 1996a, 48; Fittschen 1996b, 210–11. The same is, of course, true for male portraiture. – We have to be aware that 'class is a modern concept. The ancients thought and wrote about their own societies in terms of social rank and legal status.' (Mayer 2012, 2). 'Middling-class' is nevertheless a useful term to denote the more affluent part of the Roman society that stood between the imperial and aristocratic elite and the poor, as it is precisely this part of society that generated the bulk of the material culture from Roman cities that is preserved today. For a recent discussion of the term and concept of 'ancient middle classes' see Mayer 2012, 2–21.

<sup>348</sup> Sozusa: Boschung et al. 1997, 60–61, no. 54, pls. 52, 54. 3. The bust was dedicated by a certain P. Aelius Lycus, an imperial freedman (*Augusti libertus*), *paedagogus*, and rich enough to have a mausoleum built for himself and his family. – Claudia Olympias: Hinks 1935, 28, fig. 32. – Fittschen 1996a, 52 n. 91.

<sup>349</sup> Fittschen 1996b, 210–11.

<sup>350</sup> Fittschen 1996a, 46. Around 25 such examples from the second century A.D. were known to Fittschen at the time of his study. – For portrait types of 'private' individuals in general see Fittschen 1992, 116 with n. 16; Fittschen 1996b, 210 with n. 34. For measuring points on private portraits, proving that they were 'copied' from models, cf. the examples collected by Pfanner 1989, 236–51 (e.g. figs. 44, 45 a–b, 46).

<sup>351</sup> Fittschen 1996a, 46 with nn. 49–51. In funerary contexts, especially, this habit is also attested for wider social circles (Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 86 with n. 2 for further references; 76–77, no. 100, pls. 125–27, supplement 18; 86–87, nos. 118–19, pls. 149–51).

related to the imperial family or originated from the influential families of the senatorial and equestrian order.<sup>352</sup> Beyond this is a grey area of less certain pieces, with portrait images in several versions each from unknown or uncertain find locations possibly representing elite women.

Based on a physiognomic resemblance to known imperial types, Fittschen attempted to link some of these portrait types of members of the elite to women within the imperial family that are not known on coins.<sup>353</sup> For example, the interpretation of a portrait type with a 'finger-wave' hairstyle known from four versions (Fig. 106) is convincing, directly quoting Lucius Verus' portrait physiognomy and most probably representing one of his sisters, Ceionia Fabia or Ceionia Plautia.<sup>354</sup> Among the possible, but less certain identifications is a portrait type of an elite woman with an elaborate 'tower-hairstyle' known from three versions (Fig. 107), linked on the basis of a physiognomic resemblance to the portraits of Marcus Aurelius to his younger sister Annia Cornificia Faustina.<sup>355</sup>

So far, no female members of senatorial or equestrian families have been identified among the 'private' portrait types or other extant portraits. However, it is absolutely clear from the epigraphic evidence of honorific monuments of these women – primarily statuary honours – that portrait images for many of them must have existed.<sup>356</sup> As a phenomenon, the body of unidentified portraits of elite women stands (partly) parallel to the epigraphic evidence of honorific monuments but it is impossible to connect them without useful find contexts or new discoveries.<sup>357</sup>

---

<sup>352</sup> Fittschen 1996a, 46; Fittschen 1996b, 210–11. The probability of this assumption increases with the number of versions surviving and their widespread geographical distribution.

<sup>353</sup> Fittschen 1996a, 46–48. For a brief discussion of this phenomenon of 'considered assimilation' see Smith 1985, 215.

<sup>354</sup> Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 26–27, nos. 26–27, pls. 35–37, supplement 14; Smith 1985, 215; Fittschen 1996a, 48, fig. 13.

<sup>355</sup> Calza 1964, 92–94, nos. 148–49, pl. 88 ('Domitia Lucilla'); Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 73, nos. a1–a3; Fittschen 1996a, 48, fig. 21.

<sup>356</sup> Fittschen 1996a, 46, 48; Fittschen 1996b, 211. No comprehensive publications exist that would allow a quick overview to be gained of such epigraphic evidence. – See Murer 2017 for honorific statues of women in the Roman imperial period in Italy and North Africa.

<sup>357</sup> Some of the portraits will have served a more 'private' purpose e.g. in the context of villas (cf. for this aspect Fittschen 1996a, 51 n. 45).

Among the body of unidentified portraits of elite women are a number of images of very high quality with extremely elaborate coiffures. For example, two portrait types with complex ‘tower-hairstyles’ are known from two (Fig. 108) and three (Fig. 109) versions respectively.<sup>358</sup> Another image in the Capitoline Museum of particularly high quality with a complex ‘tower-hairstyle’ is only known from a single example (Fig. 110), but it also might well represent a woman from the Roman elite.<sup>359</sup>

These portraits belong to the very best examples from the time.<sup>360</sup> They all date to the early Antonine period based on the relation of their formal and stylistic characteristics with imperial portraiture, but the hairstyles of these portraits are much more complicated and skilfully arranged than the contemporary imperial coiffures known from images of Faustina the Elder, here exemplified by a portrait of her so-called ‘Plain Type’ (Fig. 111), and her daughter Faustina the Younger.<sup>361</sup> However, comparable ‘tower-hairstyles’ are known from numerous other unidentified portraits. Among them are not only pieces of high quality but also many examples of more modest quality, which Fittschen ascribed to the middling-class.<sup>362</sup> The evidence of these portraits suggests that this kind of hairstyle spread through the influential Roman elite to wider social circles, supported by the fact that such complex ‘tower-hairstyles’ are unknown from the portraits of the Antonine empresses.<sup>363</sup>

Two final examples of portraits of very high quality in the Capitoline Museum from the same period (Figs. 112–113), each known from a single portrait, can serve as a further illustration of the range of

---

<sup>358</sup> Two versions: Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 73, nos. d1–d2; Fittschen 1996a, 48, figs. 17–18. – Three versions: Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 74–75, no. 97, pls. 121–22, supplement 19.

<sup>359</sup> Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 72–74, no. 96, pls. 120–21. – This assumption is based on the exceptionally high quality in combination with the complex coiffure.

<sup>360</sup> For other examples see Fittschen 1996a, 52 n. 93.

<sup>361</sup> Cf. Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 73–74 for the dating; Fittschen 1996a, 48. – Portrait of Faustina the Elder: Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 13–15, no. 13, pls. 15–16.

<sup>362</sup> For examples of more modest quality see e.g. Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 66–70, nos. 87–91, pls. 109–12. – For a discussion of workshop practices at the mid-market segment in Flavian and Trajanic times see Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 54–56, nos. 70–72, pls. 88–91.

<sup>363</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1996a, 48 for a comparable argumentation; see also Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 73.

possible coiffures.<sup>364</sup> Fittschen suggested on stylistic grounds that they are possibly from the same workshop as the bust of Faustina Type I in the Capitoline Museum (Stanza degli Imperatori 32) (Fig. 64), and they might well depict elite women.<sup>365</sup> The coiffure of the latter example, especially, of these two ‘private’ portraits (Fig. 113) has little to do with imperial hairstyles, if anything at all, and exemplifies the level of individual choice we may expect with respect to personal style.<sup>366</sup>

All these portrait images of elite women, as marble versions of their styled self, allow a glimpse into fashionable aristocratic (hair)styles of the second century A.D. They stand for others that must have survived among the hundreds of extant examples, but that are impossible to name on an objective basis. Together, they inform us about a wide range of personal (hair)styles available within the Roman elite.<sup>367</sup>

#### **Relation of the imperial image to aristocratic metropolitan ‘private’ portraiture**

If we now return to the imperial image of the empress in the second century A.D. and see her portrait against the background of contemporary aristocratic self-styling at Rome sketched above, it is absolutely clear that she was not the only model for her fellow elite women and other social classes. As Fittschen correctly observed, ‘other women within the imperial family, and in large measure women from the influential families of the senatorial and equestrian orders, provided important models as well’. That is to say, ‘the upper class at large was influential in the development and spread of fashionable coiffures’.<sup>368</sup> The imperial image in the second century A.D. was ‘embedded in the norms of high society at Rome and in fact emerged from fashionable aristocratic styles in the capital’, as R. Smith stated. It ‘could then be seen as playing the role of a multiplier in a

---

<sup>364</sup> Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 75, no. 98, pl. 123; 87, no. 120, pl. 152.

<sup>365</sup> Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 75, 87.

<sup>366</sup> Cf. Fittschen 2012, 106, 111–14 on this matter and for further examples.

<sup>367</sup> It is possible that fellow elite women of the empress also had multiple portrait types with changing coiffures; however, as the hairstyle is the main typological criterion for the identification of portrait types of women, it is on an objective basis almost impossible to identify them.

<sup>368</sup> Fittschen 1996a, 46, 48; Fittschen 2012, 110 n. 59; 114.

wider social circle and in the provinces'.<sup>369</sup> The latter is proven by the numerous widespread 'private' portraits imitating particular imperial types as the results of this multiplier effect, while much less is preserved or identifiable from the narrow elite circle, in which these new personal (hair)styles evolved.<sup>370</sup>

Against this background, it is absolutely certain that the portrait image of the empress interacted with the 'private' female elite portraiture, and it shared in the phenomenon of metropolitan aristocratic self-styling.<sup>371</sup> Some of these women were 'in advance' of the court while others 'lagged behind' and a few will have maintained their 'own' style.<sup>372</sup>

There can be no doubt that the wide range of coiffures represented by the portraits reflect actual hairstyles available in life and that most of them can be arranged using the wearer's own hair, as E. Bartman ascertained and J. Stephens, a hairdresser by profession, confirmed.<sup>373</sup> Of course, stone and hair are simply not the same and one has to focus on the arrangement of the hair to understand the underlying hairstyle, as we can be certain that the portraits did not match the real coiffures in every detail.<sup>374</sup> That the reference for the represented hairstyles is real life, is also confirmed by the 'idiosyncracies of hairlines, cowlicks, growth patterns and directional movement in short hair, and wispy transitional hair at the ear and nape in long hair' conveyed by the portraits, as Stephens observed in comparison with the same hair phenomena she sees every day in the salon.<sup>375</sup> While this is certainly correct for the range of represented hairstyles as a phenomenon, we have to be more

---

<sup>369</sup> Smith 1998, 91 in the context of male portraiture. This connection was to a certain extent already observed by Zanker 1982, esp. 310–11; Bergmann 1982, esp. 143; cf. also Fittschen 2010, 236–39 for the problems involved in the misleading use of the term 'period face' ('Zeitgesicht'), first introduced by Zanker 1982.

<sup>370</sup> Smith 1998, 91 in the context of male portraiture. – Many of these 'private' portraits imitating specific portrait types of Faustina were collected by Fittschen 1982 in the notes under the respective type.

<sup>371</sup> Cf. Fejfer 2008, 416 for this thought.

<sup>372</sup> Smith 1985, 212. In consequence, more flexibility for the dating of 'private' portraiture should be allowed. – A possible example of a portrait slightly in advance of the court is the bust Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 71–72, no. 95, pls. 117–19. It has an 'early Antonine' hairstyle (following the conventional dating after Fittschen); however, the rendering of the bust support is comparable to busts of Sabina and the eyes are still unengraved, suggesting a date still in the A.D. 130s.

<sup>373</sup> Bartman 2001; Stephens 2008.

<sup>374</sup> Cf. Stephens 2008, 123 for the recreation of ancient hairstyles.

<sup>375</sup> Stephens 2008, 119.

careful when interpreting individual portraits since the coiffure deployed was not necessarily the hairstyle worn by the subject. We must distinguish between image and life.<sup>376</sup> While in the narrow elite circle, where these styles evolved, we can expect a certain degree of overlap or accordance, this is far from sure in the wider social circles imitating these styles in their image.

In terms of the real hairstyles of Faustina, emerging from fashionable aristocratic styles, we can be sure that there was some overlap or accordance between the coiffures worn by the empress and the hairstyles she is represented with in portraiture. Her many different coiffures were firmly rooted within metropolitan aristocratic culture and the evidence suggests that Faustina the Younger followed changing fashions.

#### **Possible reasons for the creation of Faustina's portrait types**

It still remains to assess why the many portrait types of Faustina were brought into circulation. Competing possibilities have to be considered. First, Faustina or the court more generally might have wished that her portrait image was adapted to follow changing fashions and to reflect her real appearance. The new portrait type would, in this case, have been officially commissioned.<sup>377</sup> Alternatively, the mint or the marble workshops might have adjusted Faustina's image to update her portrait identity. This is a possible option if only some variations in image were involved. Finally, some new portrait types were most likely officially commissioned in connection with historical events, but not necessarily to commemorate them. The evidence suggests that not a single of these possible explanations on its own suits all types but that different types can have different reasons for their creation, as will be argued in the following chapter.

---

<sup>376</sup> Cf. Smith 1998, 60 in the context of male portraiture; Fittschen 2012, 106 with n. 24.

<sup>377</sup> Cf. for these assumptions Fejfer 2008, 416 with n. 175; Beckmann 2014, 46.

### **Workshop practices**

In contrast to male portraiture, as already mentioned, the versions of female portrait types also 'replicated' the back of the head, often with great care. Clearly, the often complex and elaborate female coiffures were thought important.<sup>378</sup> This is not only proven by the accordance between versions of the particular types but also by the occasional survival of measuring points at the back of the head that were used to 'copy' them.<sup>379</sup>

### **Bust types**

The majority of the portraits of Faustina are preserved without their original supports (bust or statue). Many of them were probably busts, as this format was extremely common in second-century Rome and Italy, where most of the surviving examples originate.<sup>380</sup> The best evidence we have to support the idea that at least some types of Faustina (if not all) were created and issued as 'bust types' are the two complete busts of Type VIII in Rome (Fig. 95) and in Istanbul from Kandilli (Fig. 97). While the drapery is not so closely 'copied', the two busts differ in size by less than one centimetre. Most importantly, the careful adjustments of the posture, carried through from the head to the bust support, are meticulously repeated by both versions, and many heads without their support indicate the same turn of the head by the direction of the eyes. In consequence, it is almost certain that these features were typologically set by the 'original' model and 'copied' in the marble workshops.

---

<sup>378</sup> Cf. Fittschen 2012, 112 for this phenomenon.

<sup>379</sup> For examples see Fittschen 1977, 80–84, no. 30, pls. 34. 1, 2; 35 (Faustina the Elder). – Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 21–22, no. 20, pls. 27–29 (Faustina the Younger Type VII).

<sup>380</sup> Cf. Smith 1998, 61–63 for a brief general account of metropolitan portraiture in the second century A.D.

## CHAPTER 4

### **Faustina: Discussion**

It has been demonstrated in several different ways in the preceding two chapters on Faustina's coinage and the sculptured portraits that there is no complete correspondence between coins and sculpture. What follows is a brief combined analysis of all ten types (Types I–X). The absolute dates given below in the heading for each type are the proposed dates of their creation. It is likely that Types I and VII were made in connection with specific historical events: Faustina's marriage and Marcus Aurelius' accession respectively. For all other types, the suggested date of their introduction in the mint is given as a *terminus ante quem* for their creation, supposing that in most cases this date roughly coincides with their conception. Faustina's age at this date is given in parentheses.

#### **First portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type I) – A.D. 145 (aged ca. 14/15)**

Fittschen presumed that Faustina's first portrait Type (Type I) was created to commemorate the birth of her first child, Domitia Faustina, and the subsequent conferral of the title *Augusta* in A.D. 147. This assumption was based on the belief that most, if not all, portrait types of the empress were made to coincide with births of Faustina's children. However, he also stated that it cannot be ruled out, but also not proven, that Type I was created for her marriage.<sup>381</sup> The situation has changed. Most, if not all portrait types can no longer be connected with the birth of a new child, and the age level of a 'marriageable girl' represented by the type points towards an earlier creation. Very likely, Faustina's Type I was made at the time of her marriage to Marcus Aurelius in A.D. 145, as a portrait identity for the young princess was needed from that time onwards.<sup>382</sup> The type is known from 11 sculptured versions.

---

<sup>381</sup> Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 20.

<sup>382</sup> Smith 1983, 229; Ameling 1992, 162 with n. 77.

Type I was most likely a brand-new portrait conception that involved a sitting with the young princess, as it marks the initial creation of her portrait identity. Almost certainly, it was officially commissioned by the court.

About two years later (A.D. 147), Faustina started to appear on the imperial coinage after the birth of her first child and the conferral of the title Augusta, when she was ca. 16 or 17 years old. The mint employed the existing sculptured type (Type I) and converted it into coin-format.

### **Second portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type II) – A.D. 148/49 (aged ca. 17–19)**

The following Type II is exclusively known from coins, as it was probably only put through the mint or originated within the mint and stayed there. In relation to the preceding type, the hairstyle changed, and the physiognomy looks more mature. It appears that the mint was in advance of the marble workshops in updating the portrait image of Faustina, possibly primarily to reflect the advance in age.

### **Third portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type III) – A.D. 149/50 (aged ca. 18–20)**

Type III is the next with sculptured portraits after Type I. It is known from two versions in the round. Compared to Type I, the physiognomy has considerably changed and is more mature with a fuller and rounder face, marking an advance in age and representing the ‘young mother’. This is also supported by the change from the ‘melon-hairstyle’ of girls and young women to an elegant early Antonine coiffure. Type III is, as far as we can tell from the two surviving versions, clearly a re-think of the portrait image of Faustina and its creation most probably involved a portrait sitting with the young empress. We can therefore assume that the court was involved in its creation. Type III was made available to both the mint and the marble workshops, probably at the same time.

#### **Fourth portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type IV) – A.D. 151/52 (aged ca. 20–22)**

Type IV is the second type known exclusively from coins as it was, again, probably only put through the mint or originated within the mint and stayed there. It features yet another coiffure of Faustina.

#### **Fifth portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type V) – A.D. 153/54 (aged ca. 22–24)**

The next type known also in sculpture after Type III is Type V. It is known from five versions in the round. Type V introduces, besides an updated and exceptionally plain coiffure, the full and rounded face of the ‘young matron’, so typical for all the succeeding sculptured types (Types VII, VIII, X). The matronly appearance of Faustina was not necessarily a real physiognomic characteristic of the empress as many other slightly earlier and contemporary ‘private’ portraits feature a full and rounded face.<sup>383</sup> However, the type is a careful new edition and was most probably officially commissioned, involving a portrait sitting with the empress. It was employed both by the marble workshops and the mint.

#### **Sixth portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type VI) – A.D. 156/57 (aged ca. 25–27)**

Like Types II and IV, Type VI is also known exclusively from coins. As with the two other types, it was probably only put through the mint or originated within the mint and stayed there. It is distinguished from Type V only by the new hairstyle.

#### **Seventh portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type VII) – A.D. 161 (aged ca. 30/31)**

It is very likely that Type VII was not created to commemorate the birth of the twin brothers Commodus and Antoninus on the 31st of August A.D. 161, but that it was made in connection with Marcus Aurelius’ accession on the 7th of March A.D. 161, to visually express Faustina’s position and relation to the emperor by the considered assimilation to his portrait image.<sup>384</sup> In this case, it was

---

<sup>383</sup> Cf. Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 71, no. 94, pls. 116–17, with a reference to further examples from the early Antonine period, when this phenomenon first appeared in high-quality metropolitan portraiture well before Type V of Faustina was created.

<sup>384</sup> This has already been considered by Smith 1983, 229.

almost certainly an official commission. The number of 22 sculptured versions of Type VII underlines its importance and makes it the most common of all of Faustina's types in the round.<sup>385</sup> The high number of versions of this type (and the succeeding Type VIII) is probably best explained by the increased demand for portraits of the imperial couple in the first years after the accession of Marcus Aurelius.<sup>386</sup> Type VII was employed by the marble workshops and the mint, probably a few months later by the mint, coinciding with the birth of the twin brothers, as the numismatic evidence might suggest.

#### **Eighth portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type VIII) – A.D. 162/63 (aged ca. 31–33)**

Type VIII is, besides yet another new hairstyle, basically a further enlivening of the sculptured portrait image of Faustina. With its subtle adjustment of details rather than a re-think of the whole portrait image, it is more like an 'enhanced edition' of Type VII. It is therefore possible that it originated in the sculpture workshops, perhaps supported by the fact that it had been created shortly after the preceding type. With 17 surviving sculptured versions it was apparently very popular, second only after Type VII. This is not only because it is visually convincing, as it seduces one into seeing the real person behind it, but also because it was created not too long after the accession, when many portraits were dedicated to the emperor and the empress in honorific contexts. Together with Type VII, these two portrait types account, with 39 surviving sculptured versions, for more than two-thirds of the total of 58 extant portraits known for all types of Faustina the Younger. As with the preceding type, Type VIII was employed both by the marble workshops and the mint.

---

<sup>385</sup> Fittschen 1982, 55.

<sup>386</sup> This is suggested by the evidence of the statue bases for Marcus Aurelius (see Højte 2005, 154, fig. C 17, and below in Chapter 7); see also Fittschen 1999, 108–38 for Antonine 'portrait galleries'.

### **Ninth portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type IX) – A.D. 163/64 (aged ca. 32–34)**

Type IX is the fourth and final type known from coins only. As with the other three types it was probably specifically created for the mint and made available to it or was conceived within the mint and never left it.

### **Tenth portrait type of Faustina the Younger (Type X) – after A.D. 163/64 (older than 32–34)**

Finally, Type X in sculpture, besides introducing a new hairstyle, appears to closely resemble the preceding sculptured type (Type VIII), as far as we can tell from the sole surviving version. Such a variation in image could have been officially commissioned or might possibly have originated in the marble workshops. In any case, it was employed by both the marble workshops and the mint.

### **Reception of the types**

Common types in sculpture were Types I, V, VII and VIII, while Types III and X are only known from one or two versions each.<sup>387</sup> Types I, V, VII and VIII were likewise frequently employed on coins. However, in contrast to portraits in the round, Types III and X were also commonly used in the mint.

It is telling that three out of the four types unknown in sculpture (Types II, IV and IX) were not used for a particularly long time on the coins and that Type IX does not appear on *denarii*. Type VI is even exclusively known from *aurei*, gold *quinarii* and medallions. That further sets these four types apart from the others and might suggest that Types II, IV and IX reflect short-lived hairstyles worn by the empress.

If we look at our adjusted typology and absolute chronology of the portrait types on coins and compare them with the portrait types missing in sculpture (Types II, IV, VI and IX), an interesting pattern evolves: between Type I and Type VI, every other type is missing in sculpture. The ‘less agile

---

<sup>387</sup> Types I, VII and VIII are also the most strongly recognisable sculptured types of the empress.

machinery for the distribution of types in the round', as R. Smith called the portrait 'system' for sculpture in 1983 in comparison to the much more flexible mint, probably did not keep pace with the changing hairstyles of the empress, as they were possibly not regarded as important enough for a 'replication' in the round.<sup>388</sup> Interestingly, from the four types exclusively known from coins (Types II, IV, VI and IX), at least two types clearly also appear on provincial Roman coinage (Types IV and VI). Despite the rarity of these particular provincial coins, this strongly suggests that the design of their portrait followed imperial coinage.<sup>389</sup>

*Reception of the sculptured types in the provinces.* The low number of only ten provincial versions for all sculptured types of Faustina together does not allow a sound statistical analysis of the reception of the types in the provinces.<sup>390</sup> However, with four versions for Type VII and three for Type VIII (70 % of the total) compared with two for Type I and one for Type V, it becomes absolutely clear that Types VII and VIII were also the most popular types outside Italy.

### **Reasons for the changing hairstyle of the portrait types**

As can be shown, two of the ten types of Faustina (Types I and VII) were most likely created in connection with specific historical events, since a portrait identity was needed after her marriage (Type I), and to visually express Faustina's position and relation to Marcus after his accession (Type VII). However, it has yet to be explained why the other eight types were created and what they were for.

The total number of portrait types appears, in comparison to other emperors or empresses, conspicuously high. Our modern perception, however, is probably wrong, as the ten types in the 30 years from Faustina's marriage in A.D. 145 to her death in A.D. 175/76 have to be seen in their

---

<sup>388</sup> Smith 1983, 229.

<sup>389</sup> Type IV: Classical Numismatic Group, Electronic Auction 214, 15 Jul 2009, Lot 304 (bronze coin from Tabala in Lydia). – Type VI: RPC Online, vol. 4, temporary no. 3907 (bronze coin from Byzantium in Bithynia-Pontus).

<sup>390</sup> In addition, the statue bases have not yet been systematically collected.

ancient context. This was a long period of time and the empress was at the very pinnacle of the metropolitan aristocracy at the heyday of the Antonine period. It has already been demonstrated in the preceding chapter that self-styling and elaborate coiffures were extremely important in these narrow elite circles. Faustina's many different coiffures are firmly rooted within metropolitan aristocratic culture; they emerged from fashionable elite styles and interacted with them. Furthermore, there was surely some overlap or accordance between the real coiffures worn by Faustina and the hairstyles we see in her portraiture. Seen in this context of metropolitan elite culture, one of the reasons for the creation of Faustina's portrait types becomes clear: the portrait image of Faustina the Younger was frequently updated to reflect the main changes of her hair in real life as they occurred.<sup>391</sup>

---

<sup>391</sup> Besides others, this was most forcefully denied by Fittschen 1982, 18.

## CHAPTER 5

# Marcus Aurelius: Imperial Coins and Medallions

### A. RESEARCH HISTORY AND STATE OF RESEARCH

A brief treatment of the chronological ‘development’ of the coin portraits of Marcus Aurelius up to A.D. 161 can be found in P. Strack’s *Untersuchungen zur römischen Reichsprägung des zweiten Jahrhunderts. Teil III* (1937) on imperial coinage under Antoninus Pius.<sup>392</sup> Subsequent studies made use of the coin portraits and their diachronic change primarily to establish an absolute chronology of the sculptured portraits of Marcus Aurelius. The most important among these publications in chronological order are, first, M. Wegner’s study on Antonine portraiture *Die Herrscherbildnisse in antoninischer Zeit* (1939).<sup>393</sup> He was followed by M. Bergmann in her booklet *Marc Aurel* (1978).<sup>394</sup> Most influential, however, are still the fundamental studies by K. Fittschen in the first volume of the Capitoline portrait catalogue (1985) and in his book on *Prinzenbildnisse antoninischer Zeit* (1999).<sup>395</sup> Building on the work of Wegner and Bergmann, Fittschen attempted to further refine the chronology of the sculptured portraits. A systematic study of the coin portraits of Marcus Aurelius in their own right has been lacking up to now.

### B. CHRONOLOGY

Marcus Aurelius was born on the 26th of April A.D. 121 in Rome. He was adopted by Antoninus Pius on the 25th of February A.D. 138 at the age of 16.<sup>396</sup> The first imperial coins for Marcus Aurelius were minted in late A.D. 139, following his designation to the first consulship (COS DES) and his elevation

---

<sup>392</sup> Strack 1937, 14.

<sup>393</sup> Wegner 1939, 33–47.

<sup>394</sup> Bergmann 1978, esp. 22–26, 40–42.

<sup>395</sup> Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 67–78; Fittschen 1999, 13–31.

<sup>396</sup> Date of birth: SHA, vita Marci 1. 5; adoption: SHA, vita Marci 5. 6; see also Kienast 1996, 137.

to the rank of Caesar. These coins (Fig. 114), a joint issue of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius, show the portrait of the emperor on the obverse and the likeness of the young prince on the reverse. The joint issue continues into A.D. 140 (COS) and probably later.<sup>397</sup>

The coinage of Marcus Aurelius in his own name and with his portrait on the obverse (Fig. 115) starts in A.D. 140.<sup>398</sup> The chronology of the coins until A.D. 147 rests solely on the mention of the consulship. The coinage with COS in the legend can be dated to A.D. 140–144. Coins issued following the designation to the second consulship (COS DES II) (Fig. 116) were minted in late A.D. 144.<sup>399</sup> The following issue (COS II) runs from A.D. 145–147 (Fig. 117).<sup>400</sup>

On the 1st of December A.D. 147 the tribunician power was conferred on Marcus Aurelius (and the title Augusta on Faustina) the day after the birth of his first child Domitia Faustina, renewed as soon as the 10th of December A.D. 147 and thereafter every year on the same day.<sup>401</sup> This led to a short issue of only nine days (TR POT COS II) in late A.D. 147 (Fig. 118) and, more importantly, conveniently allows us to date the following issues by the number of the *tribunicia potestas* starting with TRP II in A.D. 147/48 (Fig. 119).<sup>402</sup>

On the 7th of March A.D. 161 (TRP XV) (Fig. 120), immediately after the death of Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus advanced to the rank of Augustus (*dies imperii*) and their joint rule

---

<sup>397</sup> BMCRE IV, p. xli; Fittschen 1999, 19 with n. 142; for the designation to the consulship and elevation to the rank of Caesar see: SHA, vita Marci 6. 3; see also Kienast 1996, 137.

<sup>398</sup> Strack 1937, 12.

<sup>399</sup> Strack 1937, 12; BMCRE IV, p. xlii; see also Kienast 1996, 138.

<sup>400</sup> Strack 1937, 12; BMCRE IV, p. xliii; see also Kienast 1996, 139.

<sup>401</sup> For the conferral of the title see: Fasti Ostienses Pb 13–15, Vidman 1982, 51, 128: *pr. k. Dec. Aurelio Caesar(i) [ex A]nnia Faustina filia nata est. K. Decem. Aurelius Caesar [trib(uniciam)] pot(estatem) iniit et Faustina Aug(usta) cognominata est.* – For the name of the first daughter see Fittschen 1999, 2 with n. 14 for further references. – For the date of the iteration see Strack 1937, 1 with n. 1; BMCRE IV, p. xxxix; Kienast 1996, 139.

<sup>402</sup> Strack 1937, 12; BMCRE IV, p. xliii; undated coins are rare. – For reasons of clarity, only full years are given for the tribunician power in the following (e.g. TRP II = A.D. 148, TRP III = A.D. 149, etc.); if not referring to a specific legend, TRP here stands for either abbreviation that appears on coins and medallions: TRP or TR POT.

started.<sup>403</sup> After Lucius Verus died in early A.D. 169 (TRP XXIII), Marcus Aurelius was sole ruler until A.D. 177 (TRP XXXI), when the joint rule with his son Commodus commenced and lasted until Marcus' death on the 17th of March A.D. 180 (TRP XXXVIII) (Fig. 121) at the age of 58.<sup>404</sup>

### C. CHRONOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGE OF THE PORTRAIT

The coins and medallions of Marcus Aurelius cover a period of more than 40 years and show the development of his portrait image from a youth to a man. For an easier understanding, these four decades are broken down into several phases that are not necessarily associated with a change in portrait but rather try to exemplify the development. Corresponding age levels of Marcus Aurelius are given in the headings.

As in the earlier chapter on the coinage of Faustina, not all denominations are discussed separately, but common features and general tendencies are pointed out, best observed on *aurei* and bronzes from dies of good quality as well as on medallions. Again, *denarii* frequently vary more widely.<sup>405</sup>

#### **Coins and medallions of A.D. 139–144 (COS DES and COS) – aged 18–23**

The earliest imperial coins with the portrait of Marcus Aurelius on the reverse, the joint issue with Antoninus Pius that was minted in late A.D. 139 (COS DES) (Fig. 122) and continued in A.D. 140 (COS) and probably later (Fig. 123), show the prince as a youth with a rounded face and lavish large, protruding curls, deeply engraved on the dies. Frequently, short strands and stray hair, indicated by more shallow incisions, escape the contour of the hair and enliven the flamboyant hairstyle (Fig. 124). The same issues, however, already also show the prince from A.D. 139 onwards with a more elongated face and a more pronounced chin, best observed on the (in comparison to other

---

<sup>403</sup> BMCRE IV, p. cix; Kienast 1996, 137, 143.

<sup>404</sup> BMCRE IV, pp. cx–cxii; Kienast 1996, 138, 144.

<sup>405</sup> Strack 1937, 20; BMCRE IV, p. xxxviii.

denominations) more frequent *denarii* (Fig. 125). The hairstyle of this more mature portrait does not distinctively change but the contour of the hair appears on some dies to be slightly more uniform (Fig. 126).<sup>406</sup>

The more mature version of the portrait of the prince continues, with some exceptions, from A.D. 140–144 (COS) on the imperial coins in Marcus Aurelius' own name with his likeness on the obverse. It has already been observed in previous studies that most of the dies of this period show him still beardless (Figs. 127–28), but some of the latest coin portraits already feature, to a variable degree, a faint beard on the cheeks, the chin and the upper lip (Fig. 129).<sup>407</sup> More precision can be reached in this matter: the years from A.D. 140 to 144 (COS) feature three main reverse types. No facial hair appears on portraits that are connected with the reverse type '*Pietas Aug*', which is probably the inaugurative type for the prince, as the occasionally still very youthful physiognomy also suggests (Fig. 130). A faint beard rarely occurs in connection with the reverse type '*Iuventus*' (Fig. 131) but is frequently found on portraits connected with the reverse type '*Honos*' (Fig. 129); the iconography of the latter reverse type is carried on into the COS DES II and COS II issues. Clearly, H. Mattingly was right when he suggested that these three reverse types are successive.<sup>408</sup>

The more mature portrait also appears on the medallions from A.D. 140–144 (COS), both on the joint issue(s) with Antoninus Pius (Fig. 132) and on the medallions in Marcus' own name (Fig. 133). All of the pieces published by Gnecci appear to be beardless.<sup>409</sup>

---

<sup>406</sup> See Fittschen 1999, 20 for a comparable observation. The physiognomy of the portrait of Marcus Aurelius on the joint issues with Antoninus Pius shows a wide range of variability and frequently a clear distinction between a very youthful and a more mature portrait cannot be made on an objective basis.

<sup>407</sup> Strack 1937, 14; Wegner 1939, 38; Bergmann 1978, 40; Fittschen 1999, 20.

<sup>408</sup> BMCRE IV, p. xlii. – *Pietas Aug*: BMCRE IV, 42, no. 276, pl. 7. 4; Strack 1937, pl. 5. 122. – *Iuventus*: BMCRE IV, 41, no. 268, pl. 7. 1; Strack 1937, pl. 5. 121. – *Honos*: BMCRE IV, 40, no. 263, pl. 6. 19; Strack 1937, pl. 5. 120.

<sup>409</sup> GNECCHI II, pl. 56. 2–3; 65. 5; Gnecci describes beardless portraits of Marcus simply as '*giovanile*' while he calls the portraits with the start of a beard '*giovanile con barba nascente*' or '*giovanile, leggermente barbata*'; however, he does not consistently mention a beard where extant and he might have overlooked the traces in some cases, especially when the surface is worn or shows modern reworking.

Marked (dotted) pupils, giving 'life' to the portrait, begin to emerge A.D. 139–140 and they are soon commonplace on the coins and medallions of Marcus Aurelius.<sup>410</sup>

### **Coins and medallions of A.D. 144–147 (COS DES II and COS II) – aged 23–26**

The faint beard of the COS issues on the coins carries on into a short COS DES II issue in late A.D. 144, as especially the (in comparison to other denominations) more frequent *denarii* can prove (Fig. 134), and into the following COS II issue (Fig. 135), that runs from A.D. 145–147. The earliest bronzes of this period (COS DES II and COS II) (Fig. 136) appear to slightly lag behind this development. They can still feature no beard at all or just sideburns and a very faint moustache.<sup>411</sup> In general, the extent of beard in all denominations can vary from die to die, but besides covering the upper lip it now frequently very faintly covers the jaw and connects the beard between the cheeks and the chin (Fig. 135). The scattered beard hairs incised on the dies are the stylistic conversion of the downy beard of an adolescent or young adult. Already appearing before the 1st of December A.D. 147 (conferral of the tribunician power on Marcus Aurelius) is a fuller beard on the coins, now covering the cheeks, the jaw and the chin more densely (Fig. 137).<sup>412</sup>

The physiognomy from A.D. 144–147 (COS DES II and COS II) can show slight variation depending on the die-cutter and the rendering of the hairstyle can vary from voluminous and curled with protruding locks (Fig. 138), as we have seen with the earlier coin portraits, to curls that are more closely confined to the head with a more uniform contour of the hair (Fig. 139). What unifies these portraits despite the different styles of the die-cutters is the vibrant and flamboyant look of the hair: the deeply engraved curls are frequently set against each other in opposite directions and many dies feature short strands and stray hair escaping the contour (Fig. 138).

---

<sup>410</sup> Strack 1937, 9; BMCRE IV, p. xxxviii.

<sup>411</sup> Bronzes: Banti 1985, 108, no. 70 (DES II); 128–29, nos. 109–12 (HILARITAS); 220–22, nos. 293–97 (consular procession). The exact extent of beard (or no beard) on the bronzes is in many cases difficult to determine as the faint facial hair easily wears off and the quality of the photographic images is often not high enough for such detailed observations.

<sup>412</sup> This was missed by Fittschen 1999, 30.

What has just been said about the coins of A.D. 144–147 (COS DES II and COS II) is, with respect to the physiognomy and the rendering of the hairstyle of the portrait in general, also valid for the medallions of that period (COS II). However, as some of the bronzes, supposedly the earliest portraits on the medallions can still feature no beard (Figs. 140–41) while the later medallions are within the range of variation observed on the coins, varying from a rather faint beard (Fig. 142) to a fuller beard (Fig. 143), that probably first appears in A.D. 147.<sup>413</sup>

### **Coins and medallions of A.D. 147–152 (TRP I–VI) – aged 26–31**

The varied rendering of the hairstyle of A.D. 144–147 (COS DES II and COS II) described above and the fuller beard of the latest coins with COS II, as well as the slightly varying physiognomy carry on into a short issue with TR POT COS II (Fig. 144) in late A.D. 147 and into the following coin issues of A.D. 148–152 (TRP II–VI). The range of variation is well illustrated by comparing *aurei* struck from different dies (Figs. 145–48).<sup>414</sup> As concerns the beard, one might argue, based on a careful but subjective selection of dies, that it gains volume and substance in the years up to A.D. 152 (TRP VI) until the moustache finally connects with the beard on the cheeks and the chin (Fig. 148).<sup>415</sup> However, the development is neither continuous nor linear: a variable extent of beard can appear on different dies of the same years, here exemplified by *aurei* from A.D. 149 (TRP III) (Figs. 146, 149) and A.D. 152 (TRP VI) (Figs. 148, 150).<sup>416</sup> These coins clearly prove that even in A.D. 152 (and later) a reduced extent of beard can occur, reminiscent of earlier issues and testifying the flexibility of the mint.

---

<sup>413</sup> Without beard: GNECCHI II, pl. 65. 1, 8–9; 66. 10. – varying extent of beard: GNECCHI II, pl. 65. 2, 10; 66. 6. – fuller beard: GNECCHI II, pl. 56. 4 (joint issue with Antoninus Pius).

<sup>414</sup> Apparently, no coins for Marcus Aurelius were struck in A.D. 151 (TRP V).

<sup>415</sup> For this argument see Wegner 1939, 39–40; Fittschen 1999, 30 with n. 195.

<sup>416</sup> *Denarii* can show an even wider variability, occasionally featuring an extent of beard reminiscent of the COS II issue up to ca. A.D. 152.

The latter *aureus* from A.D. 152 (Fig. 150) is also a good example of how far this flexibility of the mint could go. The single die shows a complete stylistic conversion of the portrait, that still appears to go back to the same mint model as the other dies of this year (here exemplified by fig. 148), as the general physiognomy and the shape of the head as well as the extent of hair suggest. The die-cutter chose to set, instead of curls, deeply cut curved strands of hair in different directions against each other, radically breaking out of the contour of the coiffure and lending the portrait a very 'energetic' and vibrant appeal. The physiognomy is enriched with highly arched brows and a slightly hooked nose. The extent of beard, however, is clearly reduced, conferring a more youthful appearance to the likeness.

The portraits on the medallions up to A.D. 152 (Fig. 151) seem to follow roughly the same pattern, as far as the frequently modest state of preservation allows to conclude. The exact extent of beard is especially often hard to determine.<sup>417</sup> However, the vibrant style of the *aureus* die from A.D. 152 (Fig. 150) is not yet to be found on medallions.

A few *denarii* of A.D. 149 (TRP III) (Figs. 152–55) offer further insight into the workings of the imperial portrait in the mint and support the use of 'work-models' by the die-cutters, as already suggested above in Chapter 2 on Faustina's coinage. Despite being hastily and not particularly skilfully cut, the portraits closely resemble one another, almost as if the die-cutters attempted to 'copy' a common model incision by incision in a conspicuously linear, graphic way. That at least some of these *denarii* were engraved by different die-cutters is suggested by differences in style and in the skill of using the engraving tool(s) for details of the hair and beard, ranging from heavy-handed to fluent, from fine incisions to thick lines.

---

<sup>417</sup> TRP: GNECCHI II, pls. 64. 2; 65. 6. – TRP II: GNECCHI II, pls. 61. 6; 63. 10. – TRP III: GNECCHI II, pls. 61. 7–10; 65. 4, 7.

Furthermore, these *denarii* distinctively differ from (some of) the other *denarii* of the same year (Fig. 156) and from the varied portraits of the *aurei* (Figs. 146, 149) and other denominations. It is very likely that they do not directly refer to the assumed 'authorised mint model' but to a common 'work-model'. The use of such 'work-models' can also be expected for other *denarius* dies and for coin dies of other denominations. However, this practice is not easy to prove since the coin dies often do not conform that closely. In many cases they are worked more freely after a common model, varying around its design elements.

### **Coins and medallions of A.D. 152–156 (TRP VI–X) – aged 31–35**

The 'energetic' and vibrant portrait style first seen on a single *aureus* die from A.D. 152 (Fig. 150) appears to be influential in the following years and, despite variation, a vibrant mixture of curls, strands and stray hair can frequently be observed on the gold coins (Figs. 157–58) and in other denominations (Figs. 159–61). Upswept strands of hair above the forehead and a lock brushed to the side often indicate an elaborate frontal hair-scheme, most clearly noticeable in the exaggeration of this motif on *aureus* dies from A.D. 157 (TRP XI) (Figs. 162–63).<sup>418</sup>

What has just been said is also valid for the medallions of this period, here exemplified by a particularly appealing example from A.D. 156 (TRP X) (Fig. 164). Both curved strands or a more curly rendering of the hair can be observed on different dies, confirming a stylistic variety comparable to that of the coinage.<sup>419</sup>

Three *aureus* dies from A.D. 153 (TRP VII) (Figs. 157, 165–66) with the 'energetic' and vibrant portrait described above strongly suggest the use of a common 'work-model' as the portraits closely resemble one another, as well as the single *aureus* die from A.D. 152 (TRP VI) (Fig. 150) that first featured the new style. Two more *aureus* dies from A.D. 153 (TRP VII) follow this style more loosely

---

<sup>418</sup> According to Strack 1937, 14 the upswept strands of hair can frequently be observed from A.D. 148 onwards; however, my own observations have shown that they are more clearly discernible from A.D. 152 (TRP VI).

<sup>419</sup> TRP VII: GNECCHI II, pl. 62. 1. – TRP VIII: GNECCHI II, pl. 62. 2. – TRP X: GNECCHI II, pls. 64. 3; 65. 3.

(Figs. 167–68), while a further example (Fig. 169) proves that alternative stylisations of the portrait also existed.

### **Coins and medallions of A.D. 156–161 (TRP X–XV) – aged 35–40**

From A.D. 156 (TRP X) onwards, the beard of Marcus Aurelius' portrait increases in length on the coins, no longer being tightly confined to the jaw and the chin, best observed on *denarii* (Fig. 170) and on *aurei* (Figs. 171–72).<sup>420</sup> On some dies, especially of *denarii*, this goes hand in hand with a more mature and marked physiognomy (Figs. 173–74). The hairstyle on the coins stays 'vibrant' in many cases (Figs. 171–72, 175) with a mixture of strands, curls and stray hair set against each other in different directions well into the main issue of A.D. 160 (TR POT XIII COS II). However, some dies from this year, before the designation to the third consulship in late A.D. 160 (TR POT XIII COS II DESIG III), already feature a more well-ordered curly beard and a 'calmer' hairstyle with a more uniform contour (Figs. 176–77), which dominate the coin issues of A.D. 161 (TRP XV) and the following years.

The medallions feature a portrait with longer beard from about A.D. 158 (TRP XII) (Fig. 178) onwards.<sup>421</sup> An extraordinarily well-preserved medallion in the British Museum from A.D. 159 (TRP XIII) (Fig. 179) well illustrates the longer beard, clearly showing short, wavy strands of hair below the chin that match the still-vibrant rendering of the hairstyle with large curls.<sup>422</sup> The portrait on the medallions of A.D. 160 (TRP XIII) seems to follow the portrait of the previous year as seen on the medallion in the British Museum but the two pieces published by Gnecci (Fig. 180) are too poorly preserved to allow any more detailed observations.<sup>423</sup>

---

<sup>420</sup> Strack 1937, 14 dates this change from A.D. 158 onwards, followed by Wegner 1939, 39; Fittschen 1999, 30 with n. 197 observes the longer beard 'since the middle of the 50s'.

<sup>421</sup> TRP XII: GNECCHI II, pl. 62. 4–5. The two portraits from the same obverse die are poorly preserved but the tips of the strands of facial hair below the chin, clearly visible on both examples, and the pointed chin itself suggest a longer beard than on previous issues (e.g. TRP XI: GNECCHI II, pl. 62. 3).

<sup>422</sup> GNECCHI II, pl. 62. 6 = Kent et al. 1973, pl. XII. 325.

<sup>423</sup> GNECCHI II, pl. 62. 7–8.

### Coins and medallions of A.D. 161–166 (TRP XV–XX) – aged 40–45

By A.D. 161 (TRP XV), after Marcus Aurelius advanced to the rank of Augustus, the portrait with the ‘calmer’ hairstyle mentioned above is omnipresent on the coins (Figs. 181–82). The characteristic features of the ‘new’ portrait are a tightly curled hairstyle with more evenly distributed locks and a more clearly defined uniform contour (in comparison to previous coin issues) as well as a more well-ordered beard with slightly twisted, pointed ends underneath the chin and part of the jaw. All of this, of course, can be subject to slight variations. It is important to note that the ‘accession’ of Marcus Aurelius had no influence on the coin portrait apart from the addition of the laurel wreath as an attribute of the emperor on some dies.

A distinctive technical-stylistic peculiarity of especially the *aurei* and *denarii* from ca. A.D. 161 (TRP XV) to 163 (TRP XVII), first observed by Strack, are the large letters of the legend, completely surrounding the portrait instead of leaving a gap above the portrait (Fig. 183).<sup>424</sup> This feature also influences the coin portrait and its size, since the lettering reduces the area available for the carving: the likeness frequently looks squat and roundish in its proportions (Figs. 183–84). Less frequently and in a less conspicuous way, the (large) letters completely surrounding the portrait can also be found on some of the dies for bronzes (Fig. 185).

The change back to the ‘normal’ lettering in A.D. 164 (TRP XVIII) also leads to a stylistic conversion of the portrait. The additional space brings about a larger, slightly more elongated and ‘fuller’ portrait in terms of details (Fig. 186), but neither an advance in age nor a portrait type change should be seen in this distinctive but strictly stylistic alteration.<sup>425</sup> However, in A.D. 164 (TRP XVIII) the pointed ends of the beard on some *aureus* dies are already slightly longer than they were before (Fig. 186), and by

---

<sup>424</sup> Strack 1937, 11. This feature already starts to develop in A.D. 159/60 (TRP XIII/XVIII) and can occasionally still be found on dies of A.D. 164 (TRP XVIII).

<sup>425</sup> Fejfer 1998, 48 wrongly sees ‘a more mature elderly man’ in the portrait of the emperor aged 43 at that time and argues that a change of the portrait type in A.D. 163/64 cannot be ruled out.

early A.D. 166 (TRP XX IMP III) all the dies show a longer beard (Fig. 187).<sup>426</sup> This development can be observed in all denominations, probably as soon as A.D. 163 on the bronzes (Fig. 188). As with the coins of Marcus Aurelius as Caesar, the progress is not completely linear and change appears not to happen in all denominations at the same pace.

The medallions from A.D. 162 (TRP XVI) onwards confirm what has just been said.<sup>427</sup> They do not feature the large letters of the obverse legend and the portrait does not go through the stylistic change observable on many *aurei* and *denarii* from ca. A.D. 161–163 (TRP XV–XVII). The portrait of the medallions (Fig. 189) stays the same, apart from minor variation, until about A.D. 164 (TRP XVIII), when it starts to show a longer beard (Fig. 190), comparable to the *aurei*. Unfortunately, no medallions can be securely dated to A.D. 161. However, some of them show portraits of Marcus Aurelius (COS III) and Lucius Verus (COS II) facing each other on the obverse (Fig. 191), an image particularly adequate to commemorate their accession and joint rule. These medallions should most probably be assigned either to A.D. 161 or the succeeding year.<sup>428</sup>

### **Coins and medallions of A.D. 166–180 (TRP XX–XXXVIII) – aged 45–58**

From the fourth imperial acclamation in A.D. 166 (TRP XX IMP III) a prominent new portrait feature starts to appear on the coins (Figs. 192–93), more clearly discernible on the majority of the dies from A.D. 167 (TRP XXI) onwards (Fig. 194): a distinctive long flowing beard divided into thick wavy (or curly) strands of hair. The change in motif becomes especially obvious in comparison with the corresponding sculptured portrait type (Type IV) discussed in Chapter 6. The underlying portrait

---

<sup>426</sup> This was already observed by Wegner 1939, 42.

<sup>427</sup> TRP XVI: GNECCHI II, pl. 66. 7–8. – TRP XVIII: GNECCHI II, pl. 66. 3. – TRP XIX: GNECCHI II, pl. 66. 1, 5. – TRP XX: GNECCHI II, pl. 62. 10.

<sup>428</sup> The mention of IMP COS III for Marcus and IMP COS II for Lucius allows us to broadly date the medallions between the 7th of March A.D. 161, the day of their accession, and the 31st of December A.D. 167, the day before Lucius' third consulship started. The still shorter beard of Marcus suggests a date before A.D. 164. Furthermore, the obverse type expressing their concord corresponds well with the CONCORDIAE AVGUSTOR(VM) reverse type on coins of A.D. 161 and 162, showing Marcus and Lucius clasping hands, suggesting a similar date for the medallion-obverse. *Concordiae Augustorum*: BMCRE IV, 386, no. 9, pl. 53. 13.

model was already available to/at the mint in later A.D. 166, as some coins of this year suggest, but was only fully converted into coin-format in the succeeding year.

Conspicuously upswept strands of hair above the forehead on many coins (Figs. 194–96) should most probably not be mistaken for the stylistic conversion into coin-format of the upswept curls of the sculptured portrait type (*anastolé*). The motif of the upswept strands of hair already appears on much earlier coin issues (Figs. 150, 157–58) and indicates more generally an elaborate frontal hair-scheme, as argued above.<sup>429</sup> The stylistic rendering of the beard can vary from three or four clearly defined wavy (or curled) strands of hair (Fig. 197) to a wavy mass of hair (Fig. 198). A leaner neck and a skinnier face are observable on some coin dies from ca. the mid A.D. 170s onwards (Figs. 199–201), culminating in the posthumous portrait on the issues for the Divus Marcus (Fig. 202). With the variations just described and some further variability of the physiognomy and the proportions of the head, depending on the die-cutter, this portrait type appears to continue in use on the coins (Figs. 199–200, 203–04) until the death of Marcus in A.D. 180 (TRP XXXVIII) (Fig. 201) and beyond, for the consecration issues in his name (Fig. 202).

The medallions of A.D. 166 (TRP XX IMP III) still feature the ‘old’ portrait (Fig. 205). However, medallions of A.D. 167 (TRP XXI IMP IIII) show the portrait change more distinctively and pronounced than is discernible on the *aurei* (Fig. 206): the beard is divided into four long wavy (or curled) strands of hair, two of them extending outwards onto the neck.<sup>430</sup> The number of wavy or curly strands of the beard can vary (Fig. 207), but they are more clearly defined than on the coins. For the upswept strands of hair above the forehead that also occur on medallions, the same holds true as was just said for the coins: they should not be mistaken for the stylistic conversion into coin-format of the

---

<sup>429</sup> Cf. Bergmann 1978, 40 for a closely related observation. – This example clearly shows the limitations of the small format (simplification and loss of detail in relation to a larger model) and exemplifies the difficulties involved in the modern interpretation of such features.

<sup>430</sup> The distinctive beard was already observed by Albertson 2004, 287; however, he missed that the obverse die of the medallion of A.D. 168 (TRP XXII) in Berlin he depicts (Albertson 2004, 288, fig. 44 = Dressel 1973, 77–79, no. 40, pl. 6. 4) was already used a year earlier in A.D. 167 (TRP XXI) (see GNECCHI II, pl. 61. 3; 63. 1).

upswept curls of the sculptured portrait type (*anastolé*). As on the coins, this portrait type continues in use on the medallions until the death of Marcus.

## D. ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

### Reuse and updating of dies

It has been repeatedly noticed that dies for medallions were frequently used for more than one issue or year, respectively. Some obverse dies were employed for several consecutive years, while reverse dies could even be used discontinuously, 'reappearing' after several years, as has been proven by earlier studies.<sup>431</sup> Where necessary, the dies were re-engraved to update the mention of the tribunician power, confirming that the correct date on the issues was of importance.<sup>432</sup>

One obverse die of Marcus Aurelius was used for three consecutive years, from A.D. 167 (TRP XXI) to A.D. 169 (TRP XXIII), to mint medallions (Fig. 206).<sup>433</sup> Another obverse die of Marcus, also first appearing A.D. 167 (TRP XXI) was re-employed the following year (A.D. 168, TRP XXII) (Fig. 208).<sup>434</sup> The final example to be mentioned here is of special interest, because the *tribunicia potestas* of this obverse die from A.D. 173 (TRP XXVII) (Fig. 209) was updated by adding one figure (I) to correctly date the medallion to A.D. 174 (TRP XXVIII) when it was reused (Fig. 210).<sup>435</sup>

---

<sup>431</sup> Kaposy 1971/1972, 134–36; Dressel 1973, 72; 79, no. 41; 129–30, no. 66; 89, no. 44; 142, no. 73; Franke 1975, 408–10; Szaivert 1986, 85, 88.

<sup>432</sup> See Franke 1975, 408–10 for examples.

<sup>433</sup> TRP XXI: GNECCHI II, pl. 61. 3; 63. 1 (Gneccchi erroneously read TRP XXIII instead of XXI on the former example. The correct *tribunicia potestas* is clearly discernible on the reverse of GNECCHI II, pl. 63. 2, struck with the same die). – TRP XXII: GNECCHI II, pl. 63. 3; Dressel 1973, 77–79, no. 40, pl. 6. 4 = Albertson 2004, 288, fig. 44. – TRP XXIII: GNECCHI II, pl. 63. 6. – Franke 1975, 409.

<sup>434</sup> TRP XXI: GNECCHI II, pl. 63. 2. – TRP XXII: GNECCHI II, pl. 64. 1 (The *tribunicia potestas* reads like XXIII on the plate; however this reverse type is not attested for A.D. 169 and the imperatorial acclamation would have to read IMP V in that case; see Szaivert 1986, 180). – Franke 1975, 409.

<sup>435</sup> TRP XXVII: GNECCHI II, pl. 59. 9; 60. 1. – TRP XXVIII: GNECCHI II, pl. 63. 8. – Dressel 1973, 89, no. 44; 142, no. 73; Franke 1975, 410 n. 13.

What was previously unnoticed is the ‘updating’ of a portrait of an obverse die for a medallion of Marcus Aurelius as Caesar in one case. The die dating to A.D. 145–147 (COS II) (Fig. 141) was re-engraved to feature a portrait with beard (Fig. 142) instead of the beardless likeness.<sup>436</sup> Apparently, when the die was carved (most probably in A.D. 145) and subsequently employed to mint medallions, it was still regarded appropriate to depict Marcus Aurelius without a beard. This is also proven by other medallions and some of the bronzes of the same period (COS II) mentioned above, despite the fact, that the concurrent *aurei* and *denarii* featured a beard of variable extent on a regular basis. However, at some point between A.D. 145 and 147, someone in the mint must have thought the beardless portrait outdated and the die was re-carved to feature facial hair. This finding is significant, as it suggests a flexible usage of the imperial portrait only up to a certain point or variability within a certain range, but not completely uncontrolled employment of the imperial image.

Like the dies for medallions, obverse dies for *aurei* can also be used for more than one issue or year. From a close examination of the sample of *aurei* used for this study it has been observed that nine obverse dies were reused in the following year, while two further obverse dies were used for three consecutive years.<sup>437</sup>

Two obverse dies of A.D. 148 (TRP II) were reused in the succeeding year (Figs. 211–12).<sup>438</sup> One obverse die of A.D. 153 (TRP VII) was used for a total of three years until A.D. 155 (TRP VIII) (Fig. 213)

---

<sup>436</sup> Beardless portrait: GNECCHI II, pl. 65. 8 = Dressel 1973, 64–65, no. 32, pl. 6. 2 = Kent et al. 1973, 117, no. 315, pl. 79. 315 – portrait with beard: GNECCHI II, pl. 66. 6 = Dressel 1973, 65–66, no. 33, pl. 5. 4 = Kent et al. 1973, 117, no. 314, pl. XII. 314; Kent et al. 1973, 116–17, no. 313, pl. 79. 313.

<sup>437</sup> All these obverse dies are without mention of the tribunician power, only dated by the connected reverse (with the *tribunicia potestas*). – Szaivert 1986, 88 mentions that obverse dies of gold denominations were relatively frequent reused in the succeeding year; however, he does not give any examples.

<sup>438</sup> Gorny & Mosch, Giessener Münzhandlung, Auction 180, 12 Oct 2009, Lot 403 (TRP II) = Ira & Larry Goldberg, Coins & Collectibles, Auction 46, 26 May 2008, Lot 109 (TRP III). – Roma Numismatics Ltd., Auction 9, 22 Mar 2015, Lot 716 (TRP II) = Gemini LLC, Auction 3, 9 Jan 2007, Lot 402 (TRP III).

and another die of A.D. 153 was reused in the following year (Fig. 165).<sup>439</sup> In addition, an obverse die of A.D. 155 (TRP VIII) was reused in the succeeding year (Fig. 214), while a die of A.D. 157 (TRP XI) was again used for a total of three years until A.D. 159 (TRP XIII) (Fig. 172).<sup>440</sup> One obverse die of A.D. 160 (TRP XIII) was reused A.D. 161 (TRP XV) before Marcus became emperor (Fig. 177).<sup>441</sup> Finally, we have four more cases of reuse of obverse dies in the following year in A.D. 162 (TRP XVI), 164 (TRP XVIII) and 166 (TRP XX) (Figs. 215–18).<sup>442</sup>

A worn and recut obverse die known from three *aurei* has only been securely identified in one case in A.D. 164 (TRP XVIII) (Fig. 219).<sup>443</sup> The ‘original’ die before the alteration has not yet been identified, but the rough ancient rework of parts of the hairstyle and beard becomes sufficiently clear in comparison with other dies.

A reverse die for *aurei* with an updated mention of the tribunician power was found in one instance.<sup>444</sup> The die from A.D. 166 (TRP XX) (Fig. 218) was recut in the succeeding year to feature

---

<sup>439</sup> Gerhard Hirsch Nachfolger, Auction 279–80, 8 Feb 2012, Lot 2472 (TRP VII) = Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 49, 21 Oct 2008, Lot 270 (TRP VIII) = Classical Numismatic Group, Auction Triton 11, 8 Jan 2008, Lot 940 (TRP VIII). – Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 59, 4 Apr 2011, Lot 1020 (TRP VII) = Numisma S.p.a., Auction 48, 26 Oct 2013, Lot 138 (TRP VIII).

<sup>440</sup> Heritage World Coin Auctions, Auction 3019, 26 Apr 2012, Lot 23417 (TRP VIII) = Classical Numismatic Group, Auction Triton 17, 7 Jan 2014, Lot 715 (TRP X). – Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 92, 24 May 2016, Lot 2250 (TRP XI) = Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction O, 13 May 2004, Lot 2023 (TRP XII) = Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 92, 23 May 2016, Lot 590 (TRP XIII).

<sup>441</sup> Classical Numismatic Group, Auction Triton 18, 6 Jan 2015, Lot 1117 (TRP XIII) = Fritz Rudolf Künker GmbH & Co. KG, Auction 104, 27 Sept 2005, Lot 539 (TRP XV).

<sup>442</sup> Classical Numismatic Group, Auction 99, 13 May 2015, Lot 654 (TRP XVI) = Noble Numismatics Pty Ltd., Auction 111, 5 Apr 2016, Lot 4416 (TRP XVII). – UBS Gold & Numismatics, Auction 83, 8 Sep 2009, Lot 255 (TRP XVI) = Classical Numismatic Group, Auction Triton 11, 8 Jan 2008, Lot 942 (TRP XVII). – Editions V. Gadoury, Auction 2016, 3 Dec 2016, Lot 74 (TRP XVIII) = UBS Gold & Numismatics, Auction 64, 24 Jan 2006, Lot 199 (TRP XIX). – Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 27, 12 May 2004, Lot 417 (TRP XX) = Fritz Rudolf Künker GmbH & Co. KG, Auction 182, 14 Mar 2011, Lot 728 (TRP XXI).

<sup>443</sup> Classical Numismatic Group, Electronic Auction 284, 8 Aug 2012, Lot 341 = Ira & Larry Goldberg, Coins & Collectibles, Auction 75, 24 Sep 2013, Lot 2615 = Ira & Larry Goldberg, Coins & Collectibles, Auction 23, 25 Jan 2004, Lot 3802 (all dated to A.D. 164). – An ancient alteration of a die can only be determined securely when two or more (authentic) coins show identical modified features, while singletons always bear the risk of modern reworking.

<sup>444</sup> Cf. Szaivert 1986, 87 with n. 138 for this phenomenon on coins.

TRP XXI (Fig. 220).<sup>445</sup> Interestingly, the obverse die connected with the recut reverse on our example was also previously used in the preceding year (Fig. 218), as mentioned above.

The coins and medallions with an updated mention of the *tribunicia potestas* clearly show that the correct date on the issues was of great importance. Likewise, new titles were swiftly updated on the coins throughout the year. Both are also well exemplified by the rapid succession of dates and titles on the last coin issues of Marcus Aurelius before the death of Antoninus Pius on the 7th of March A.D. 161 and the first issue immediately after: following the designation of Marcus Aurelius to the third consulship in late A.D. 160, the coins feature the reverse legend TR POT XIII COS II DESIG III (Fig. 221). Subsequent to the renewal of the tribunician power on the 10th of December A.D. 160, the legend changes to TR POT XV COS II DESIG III. After the turn of the year, the reverse legend reads TR POT XV COS III (Fig. 222) and immediately after the death of Antoninus Pius the filiation AVG PII F is dropped and the *praenomen imperatoris* (IMP) as well as the title *Augustus* (AVG) are added on the obverse (Fig. 181).<sup>446</sup> Apparently, there was a strict and rigid control of the titles and the dating in the mint.

Reverse types can also change in connection with important events as, for example, the prominent type CONCORDIAE AVGVSTOR(VM), depicting Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus clasping hands to express the harmony between them (Fig. 181), demonstrates. The type was introduced in A.D. 161 after their 'accession' and continued in the succeeding year.<sup>447</sup>

In contrast, no change or adjustment of the imperial portrait in connection with new titles or specific events can be traced on the coins until A.D. 166. The conspicuous fuller beard of some of the coin portraits of A.D. 147 had already emerged before the conferral of the tribunician power on Marcus

---

<sup>445</sup> Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 27, 12 May 2004, Lot 417 (TRP XX) = Fritz Rudolf Künker GmbH & Co. KG, Auction 182, 14 Mar 2011, Lot 728 (TRP XXI).

<sup>446</sup> Strack 1937, 12–13, pl. 5. 376, 377, 390; BMCRE IV, 149, no. 1003, pl. 21. 14; BMCRE IV, 152, no. 1017, pl. 22. 2; BMCRE IV, 385, no. 1, pl. 53. 12.

<sup>447</sup> *Concordiae Augustor(um)*: BMCRE IV, 386, no. 9, pl. 53. 13.

Aurelius on the 1st of December of the same year.<sup>448</sup> Likewise, neither the designation to the third consulship (COS II DESIG III) in late A.D. 160 nor the 'accession' of Marcus Aurelius in A.D. 161 appears to have had an influence on the coin portrait besides the addition of a laurel wreath as an attribute of the emperor on some dies, following the 'accession'.<sup>449</sup> However, it is probable, as will be demonstrated later in this study, that the described change of the portrait in A.D. 166 (TRP XX) is connected with the fourth imperial acclamation in the same year (IMP IIII).

The evidence clearly shows that dies for coins and medallions of previous issues could be re-employed when they were still in a good state and the titles and the date were correct. In some cases, if necessary, they were updated before reuse. As was demonstrated, the mint could react quickly, if changes or adjustments were thought important. With the exception of A.D. 166 (TRP XX IMP IIII), however, portrait changes appear to be gradual and not completely linear and continuous. We have proof for the use of obverse dies of Marcus Aurelius for up to three consecutive years, as has been shown above, and the evidence of the coin portraits presented suggests that different variations or types could be used side by side even for a longer period of time. For example, the youthful portrait of Marcus Aurelius of A.D. 139 runs parallel to a more mature version of the imperial image already seen in the same year and continues into the early A.D. 140s. The extent of beard, for example, can also vary widely up to the early A.D. 150s.

The portraits apparently did not lose their validity and the use of the imperial image in the mint was rather flexible up to a certain point. There are no indications of a tight control of the imperial portrait in the mint. However, the obverse die for a medallion mentioned above that was updated to feature a beard, possibly in A.D. 146 after it was first used in A.D. 145, demonstrates the limits of this

---

<sup>448</sup> The evidence presented here clearly speaks against Fittschen 1999, 30 who assumed an adjustment of the underlying portrait type of Marcus Aurelius ('Neuaufgabe') in connection with the conferral and the birth of his first child.

<sup>449</sup> It has been assumed that a new sculptured portrait type for Marcus Aurelius was created either in A.D. 160 for his third consulship in the following year or in A.D. 161 for his 'accession' (Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 73 with nn. 12–13 for further references).

flexibility. Someone in the mint must have thought the beardless portrait outdated. So, we have to assume some control of the employment of the imperial image in the mint as most probably a recognisable and distinct portrait identity for the Caesar on the coins and medallions was attempted.<sup>450</sup>

### **Portrait types**

In contrast to Faustina the Younger, it is difficult to divide the images of Marcus Aurelius on coins and medallions into types without the knowledge of the sculptured portraits (Types I–IV). His portrait on the numismatic evidence often shows only a gradual but not strictly linear and continuous development or adjustment over time. As we have seen on several occasions in this chapter, portraits of the same issues – especially of Marcus as Caesar – can sometimes widely differ from one another, still going back to the same model and reflecting it. Type changes are in most cases not clearly marked and a certain shift between types makes it hard to date the introduction or initial employment of a new type in the mint exactly.<sup>451</sup> The transition from the first to the second portrait type of Marcus Aurelius, especially, is not clearly discernible. Consequently, the types and their chronology on coins and medallions outlined below have to rest on a close comparison with the portrait features – especially the hair- and beard-styles – of the sculptured types discussed in detail in Chapters 6 and 7.

Type I (Fig. 124) is the least problematic in this respect, as it was doubtless introduced in the mint in late A.D. 139, but we must recall that the introduction of a portrait type in the mint is only a *terminus ante quem* for its creation. Possibly still in the same year Type II was also first employed in the mint, as the coins might suggest, but it cannot be ruled out that these initial portraits with a more mature physiognomy are simply variations of Type I.

---

<sup>450</sup> For the recognisability of the imperial image see Smith 1996, 32–33.

<sup>451</sup> Cf. Bergmann 1978, 40; Fittschen 1999, 20 n. 143 for this finding.

The new type (Type II) is more clearly discernible in ca. A.D. 140 and 141 on the continued joint issue with Antoninus Pius (Fig. 126) and in connection with the reverse type 'Pietas Aug' (Figs. 127–28), where both types (Types I and II) appear to have been used side by side for a while.<sup>452</sup> On coins and medallions, Type II is the most flexible of all types of Marcus. It was used for a considerably long period of time up to ca. A.D. 160 (Fig. 175) and was adjusted to reflect the advancing age of the growing prince.

Type III was probably introduced in the mint in A.D. 160, judging from the more well-ordered beard and the 'calmer' hairstyle with a more uniform contour that first seems to appear in this year and is omnipresent from A.D. 161 onwards (Fig. 181). However, a more mature portrait with a longer beard is discernible on some dies as early as A.D. 156 and the possibility cannot be excluded that Type III is already reflected by these earlier issues.

The introduction of Type IV (Fig. 194) in the mint has to be seen most likely in connection with the fourth imperatorial acclamation (IMP IIII) and the Parthian victory in later A.D. 166, as the conspicuous and omnipresent reverse type with Victoria holding a shield inscribed VIC(TORIA) PAR(THICA) strongly suggests (Figs. 193, 195).<sup>453</sup> The new portrait type with the distinctive long flowing beard is unusually quickly adopted in the mint and was clearly thought important.

It is important to note that 'introduction' in this context does not mean, as can be shown, that the new types were immediately employed by all die-cutters. Instead, we observe again the flexibility of the mint: the types were made available to the mint and could be adopted quickly if they were thought important (Type IV) or they were received by the die-cutters more gradually and slowly

---

<sup>452</sup> These issues are not dated to a specific year but ca. A.D. 140–141 appears to be the most likely date for the continued joint issue and the inaugurative 'Pietas' reverse type for Marcus.

<sup>453</sup> For the Parthian victory cf. below Chapter 7 under Type IV. – Reverse type with *Vic(toria) Par(thica)*: BMCRE IV, 441, no. 405, pl. 60. 14.

(Type II). The presumably complex processes and workings behind the observed phenomena are described in the following.

### **Work-models**

It is almost certain that the die-cutters did not engrave the dies directly from a life-size three-dimensional model, as the surviving coin portraits, even of the most skilful engravers, would in that case be far more heterogeneous. Therefore, two intermediary steps between the official three-dimensional model ('Palatine model') and the actual cutting of the die were proposed in Chapter 2 on Faustina's coinage. First, the 'Palatine model' was converted into a relief or two-dimensional model of the portrait ('authorised mint model'). Ideally, the 'authorised mint model' would be in strict profile view and probably already of reduced size but still large enough to show all the relevant details and to give a first impression of what the portrait on the coins would look like.<sup>454</sup> Such a model would most probably also have considered the three-dimensional properties of the portrait (depth of relief), if it were in relief.

The 'authorised mint model', as the evidence of the coins suggests, was the point of reference for 'work-models', either two-dimensional or in relief, that set the die design and were referred to by the die-cutters when engraving the dies. These 'work-models' were an outline of the actual die design.<sup>455</sup> The existence and use of such 'work-models' by the die-cutters for the coin portraits of Marcus Aurelius is supported by the group of *denarii* of A.D. 149 (TRP III) discussed above (Figs. 152–55). Despite being hastily and not particularly skilfully cut, the portraits closely resemble one another and appear to 'copy' a common model almost incision by incision in a conspicuously linear, graphical way. Furthermore, the stylistic rendering shows that the dies were engraved by more than one die-

---

<sup>454</sup> The portrait to the left on coins and medallions of Marcus Aurelius and Faustina the Younger appears to be the mirrored version of the 'standard' portrait to the right. No evidence can be found that would support that they relate to the respective side of a three-dimensional model (cf. von Kaenel 1986, 274 in the context of the coinage of Claudius).

<sup>455</sup> In relation to the 'authorised mint model' (positive form), these 'work-models' were probably inverted (negative form or mirror image).

cutter, advocating that ‘work-models’ could be shared between them. Other dies of the same year, however, show completely different stylistic renderings, also suggesting that other ‘work-models’ were in use at the same time.

Likewise, three *aureus* dies from A.D. 153 (TRP VII) (Figs. 157, 165–66), closely following the portrait of a single *aureus* die from A.D. 152 (TRP VI) (Fig. 150) that first introduced this ‘energetic’ and vibrant style, strongly support the use of common ‘work-models’ shared between die-cutters.<sup>456</sup> Interestingly, of the six obverse dies for *aurei* from A.D. 153 (TRP VII) in our sample, only these three portraits resemble one another very closely, two further dies follow the ‘new’ style more loosely (Figs. 167–68), while one portrait (Fig. 169) testifies that alternative stylisations were available, again supporting the simultaneous use of different ‘work-models’.

The close resemblance of the portraits on the mentioned *denarii* and *aurei* and the existence of different stylisations of the imperial image in the same years are strong evidence that they do not directly refer to the supposed ‘authorised mint model’ but to common ‘work-models’. The use of such ‘work-models’ can be assumed for other dies as well and we probably have to expect this practice on a regular basis. However, this is not easy to prove since the coins often do not conform that closely in all details.

Frequently, a close accordance between different dies is limited to the repetition of a few formulaic features of the hair-scheme while the rest of the portrait characteristics show a more general resemblance. In the case of Marcus Aurelius, the hair above the forehead and at the temples as well as the hair on the neck often conforms especially well. Furthermore, the contour of the hair at the back of the head was apparently of some importance, while the rest of the coiffure could be worked

---

<sup>456</sup> It is entirely possible that impressions of coins (or trial strikes) struck from dies with a ‘successful’ design were used to multiply the initial ‘work-model’.

more freely. Several of these formulaic hair features run side by side, but no clear system or pattern behind their use can be observed.<sup>457</sup>

What becomes absolutely clear from the complex evidence of the coins and medallions is that no simple linear and continuous development of the coin portrait can be observed. Change and development is frequently multi-stranded and not in accordance on all dies and in different denominations. A considerable number of die-cutters using different 'work-models' and influencing each other must have been involved in the production of dies in the Antonine mint. Furthermore, some of the die designs set in 'work-models' even appear to be deliberate stylistic reformulations of the 'authorised mint model', as the *aureus* die from A.D. 152 (TRP VI) (Fig. 150) with the 'energetic' and vibrant portrait may prove, and the evidence suggests that such designs could be influential. This also supports the assumption that a new 'authorised mint model' was probably only necessary when a distinctively different model or type (in relation to the existing portrait) was meant to be converted into coin-format. Some adjustments, such as the depiction of the advancing growth of beard of Marcus Aurelius, were probably put through at the level of 'work-models'.

### **Adjustment of the beard in the mint**

It is unclear how the beard of the imperial image was adapted in the mint to reflect Marcus Aurelius' advancing extent and growth of facial hair on coins and medallions. These adjustments appear to be gradual but not strictly linear or continuous. In fact, as can be ascertained, they are in a number of cases not at all in accordance on different dies of the same issues and in different denominations, further complicating the matter. An 'authorised mint model' closely following an official three-dimensional model ('Palatine model') updated in several phases would be a possible explanation, as suggested by Bergmann and followed by Fittschen, but we could probably expect a higher level of

---

<sup>457</sup> This was first observed and briefly described by Bergmann 1978, 40.

accordance of the beard on the dies in that case.<sup>458</sup> Wegner's idea, on the other hand, that the die-cutters followed their personal impression and perception ('eigene Anschauung') of the emperor cannot be completely excluded but appears unlikely as this would most probably result in far more variation of the portrait on coins and medallions than we actually observe.<sup>459</sup> His finding that the coin portraits, particularly of young rulers, appear to feature a more nuanced development of the portrait (and especially of the beard) than we find in the round, however, is to a certain degree correct and suggests that there is no complete correspondence between the two media.

As already argued in the chapter on the coinage of Faustina, it is possible that some adjustments or modifications of the imperial image were only put through the mint or even originated in the mint, especially when, as in the case of Marcus Aurelius, only the beard style of the portrait changed. These adjustments were possibly based on drawings as a model, as this medium is particularly suitable for a swift reaction to changes in the appearance of the prince and later emperor. Instead of adapting the 'authorised mint model', these adjustments could equally have been made at the level of the 'work-models'. One has, however, to be careful not to mistake every variation on the dies for a change in real appearance, as the dies still refer to models and not directly to real life.

## E. ORGANISATION OF THE MINT OF ROME AND SYSTEM OF PRODUCTION

To better comprehend the workings of the imperial image in the mint outlined above, it is necessary to understand it within the framework of organisation and production of the mint of Rome, starting with the textual evidence: a group of Trajanic dedicatory inscriptions of mint personnel (dating from A.D. 115) found in Rome close to the church of San Clemente on the Caelian Hill provides important evidence that in the middle imperial period the Roman mint was located in the vicinity of the find

---

<sup>458</sup> For Bergmann's explanatory model of an official revision or reissuing of portrait types see below in Chapter 6 under Marcus Aurelius Type II.

<sup>459</sup> Wegner 1981, 656.

spot.<sup>460</sup> In combination with additional inscriptions from Rome, bearing the mention of further personnel of the mint with their respective job designations, they are also the most important evidence for various modern reconstructions of the internal organisation and the division of labour at the mint of Rome.<sup>461</sup> Despite uncertainties regarding the interpretation of these epigraphic documents, it becomes sufficiently clear that the mint was hierarchically organised, with groups of workers at the lower end involved in the actual process of minting (*suppostores*, *signatores* and *maliatores*) and officials of higher rank that most probably had various administrative duties (e.g. *officinatores*). The day-to-day operation of the mint was apparently overseen by an *optio et exactor auri argenti et aeris* ('inspector [?] and superintendent of the gold, silver and bronze').<sup>462</sup> He was subordinated to the *procurator monetae*, the (administrative) head of the mint controlling its actual running. Responsible for the entire mint seems to have been the highest official in charge of finances in the imperial administration and one of the most important imperial secretaries, the *a rationibus*.<sup>463</sup>

The traditional identification of the *signatores* of one of the Trajanic inscriptions (CIL VI, 44) as die-cutters has convincingly been refuted by B. E. Woytek, both because of the epigraphic context and for philological reasons.<sup>464</sup> Rather, the *signatores* are probably part of a group of three workers, all of them mentioned in the inscription mentioned above, in charge of minting the coins: the *suppostor* handles the blanks/coins, the *signator* is responsible for holding and placing the upper die and the

---

<sup>460</sup> CIL VI, 42–44, 791 and probably also 239; Carson 1956, 229; Burnett 1987, 28–29; Wolters 1999, 85, 89 with nn. 169–71; Woytek 2012, 101 with n. 71 for further references; 102 n. 74; see also Coarelli 1994, 47–65 for the archaeological evidence. – It apparently remained there until at least the late third century A.D. (cf. Aurelius Victor, de Caes. 35. 6).

<sup>461</sup> Woytek 2012, 101. The various reconstructions are still subject to dispute. For an overview of the modern contributions and further references see Wolters 1999, 89–96; Woytek 2012, 101 n. 73. – The most relevant epigraphic documents have been assembled by Alföldi 1958/59, 47–48.

<sup>462</sup> Burnett 1987, 29; Woytek 2012, 102–04. A division into a certain number of *officinae* or workshops/sections is not evident from the inscriptions (Wolters 1999, 98 with n. 210; Woytek 2012, 104 with nn. 83–84). – The common term 'bronze' is used here for all copper alloys.

<sup>463</sup> Carson 1956, 232–34; Burnett 1987, 25–29; Wolters 1999, 87–90; Woytek 2010, 45–46; Woytek 2012, 101. – The *tresviri monetales* are recorded on inscriptions up to the middle of the third century A.D. but after the reign of Augustus the office of the moneyer seems to have had primarily a ceremonial role and function (Burnett 1987, 27–28).

<sup>464</sup> Woytek 2012, 104–08 with further references. The inscription lists the mint personnel of lowest social status, many of them slaves.

*malliator* wields the hammer.<sup>465</sup> The correct term for die-cutter is more likely *scalptor*, as the mention of this term on a funerary inscription from Rome for an imperial freedman and employee of the Roman mint suggests.<sup>466</sup> The ancient verb *scalpere* is well attested in connection with cutting precious stones, and despite differences in the detail of the technical execution in comparison to die-cutting, these two professions were probably seen as affiliated in antiquity.<sup>467</sup> The full title of the imperial freedman just mentioned, Publius Aelius Felix, reads *adiutor praepos(iti) scalptorum sacrae monetae* ('assistant to the head of the die-cutters of the sacred mint') and we may infer from it that the die-cutters were organised within the mint in a division (or divisions) overseen by a head or supervisor (*praepositus*) and his assistant (*adiutor*) and that they probably had a higher position.<sup>468</sup> This constellation would well account for the importance of the die-cutters and the dies for the minting process: die-cutting was highly qualified work and only the coined images of the official dies conferred legal authority to the blanks and made them official currency.<sup>469</sup>

### Die design

For all coin issues we can expect a high degree of planning and organisation. First, the *a rationibus* as *custos principalium opum* ('Guardian of the Imperial Wealth') had to determine how much 'metal' was to be turned into coin in the mint in a given period.<sup>470</sup> Most probably he precisely set the number of gold, silver, and bronze (*aes*) coins and the denominations that had to be produced.<sup>471</sup> In a next step, it is suggested that someone had to decide how the total number of coins in a given period was to be broken down between the different eligible members of the imperial family. Depending on the exact time within the Antonine period, coins were concurrently minted to varying degrees for Antoninus

---

<sup>465</sup> Woytek 2012, 108–11 with fig. 7.

<sup>466</sup> CIL VI, 8464; Woytek 2012, 105–06. The undated inscription was dated by O. Hirschfeld to the Hadrianic period based on the *nomen gentile* of the imperial freedman; however, he also noted that the attribute *sacer* is very rare on inscriptions of the first and second century A.D. On coins, the *Moneta* is first labelled *sacra* under Diocletian (Hirschfeld 1905, 186 with n. 3).

<sup>467</sup> Woytek 2012, 105 with n. 88 for literary sources and further references.

<sup>468</sup> Hirschfeld 1905, 186–87; Wolters 1999, 93; Woytek 2012, 105 with n. 87.

<sup>469</sup> Cf. Wolters 1999, 94–95 for the importance of the official coin dies.

<sup>470</sup> *Custos principalium opum*: Plin. Epist. 8. 6; control over the metal turned into coin: Statius, Silv. 3. 3. 105. Burnett 1987, 26–27. – We know little about his exact responsibilities and his influence on the coinage.

<sup>471</sup> The coin blanks were produced outside the mint (Wolters 1999, 95–96; Woytek 2010, 46–47).

Pius, Faustina the Elder, Marcus Aurelius, Faustina the Younger, Lucius Verus, Lucilla, Commodus and Crispina. Subsequently the designs of the coins (images and legends) had to be specified.

It is unclear who had influence over the choice of designs. The emperor was probably only involved on occasion and in general we should not think of too rigid a control of the public image by him or his closest advisers.<sup>472</sup> Furthermore, for the traditional view that the *a rationibus* was involved in choosing the coin images and legends, there is no proof.<sup>473</sup> Someone in the imperial administration, however, must have been responsible for the designs and it is not unlikely that this too was to a great extent a function of the (permanent) staff of the mint, as we can be almost certain that they had the designs and models of previous issues and years 'in stock'.<sup>474</sup>

As a further consequence, we can expect that the division of die-cutters must have received a written or, less likely, verbal order, specifying the number of dies needed for each eligible member of the imperial family and defining the obverse and reverse legends as well as the reverse type. It is likely that such an order was in most cases not particularly concerned with the obligatory portrait on the obverse, as long as a model was available at the mint, leaving the die-cutters a certain flexibility, as observable on the dies. Although the imperial image on the coins was regarded as a sign of sovereignty, there appears to be no rigid control of the portrait.<sup>475</sup>

However, it is not unlikely that such an order was in some cases accompanied by design templates or models, especially if a new 'official' portrait type and/or elaborate reverse types were involved.<sup>476</sup> Frequently, though, the reverse types referred to qualities a good emperor could in general be associated with. The language of the reverse design became increasingly conventionalised from the reign of Antoninus Pius onwards and the reverses were dominated by constantly repeated deities

---

<sup>472</sup> Burnett 1987, 70–71.

<sup>473</sup> Woytek 2010, 46; cf. for example Strack 1931, 7 for this view.

<sup>474</sup> Cf. Burnett 1987, 67, 69–71 on this topic.

<sup>475</sup> Cf. Burnett 1987, 66–69 with literary sources on coins as a sign of sovereignty.

<sup>476</sup> Cf. Strack 1931, 6 for some preliminary thoughts on these matters.

and personifications.<sup>477</sup> In the majority of cases, therefore, it must have been routine in the Antonine period to combine the legends with largely stereotypical reverse images and the same probably holds true for the imperial image.

### **Dies and minting technology**

The official coins (and medallions) were struck using a pair of engraved dies. The obverse die was set in an anvil (lower or anvil die) while the reverse die was fixed at the end of a trussell (upper or reverse die). The dies were made of iron (steel) or bronze and engraved by hand.<sup>478</sup> The use of punches or hubs ('master punch' in relief) in the early and middle imperial period for impressing (parts of) the legend or the image on the die has repeatedly been considered but no clear proof has been found so far. Rather, the evidence of the coins speaks in most cases against this practice: even images or legends (from different dies) that look identical reveal slight differences in details such as, for example, the profile line or contour of the portrait and the rendering of the hair or the spacing of the lettering.<sup>479</sup> However, punches roughly defining (parts of) the image or the legend on the die, that subsequently had to be manually touched up remain a possibility, but in that case the resulting die would keep its individual appearance, making it virtually impossible to prove this practice.<sup>480</sup>

The method of engraving the design on the die blank must be inferred from the coins as mirror images of the dies. While die-engraving is often assumed to be closely related to gem-engraving, there are clearly some important differences in the detail of the technical execution.<sup>481</sup> The metal of

---

<sup>477</sup> Burnett 1987, 77–79.

<sup>478</sup> Göbl 1978, 50–51; Moesta – Franke 1995, 77–98; Wolters 1999, 100–01 with n. 217 for further references to minting technology. A number of dies from the Roman period have survived, quite a few of them probably the work of ancient forgers (Hill 1922, 13; Moesta – Franke 1995, 89–90 with n. 22 for further references).

<sup>479</sup> In this sense von Kaenel 1986, 197–201 (in the context of imperial coinage of Claudius) with n. 69 for further references; see Wolters 1999, 102 with n. 229 for an overview of the modern contributions on the topic; cf. also CELLINI, treatises 70, 73 for a comparable observation.

<sup>480</sup> Wolters 1999, 102–03 with n. 231. However, the use of punches would harden the steel and make it more difficult to remove it with cutting tools (this was already observed by CELLINI, treatises 73).

<sup>481</sup> For the relation of die-cutting and carving of gemstones see among others: Alföldi 1958/59, 39; Göbl 1978, 52; Zwierlein-Diehl 2007, 78; Woytek 2012, 105 with nn. 88–90 for further references.

the die blanks is softer and less brittle than stone and it was less difficult to work. In contrast to gem-cutting, the utilisation of a drill was no prerequisite for engraving dies. The use of cutting tools, such as burins and gravers, was sufficient to remove the metal bit by bit and cut the details while other implements, such as a burnisher, could be used to smooth the surface.<sup>482</sup> As G. F. Hill first pointed out, 'there is', in fact, 'no necessity to assume that ancient dies were cut with a drill at all'.<sup>483</sup> It is therefore not surprising that the coins reflect traces of an extensive use of engraving tools. This is best observed on well-preserved *denarii* from fresh dies: the curls and the laurel wreath of the portrait especially, as well as the letters of the legend, can feature sharply defined edges that clearly mirror the pointed end of the engraving tool used for chasing the corresponding grooves into the dies.<sup>484</sup>

Although the drill was possibly more efficient for removing larger masses of metal, as was necessary for engraving the basic form of the bust in negative relief, the engraving tool was clearly superior in cutting fine and fluent details such as curls and strands of hair with a precision and sharpness that could hardly be reached with a drill. This is especially well proven by portraits with elaborate hairstyles on coins and medallions of the Antonine period. For example, the best and most skilfully cut dies feature curls consisting of several carefully articulated fine strands of hair each, rising from the scalp and twisting around a central depression, with occasional more delicate strands of hair following their direction or escaping the curl (Fig. 223). Given the small size of the die and the fluency and perfection of the details, it is almost certain that the die-cutter must have held the tool hand firm while he rotated the die, most likely attached to a kind of 'movable support'.<sup>485</sup> This way he had maximum control over the die when he forced the point of his engraving tool into the metal.

---

<sup>482</sup> Hill 1922, 17–19; Moesta – Franke 1995, 94–95; cf. also CELLINI, treatises 73. – Cup-shaped cavities on the dies, frequently associated with the use of a drill, could have been made by a round-headed punch rather than by the drill.

<sup>483</sup> Hill 1922, 18.

<sup>484</sup> Gold is much softer and loses this feature after a short time in circulation while the bronzes are frequently poorly preserved or worn.

<sup>485</sup> Cf. Zwierlein-Diehl 2007, 78 for the assumption of a 'movable support' ('bewegliche Unterlage').

The coin portraits bear witness to a wide spectrum of talent and skill of the die-cutters. They range from carvings in high relief of the highest quality-level (Fig. 145), with a carefully articulated physiognomy and a skilful execution of the hair- and beard-styles, disguising any linear components, to very manual and unskilled 'technical' carvings of moderate level (Fig. 153), with a plain and simplified physiognomy and a highly graphic conception of details, in its linear features closer to drawing than to sculptured relief.

However, the quality of the dies, especially for the *denarii*, not only depends on the skill and talent of the engraver, but a certain 'economy of production' can also be determined. Besides hasty carving, a reduction of the complexity of the portraits can also frequently be observed, suggesting that a given number of dies had to be cut within a limited time. The complexity of the hair- and beard-styles especially could be reduced and the rendering of details such as curls, brows and eyes, for example, could be more graphic with a less well-defined relief.

That die-cutting was a time-consuming procedure is confirmed by an early modern source: the famous Renaissance artist Benvenuto Cellini, who used punches to sink the design on coin dies, stated in his treatises that he 'could not have produced two [dies a day]' if he had 'to work in the manner of the ancients', that is to say if he had to cut the dies.<sup>486</sup> While this finding cannot be directly compared with ancient circumstances, it illustrates that die-engraving was a lengthy process, and we have to expect that the ancient die-cutters were under pressure of time when new and substantial issues were to be minted.

To what extent the die-cutters internalised the routine of engraving a specific imperial portrait is most observable when they had to cut a different portrait, for example, after the accession of a new emperor. These portraits often resemble the coin image of the predecessor or are reminiscent of

---

<sup>486</sup> CELLINI, treatises 71.

it.<sup>487</sup> At the start of the reign it can be argued that a new model was not yet available to the mint or that it was not yet followed by all die-cutters; however, the same phenomenon is also discernible during the reign, suggesting that the die-cutters had to 'switch' between portraits of different imperial personage. An obverse die for an *aureus* of Marcus Aurelius of A.D. 152 (TRP VI) (Fig. 224), for example, features a portrait with a slightly receding hairline that is reminiscent of the coin image of Antoninus Pius (Fig. 225). A further portrait on an obverse die of A.D. 164 (TRP XVIII) (Fig. 226) resembles in its physiognomy the coin image of Lucius Verus (Fig. 227). Both examples clearly demonstrate how considerably the individual style of the die-cutter could influence the appearance of the portrait and how much the resulting coins can differ from concurrent images.

#### **Evidence for an outline of the design on the die and process of die-cutting**

Material and technique involved in cutting a portrait on a die also require, besides a planned procedure, accuracy and clarity of detail. Changes or adjustments to the image during the process of engraving are virtually impossible.<sup>488</sup> In consequence, it is almost certain that the execution of a portrait after a new model (that was distinctively different from the preceding model) had to be carefully considered from the beginning until the die-cutters developed a certain routine. The abilities of experienced and skilled die-cutters, however, should not be underestimated. The evidence suggests that they could work without sticking closely to a model after a while (when they were familiar with a new portrait), or even without a model in front of their eyes at all.

The design of the dies is framed by a (most likely punched) beaded border, outlined with a pair of compasses scribing a circle. This is in some cases proven by the traces of a second, concentric inner circle and/or a central hole (Fig. 225), made by the point of the centre leg of the compass, both raised on the coins but originally recessed on the lost dies. The inner circle divided the available surface in an inner field for the image and an outer field for the legend, although this division was

---

<sup>487</sup> Göbl 1978, 52.

<sup>488</sup> Regling 1924, 5.

more of a guidance than a strict rule. The image was engraved first while the legend was carved in a second step, probably by a different die-cutter specialising in lettering, using the space of the outer field that was left.<sup>489</sup> This is proven by a number of dies featuring an obverse legend cutting into the drapery of the bust (Figs. 138, 175), as the space for the lettering was obviously scarce.

The portrait on the dies in comparison to a relief was cut in reverse, from the 'inside out'. The presumed steps are the following: first, the shape of the bust was outlined on the die blank. More details were not necessary at this stage, as the surface within the contour was for the most part removed in the next step. Second, the basic form in negative relief of the portrait was cut into the die: the head was left plain, only physiognomic features that were meant to be recessed on the coins (e.g. eye socket and mouth) had to be considered at this stage as (roughly laid out) less deeply cut areas on the die. This relief outline (bust without details), as a cavity on the die, is clearly mirrored on the back and top of the head of coin portraits with a reduced number of curls, leaving the scalp visible (Fig. 228).<sup>490</sup> In contrast to the steep rise of the relief at the profile line of the face, the relief outline of the head at the back and the top is often more softly sloping to allow the hairstyle to define the contour in these areas and to avoid an unnatural harsh transition showing through the hair.

Subsequently, the eye and the brow, the ear, the mouth and the hair- and beard-style as well as further details, for example the drapery, were engraved. Throughout this process, the die-cutter could examine the progress of his work by making impressions. He would most likely have pushed a soft material, such as wax, into the cavity of the die to check the progress of his work. In addition, trial strikes on lead or tin must be considered, once the die-cutter proceeded towards finishing the

---

<sup>489</sup> Cf. Hill 1922, 23; Göbl 1978, 42–43 for parts of this observation; in detail described by von Kaenel 1986, 179–81, 197–201 in the context of imperial coinage of Claudius; cf. also CELLINI, treatises 69, 72–73 for a comparable process of die outline in the early modern period.

<sup>490</sup> Cf. von Kaenel 1986, 199 for a comparable observation on imperial coins of Claudius; cf. also CELLINI, treatises 73 for these steps. – This relief outline can also include a rough indication of the curls defining the contour at the back of the head.

die.<sup>491</sup> The result of this procedure – after the legend had been added – was an obverse die with the imperial subject, bringing us back to the imperial image.

We have come far from the portraits of Marcus Aurelius on coins, but the discussion clearly demonstrates how complex the functioning of the imperial image in the mint was – from the initial decision to produce a new issue to the actual dies. It can be shown that the imperial image was influenced by a variety of factors at any time. No simple answers can be found to understand how the imperial image was received and adjusted in the mint of Rome; rather, diverse possibilities have to be considered.

---

<sup>491</sup> Cf. CELLINI, treatises 73–74 for the practice of examining the progress in the early modern period.

## CHAPTER 6

# Marcus Aurelius: Marble Portraits

### A. RESEARCH HISTORY AND STATE OF RESEARCH

The beginning of modern study of Marcus Aurelius' portraits is marked by J. J. Bernoulli's *Römische Ikonographie II. 2* (1891).<sup>492</sup> The publication compiled a large amount of material and Bernoulli was able to identify a range of sculptured portraits of Marcus while excluding others. However, the portraits were still grouped by different age levels of the emperor to which the whole scope of images could not convincingly be made to conform.<sup>493</sup> Half a century later, it was M. Wegner in his then groundbreaking study on Antonine portraiture *Die Herrscherbildnisse in antoninischer Zeit* (1939) who set forth the initial division and sequence of the sculptured portraits of Marcus Aurelius into four distinct types and first attempted to date their creation. As far as is discernible, his typology is based on shared characteristics of the frontal hair, also taking into consideration physiognomic features as well as extent and style of beard.<sup>494</sup> M. Bergmann further defined the four types introduced by Wegner in her excellent booklet *Marc Aurel* (1978). She tried to specify their date of creation and to set the images of Marcus Aurelius in a wider historical context.<sup>495</sup>

The best treatment of the subject based on a strict methodology remain the fundamental studies by K. Fittschen in the first volume of the Capitoline portrait catalogue (1985) and in his volume on *Prinzenbildnisse antoninischer Zeit* (1999).<sup>496</sup> A further refinement of the now-agreed typology was put forward by F. C. Albertson in his studies from 1981, 1988 and 2004. He argues for a subdivision of Type III and Type IV into several series of portraits but perhaps, as will be shown, presses the

---

<sup>492</sup> Bernoulli 1891, 162–87.

<sup>493</sup> Bernoulli distinguished between portraits of mature age and youthful portraits and tried to further subdivide them (Bernoulli 1891, 165–82, esp. 177–82).

<sup>494</sup> Wegner 1939, 33–47. Wegner did not set out his criteria of classification clearly.

<sup>495</sup> Bergmann 1978, esp. 22–34, 40–42.

<sup>496</sup> Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 67–78; Fittschen 1999, 13–31.

evidence of the surviving images too far in giving variations within the types greater importance than they deserve.<sup>497</sup>

## B. PORTRAIT TYPES

The four portrait types of Marcus Aurelius (Types I–IV) are represented by nearly 190 surviving sculptured versions of the emperor's image – heads, busts, statues and reliefs – that can be attributed to the respective types.<sup>498</sup> These types, marking different levels of age, are connected by a physiognomic resemblance, especially of the eyes, the nose and the brows. The identification of the emperor rests primarily on a comparison with portraits on imperial coins and medallions.<sup>499</sup> The established typological sequence is secured by the represented advance in age and by comparison with the sequence of dated coins.<sup>500</sup>

In the representation of several age levels, the portrait types of Marcus Aurelius are fundamentally different from, for example, the types of Trajan or Hadrian, showing them throughout their reign at the same age with only (minor) adjustments of the hair-scheme. In contrast to the latter, the many preserved portraits of Marcus Aurelius correspond well to the different types. Nevertheless, variations within and a certain shift between types can be observed, that justify a reassessment of the prevailing typology. Portrait lists for all of Marcus Aurelius' sculptured types can be found in the Appendix.

---

<sup>497</sup> Albertson 1981, 30–92; Albertson 1988, 1–4; Albertson 2004.

<sup>498</sup> Wegner 1939, 34–47; Wegner 1979, 139–81; Wegner 1980, 115–16; Bergmann 1978, 22–28; Albertson 1981, 30–92 (Types III–IV); Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 67–78; Fittschen 1999, 13–31 (Types A–B = Types I–II); Albertson 2004 (Type IV).

<sup>499</sup> Bergmann 1978, 14; Fittschen 1999, 19 with n. 141 (Type I); 29 with n. 188 (Type II); Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 75 with n. 11 (Type IV). The latest type (Type IV) is also represented on the continuous helical frieze of the Column of Marcus, identified by the inscriptions of Adrastus (CIL VI, 1585 a–b).

<sup>500</sup> Wegner 1939, 34–35; Bergmann 1978, 40–42.

## First portrait type of Marcus Aurelius (Type I)

Literature and designation of type: Wegner 1939, 35–37: '*Typus Museo Capitolino, Galleria 28*' (currently 36); Bergmann 1978, 22, 40: '*Typus I*'; Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 67–69: '*1. Bildnistypus*'; Fittschen 1999, 13–21: '*Typus A. Knabenbildnis des Marc Aurel (Typus Capitol)*'.

The earliest portrait type of Marcus Aurelius is represented by 30 surviving versions, 29 of them listed by Fittschen.<sup>501</sup> The vast majority of them (27 versions) originate most probably from Italy.<sup>502</sup> Only three versions are of provincial (non-Italian) origin, accounting for a mere 10 % of the total number.<sup>503</sup>

Two high-quality metropolitan versions, carefully worked on all sides, stand closest to the original model because of their high extent of repeated details in relation to the other portraits and their high level of correspondence between each other: a completely preserved paludamentum-bust in the Capitoline Museum, Galleria 36 (Figs. 229, 231), and a head on a modern bust at Holkham Hall (Fig. 230).<sup>504</sup> As a point of departure, the description of the type may be oriented on those two portraits, not losing sight of the other examples, as even the 'best' versions are no substitute for the model but in some way or another adjusted.<sup>505</sup>

The underlying type can be described as follows: the hairstyle is a vibrant and wavy mixture of protruding curls and curved or crescent-shaped strands of hair. A key feature of the type is a whirl of short curls and curved strands of hair sitting low on the forehead, with a series of hair-ends escaping and pointing towards the nose. This central motif is framed by curls protruding from the temples. The face is lean and tapering towards the chin. The brows are raised; the eyes are large and slightly

---

<sup>501</sup> Fittschen 1999, 13–15 (A 1–29). An addition to this list is a marble head in the Römisch-Germanisches Museum Cologne of metropolitan (Italian) origin, published in: Mlasowsky 2006, 73–75, no. 12, pl. 18.

<sup>502</sup> Fittschen 1999, 13–15 with n. 115 (A 1–26). In accordance with Fittschen's approach it is here and in the following assumed that portraits from old European collections without established provenance most likely originated from Italy; in many cases this can be supported on stylistic grounds.

<sup>503</sup> Fittschen 1999, 15 (A 27–29).

<sup>504</sup> Rome, Museo Capitolino, Galleria 36, inv. 279: Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 67–68, no. 61, pls. 69, 70, 72; Fittschen 1999, 14 (A 11), pls. 7 c, 9; bust-foot and minor parts of the drapery restored. – Holkham Hall: Fittschen 1999, 13 (A 4), pl. 4; nose restored.

<sup>505</sup> Smith 1996, 37; Fittschen 1999, 16.

bulging, with drooping upper lids.<sup>506</sup> The nose, where preserved, is almost straight; the mouth is small with full lips. The cranium is in profile roundish, jaw and chin are little pronounced, and in relation to the head, the neck appears comparatively thin – in combination conferring a boyish appeal to the likeness.<sup>507</sup>

However, the model or type not only defined the characteristic features of the head, but its turn to the right and the slight downward look were also typologically set, as well as, most probably, even the bust form, as the evidence suggests: two completely preserved paludamentum-busts in the Capitoline Museum, Galleria 36 and Stanza degli Imperatori 29 (Fig. 231) are scale ‘copies’ of one another, both (originally) around three-quarters of a metre high.<sup>508</sup> Moreover, most of the heads without their original support (bust or statue) indicate the turn to the right by a slight shift of the engraved pupil and iris in the same direction; the neck, where preserved, offers further evidence for the turn and the downward look.<sup>509</sup> Therefore, the type was very likely created and issued as a bust.

*Variation.* Most of the versions show a high degree of accordance with respect to the hairstyle, especially of the frontal hair, and the main physiognomic features.<sup>510</sup> However, besides a more simplified rendering of the hairstyle on the sides and the back of the head, the proportions of the face especially can vary among the different versions, most probably depending on different marble carvers. Nevertheless, these variations stay within a narrow range. More profound is the alteration of a head in the Vatican, Croce Greca 583 from Ostia (Fig. 232).<sup>511</sup> The portrait is not a scale version but one and a half times life-size. While this could possibly explain the deviation from the type, Fittschen is most likely right that the proportions of the head were elongated to achieve a more mature

---

<sup>506</sup> Fittschen 1999, 16–17; see also Wegner 1939, 35; Bergmann 1978, 22.

<sup>507</sup> Bergmann 1978, 22.

<sup>508</sup> Rome, Museo Capitolino, Imperatori 29, inv. 450: Fittschen–Zanker 1985, 68, no. 62, pls. 69, 71, 73; Fittschen 1999, 14 (A 12), pls. 7 d, 10; tip of the nose restored and further minor restorations.

<sup>509</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1999, 13–15 (A 1–29), pls. 1–20 for all the extant examples known to Fittschen.

<sup>510</sup> Wegner 1939, 36; Fittschen 1999, 16–17 with n. 127.

<sup>511</sup> Rome, Vatican, Croce Greca 583, inv. 227: Fittschen 1999, 14 (A 15), pl. 13 a–b; total height: 78 cm, height without restoration: 50 cm; bust support and part of the nose restored.

appearance of the portrait, as the facial features are also more marked.<sup>512</sup> A deliberate alteration is further supported by the slight turn of the eyes to the left, excluding the standard right turn of the head – the image was most probably adapted for a local context.

*Discussion.* The high level of correspondence of the portraits from Italy supports the assumption that Type I was probably only used for a limited period of time and quickly superseded by the following type.<sup>513</sup> Beyond that, the conspicuously boyish appearance of the portrait type has been repeatedly noted and may suggest that it was soon replaced to reflect the rapid pace of adolescent growth.<sup>514</sup>

The three provincial versions of the type, one of them a depiction of Marcus Aurelius on the so-called ‘Parthian Frieze’ from Ephesus, now in Vienna (Fig. 233), are in contrast more freely rendered, adapting or simplifying the metropolitan model. This is probably not a question of skill, as they are all well sculptured, but rather that no precise model was available or the correspondence with the type was regarded sufficient for their context.<sup>515</sup> The extremely low number of provincial versions in comparison to the subsequent type(s) indicates that the young prince did not yet play an important role in the honorific system of the provinces at this early stage.<sup>516</sup> In the majority, the portraits of the imperial boy were presumably produced for an Italian villa market.<sup>517</sup>

---

<sup>512</sup> Fittschen 1999, 17 with n. 130; Kreikenbom 1992, 256 argues that the elongated proportions are the result of a conversion into larger scale.

<sup>513</sup> Fittschen 1999, 21.

<sup>514</sup> For the boyish appearance see: Wegner 1939, 35; Bergmann 1978, 22, 40; Fittschen 1999, 20.

<sup>515</sup> Fittschen 1999, 15 (A 27–29), 17. – Head of Marcus Aurelius in relief, ‘Parthian Frieze’, adoption scene, Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. I 864: Fittschen 1999, 15 (A 29), pl. 21 e. An early date of ca. A.D. 140 for the monument is favoured here (cf. Fittschen 2006, 71–87 for persuasive arguments; see also Liverani 1996/97). W. Oberleitner’s arguments for a later date (A.D. 160/70s) are not convincing (see Oberleitner 2009, 267–96, esp. 267 for the debate with further references).

<sup>516</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1999, 21 with n. 151 for the evidence of statue bases.

<sup>517</sup> It may be considered as near-certain that the leading families in Italy furnished their villas with imperial portraits (cf. Neudecker 1988, 84–91, 125). Our main archaeological evidence for this practice, however, comes from ‘imperial villas’: Raeder 1983 (Villa Hadriana); Neudecker 1988, 164–66 (Lanuvio); 200–02 (Acquatraversa).

## Second portrait type of Marcus Aurelius (Type II)

Literature and designation of type: Wegner 1939, 38–40: '*Typus Museo del Foro Romano 1211*'; Bergmann 1978, 22–23, 40–41: '*Typus II*'; Fittschen 1999, 22–31: '*Typus B. Bildnis des Marc Aurel als 'Kronprinz' (Typus Uffizien – Toulouse)*'.

The second portrait type of Marcus Aurelius is known from 41 surviving versions, 40 of them listed by Fittschen.<sup>518</sup> A total of 39 % of them (16 versions) are of provincial (non-Italian) origin.<sup>519</sup>

Over its period of use Type II was adjusted from the portrait of a youth to the likeness of a mature young man: the proportions of the head and the face became increasingly elongated and the jaw, the chin and the cheekbones more pronounced. The most evident criterion for these modifications, however, is the representation of the advancing growth of beard.<sup>520</sup>

What ties these portraits together typologically, beyond all alterations, and allows us to understand them as versions of the same type (under the typological method), is the hairstyle and especially the formation of hair above the forehead as well as a set of more or less constant physiognomic features.<sup>521</sup> According to Fittschen, four metropolitan versions, carefully worked on all sides, best represent these common characteristics of the type: two almost completely preserved paludamentum-busts in Florence (Fig. 234) and in Toulouse (Fig. 235) as well as two heads at Farnborough Hall (Fig. 236) and in Tarragona (Fig. 237).<sup>522</sup> As under Type I, these four portraits are a point of departure that the description of the type may be oriented on.<sup>523</sup>

---

<sup>518</sup> Fittschen 1999, 22–26 (B 1–40). An addition to this list is a marble head in Yale, University Art Gallery, 2010.40.1 (YaleBull 2010, online supplement, p. 28, with fig.) – B 40, a cuirassed statue and the fragment of the back of the head from the nymphaeum of Herodes Atticus in Olympia, has no typological connection with Type II (or any other type) of Marcus Aurelius but was included by Fittschen for purely archaeological and historical reasons (Fittschen 1999, 26 with n. 177; 127–28 with further references).

<sup>519</sup> The provincial versions are: B 2, B 11–14, B 28–31, B 35–40, and the head in Yale, University Art Gallery.

<sup>520</sup> Bergmann 1978, 22; Fittschen 1999, 22, 29.

<sup>521</sup> Fittschen 1999, 27; see also Bergmann 1978, 22.

<sup>522</sup> Florence, Uffizi, inv. 1914.179: Fittschen 1999, 23 (B 6), pls. 29, 31 a–b; nose restored. – Toulouse, Musée Saint-Raymond, inv. 30107 (from Chiragan): Fittschen 1999, 23 (B 12), pl. 33; Balty et al. 2012, 208–18, no. 12. – Farnborough Hall (Oxfordshire), inv. 12: Fittschen 1999, 24 (B 16), pl. 36; nose restored, original bust? – Tarragona, Museo Arqueol., inv. 386: Fittschen 1999, 26 (B 35), pl. 50.

<sup>523</sup> Fittschen 1999, 27.

The underlying type can be described as follows: the hairstyle is vibrant and lavish with protruding large curls set against each other in different directions. In contrast to Type I, the contour of the hair is now more uniform as the coiffure no longer features the wavy mixture of curls and strands of the previous type. A key feature of the type is the pattern of the large protruding curls above the forehead, consisting of a central motif of a complex whirl of two opposing curls, framed by a 'corkscrew-curl' to the subject's left and an S-shaped curl to the right. Conspicuous and probably most readily recognisable is a gap between the central motif and the 'corkscrew-curl' that is clearly discernible even in more schematically rendered provincial versions, as a bust with simplified hairstyle from Cyrene, now in the British Museum well demonstrates (Fig. 238).<sup>524</sup> The eyes, brows, and mouth of Type II did not considerably change in comparison to the previous type; however, the eyes are now more bulging and the upper lids are hanging down further. The nose, where preserved, is now slightly curved.<sup>525</sup> Clearly, Type II no longer shows the boyish features of the preceding portrait type.

*Variation and adjustments.* The hairstyle can be subject to a certain degree of variation and simplification, also involving details of the frontal hair. However, in most cases these alterations stay within a narrow range. Provincial versions can vary more substantially (Fig. 238).<sup>526</sup>

The most conspicuous alteration is the depiction of the advancing growth of beard: the two possibly beardless versions of this type at the Louvre (Fig. 239) and in Vathy (Fig. 240) listed by Fittschen might suggest that the portrait type was conceived without a beard or possibly just with a faint incised beard that was (occasionally) missed out on the earliest versions.<sup>527</sup> However, it is far from sure that these two versions are indeed beardless: the face of the head in the Louvre is heavily smoothed and reworked. The modern carving of curls in the centre of the forehead and on the temples in areas where (according to the key features of the type) no hair existed in antiquity, proves

---

<sup>524</sup> Fittschen 1999, 28. – Bust from Cyrene, London, British Museum 1464: Fittschen 1999, 26 (B37), pls. 52 d, 53.

<sup>525</sup> Bergmann 1978, 22; Fittschen 1999, 29 with n. 189.

<sup>526</sup> See Fittschen 1999, 28 for a detailed description of these variations and simplifications.

<sup>527</sup> Paris, Musée du Louvre, MA 1156: Fittschen 1999, 22 (B 1), pl. 25; bust restored. – Samos, Vathy, mus. depot no. 130: Fittschen 1999, 22 (B 2), pl. 26.

that the original surface is no longer preserved; the assumption of barefacedness has to remain speculative.<sup>528</sup> The portrait in Vathy is heavily battered; nevertheless, incised hairs are discernible in the more protected areas in front of the ears, probably forming a short beard on the cheeks. In consequence, a faint moustache also cannot be excluded as this area of the face is destroyed.<sup>529</sup>

The evidence of the other surviving portraits, representing different stages of beard growth, clearly proves that the type was subsequently adjusted. We are ignorant of the mechanisms behind this phenomenon but have to consider two contrary explanatory models: the type was either 'officially' revised or reissued ('Typusneuaufgabe') by the emperor or his administration in Rome in a number of stages, or more 'autonomously' adjusted, at the discretion of the workshops or marble carvers and their patrons. The aim, in both cases, would have been similar: reflecting different stages in the process of growing older.<sup>530</sup>

The (not uncontested) explanatory model of an official revision or reissuing of portrait types ('Typusneuaufgabe') was first proposed by Bergmann. She argued that a more or less autonomous adjustment of the type by the workshops, possibly following coin portraits, is unlikely because we should, in this case, in general find more autonomy amongst the versions of an emperor's portrait.<sup>531</sup> Furthermore, if the sculptured portraits were to have followed the coin portraits, the question would arise as to what the coin portraits were modelled on. However, she had to concede that the proof of officially revised or reissued types would require the verification of the repetition of key features of the beard amongst different versions – to my knowledge, no such proof has been presented so far.<sup>532</sup>

---

<sup>528</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1999, 22 n. 154 for some of these objections.

<sup>529</sup> Fittschen 1999, 22 n. 155.

<sup>530</sup> For the most recent discussion of the phenomenon see Fittschen 2008a, 113–14 with further references.

<sup>531</sup> Bergmann 1978, 22, 40–41; Fittschen 1999, 29 n. 186; Fittschen 2008a, 113–14. See Bergmann 1978, 40 for her attempt to arrange the sculptured portraits of Type II chronologically in groups by comparison with the beard growth on dated imperial coins; this was already endeavoured by Wegner 1939, 38–40 and followed by Albertson 1981, 36–41; however, based on Wegner's not yet clearly defined Type II (see Fittschen 1999, 27).

<sup>532</sup> Bergmann 1978, 40–41.

This model and the argumentation were followed by Fittschen in his study *'Prinzenbildnisse antoninischer Zeit'* and he attempted to refine the typology. Based on the observation of the advancing growth of the beard on portraits of dated imperial coins, he proposed that the adjustment of Type II took place in five distinct, chronologically definable stages. As he had already observed a certain heterogeneity of the rendering of the beard on the coins, his grouping is methodologically based on the assumption that the coins with the respectively most advanced features are authoritative. Accordingly, he arranged the portraits in the round in five groups (a–e).<sup>533</sup>

Group a) Without beard (A.D. 139/140?–144);

Group b) Incised beard on cheeks and upper lip (A.D. 140–144);

Group c) In addition to the characteristics of Group b, incised beard on chin, occasionally worked in relief, some versions with a patch of beard below the underlip (A.D. 144–147);

Group d) Beard worked in relief from the temples to the chin, moustache still only incised, a patch of beard below the underlip (A.D. 147 to ca. 151);

Group e) Full beard: the moustache is finally connected with the beard on cheeks and chin (A.D. 152–160).<sup>534</sup>

Fittschen further identified a physiognomic change between the first three Groups a–c and the last two Groups d–e: according to him, the shape of the head alters from 'round-oval' to more 'elongated and planar', tapering more towards the chin: the physiognomy of the latter versions appears more mature.<sup>535</sup>

D. Boschung in his review of Fittschen's study suggests that Groups a–c are probably to be understood as only one typological Group (Ba–c), as the versions of Fittschen's Groups a–b might well be just variations of Group c, featuring the characteristics of the beard less clearly or in a

---

<sup>533</sup> Fittschen 1999, 22–26, 29–31 with n. 194; Boschung 2005, 540.

<sup>534</sup> Fittschen 1999, 22–26, 29. Group a): B 1–2. – Group b): B 3–5. – Group c): B 6–14; the fragmentary heads B 13–14 could possibly belong to the succeeding group. – Group d): B 15–31. – Group e): B 32–39; B 39 could possibly belong to the preceding group.

<sup>535</sup> Fittschen 1999, 29.

reduced form; he accepts Fittschen's Groups d and e (Bd; Be).<sup>536</sup> Boschung, as Bergmann before him, poses the crucial question concerning which level these adjustments were made at: were they initiated by the marble carvers, possibly stimulated by coin portraits, or were they 'official' revisions of the type, made available to the workshops? With Bergmann and Fittschen, he argues for an 'official' revision or reissuing of the type by the emperor or his administration in Rome.<sup>537</sup> According to Boschung, this is supported by Fittschen's finding of a close accordance between alterations of the portrait on imperial coins and in sculpture, proving that these changes apparently were accomplished in an organised manner.<sup>538</sup> However, this correspondence between coins and sculpture is most probably pressed too closely, as it depends too much on modern perceptions of an imperial portrait 'system' (outlined in Chapter 1) and too little on a close comparison of the coins and the extant marbles.<sup>539</sup>

There clearly is a high accordance between sculptured portraits and imperial coin portraits when they are compared on a subjective, unsystematic basis, selecting particularly well-fitting examples from both media. However, this matter needs to be investigated on a more objective basis and we have to observe the range of variation in both media independently before they can be compared. This has already been accomplished for the coins in the preceding chapter and will now be continued here for the sculptured portraits.

The broad development of the beard from Fittschen's Group a to Group e is clearly correct; it gradually changes from single hairs or strands of hair to curls, the rendering from faint incisions and stronger engravings to various degrees of relief – the facial hair is depicted ranging from the first downy beard hairs of an adolescent to the (full) beard of a young man. However, a closer look at all the extant versions reveals that the different stages (Groups a–e) are within themselves not uniform

---

<sup>536</sup> Boschung 2005, 540.

<sup>537</sup> Bergmann 1978, 22, 40–41; Fittschen 1999, 29 n. 186; Boschung 2005, 540; see also Fittschen 2008a, 113–14; Fittschen 2010, 229 n. 30.

<sup>538</sup> Fittschen 1999, 29 n. 186; Boschung 2005, 540.

<sup>539</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1971, 220–22; Fittschen 2008a, 114 for these modern perceptions.

but heterogeneous as concerns the characteristics of the beard: its extent, volume and structure. In detail, the versions show various combinations of single hairs, strands and curls in a varied rendering that goes beyond mere stylistic variation and directly influences our perception of the beard. The evidence of the sculptured portraits reveals a diversity that hardly can be made to fit into a rigid scheme of different stages of an officially approved linear development.

This can best be demonstrated by the comparison of selected high-quality metropolitan versions within Group c and Group d to point out the range of variation: the aforementioned portraits in Florence (Fig. 234) and Toulouse (Fig. 235) and a head from Ostia in Frascati (Fig. 241), all of them assigned to Group c, are in detail very different in the way the beard is conceived.<sup>540</sup> All three portraits feature a beard on the cheeks and the chin, still unconnected, and a faint moustache. The beard on the cheeks of the version in Florence consists of short curved strands of hair and curls and is rendered in a mixture of very low relief and shallow incisions, conferring a faint downy appearance to the facial hair. In comparison, the portrait in Toulouse shows longer, wavy strands of hair on the cheeks, rendered in a mixture of low relief and deep incisions, overall conferring a more distinct look to the beard. In contrast, the beard on the head in Frascati is only indicated by incised curved or wavy strands of hair, conferring hardly any volume to it. However, the beard on the cheeks is already faintly connected with the beard on the chin.

For Group d, one example may suffice: the head at Farnborough Hall (Fig. 236), already mentioned above, and a portrait in Naples (Fig. 242) both feature a beard from the temples to the chin and a moustache.<sup>541</sup> The beard on the cheeks of the version at Farnborough Hall consists of short curls and curved strands of hair that are represented in raised relief. The marked beard is no longer just confined to the jaw and the chin but starts to grow towards the neck. In contrast, the beard on the cheeks of the portrait in Naples consists of a mixture of curls and strands of hair that are worked in

---

<sup>540</sup> Frascati, Villa Aldobrandini: Fittschen 1999, 23 (B 8), pl. 31 c–f.

<sup>541</sup> Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 6090: Fittschen 1999, 24 (B 19), pl. 38; head on modern bust.

very low relief or are incised. The appearance of the beard is thin, and it is strictly confined to the jaw and the chin, still featuring downy hair indicated by fine incisions. That these characteristics of the beard on the head in Naples are more than just mere stylistic variability is supported by a correlation between physiognomy and facial hair: the head and the face are, in comparison to the portrait at Farnborough Hall, less elongated and more roundish, the chin is shorter and less pronounced. Despite matching the diagnostic criteria for Group d, the portrait has little in common with the other versions compiled in this group and the portrait subject looks decisively younger.

Speaking in Fittschen's terminology, the beards of the portrait versions in the respective groups of Marcus Aurelius' Type II show a general resemblance rather than the repetition of typologically fixed characteristics or features.<sup>542</sup> Probably the best reason why we should expect to find such a repetition of key features of the beard in the event that the type was indeed officially revised or reissued, is given by contemporary portraits of Antoninus Pius: they clearly prove that a typologically set beard of an 'official' imperial portrait type or model was within a certain range of variability subject to repetition – here exemplified by the profile of three metropolitan versions from Formia in Rome (Fig. 243), from Chiragan in Toulouse (Fig. 244) and at Castle Howard (Fig. 245).<sup>543</sup>

A subdivision ('Überlieferungszweig') of Marcus Aurelius' Type II based on a comparable variation of the central motif of the frontal hair observable on several versions was first suggested by I. Jucker.<sup>544</sup> This variation and its repetition was specified by Fittschen, following Jucker in conceding that we probably have to deal with a subdivision of the type.<sup>545</sup> The key feature of this variation in its clearest manifestation is probably best described as a distinct reverse S-shaped curl emerging from the centre of the forehead, as seen on a high-quality portrait head in Florence (Fig. 246), belonging to

---

<sup>542</sup> Cf. Bergmann 1978, 40–41 for this issue.

<sup>543</sup> Rome, Museo Nazionale Romano – Museo delle Terme 627 (718): Felletti Maj 1953, 106, no. 203, fig. 203. – Toulouse, Musée Saint-Raymond: Balty et al. 2012, 196–205, no. 11. – Castle Howard: Borg et al. 2005, 85–86, no. 41, pls. 40. 3; 41.

<sup>544</sup> Jucker 1995, 31–32 n. 5.

<sup>545</sup> Fittschen 1999, 28 with n. 185.

Fittschen's Group c.<sup>546</sup> The fact that this repeated variation of the frontal hair can be followed through different stages of the advancing growth of beard (Fittschen's Groups c–e), here exemplified by a version at Hampton Court Palace assigned to Group d (Fig. 247), further complicates the prevailing model of an official revision or reissuing of Type II.<sup>547</sup> Under these preconditions it is hard to imagine how a supposedly uniform 'development' of the type could have been accomplished by the marble workshops.<sup>548</sup>

*Discussion.* Clearly, the broad line of the 'development' of the beard lies in the nature of the depicted subject: the process of gradual growth of the facial hair of an adolescent. However, its transformation into portraiture was probably not under tight official control but to some extent, instead, at the discretion of the workshops, as the extant portraits in their rather general resemblance with respect to the beard and the observable shift between Fittschen's groups suggest.

Interestingly, the provincial versions cluster around Fittschen's bearded Groups d (five examples) and e (six examples).<sup>549</sup> These chronologically relatively late examples account for almost 70 % of the 16 provincial versions in total. Evidently, the designated heir to the empire was established by this time and also played a certain role in the honorific system in the provinces.

Type II is most probably still in use and further adjusted in the provinces when the succeeding Type III is already in existence in the metropolitan workshops, as the bust from Cyrene in the British Museum (Fig. 238) and a hybrid head (Type II/III) of presumably eastern origin in Cambridge (Fig. 248)

---

<sup>546</sup> Florence, Palazzo Pitti, inv. 682: Fittschen 1999, 23 (B7), pls. 30 a, c–d; head on modern bust, tip of nose restored. – According to Fittschen, the following versions show variations corresponding to the head in Florence (B 7): B 14, 17, 22, 24–25, 31 and 34.

<sup>547</sup> Hampton Court Palace: Fittschen 1999, 24 (B 17), pl. 35 e–f; cuirassed bust, nose restored.

<sup>548</sup> Fittschen 1999, 28 n. 185.

<sup>549</sup> Provincial versions Group d): B 28–31, and the head in Yale; e): B 35–40 (Fittschen 1999, 25–26).

suggest.<sup>550</sup> Both feature the longer and fuller beard of the succeeding Type III, but despite quite substantial variation in relation to Type II they still show the characteristic gap between the curls above the forehead.<sup>551</sup>

### **Third portrait type of Marcus Aurelius (Type III)**

Literature and designation of type: Wegner 1939, 40–43: '*Typus Thermenmuseum 726*'; Bergmann 1978, 23, 26, 41: '*Typus III*'; Albertson 1981, 30–55: '*Type Terme 726*'; Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 70–74: '*3. Bildnistypus*'.

The third portrait type of Marcus Aurelius is known from at least 61 surviving versions. Of those, 46 % (28 versions) are of provincial (non-Italian) origin.<sup>552</sup>

Two metropolitan versions serve as a point of departure. The description of the type may start from: a head in the Museo delle Terme in Rome (Fig. 249), the eponymous piece for Wegner's designation of the type ('Thermenmuseum 726'), and a completely preserved bust of outstanding quality in Dresden (Dresden 386) (Fig. 250).<sup>553</sup> They both belong to a small group of high-quality metropolitan versions with a high level of correspondence between each other, suggesting that they stand close to the original model.<sup>554</sup> These two portraits also exemplify the possible range of stylistic variation of metropolitan workshops: an interest in rendering the hair- and beard-style in great detail and close to nature (Museo delle Terme 726) (Fig. 249) on the one hand, and a manneristic perfection with highly elaborate curl patterns on the other (Dresden 386) (Fig. 250).

---

<sup>550</sup> Head in Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, inv. GR. 33.1850: Budde – Nicholls 1964, 72, no. 115, pl. 39; Fittschen 1999, 26–27 n. 178 e (standing close to Type B), with further references; Albertson 1988, 1–9, pls. 1, 2 a–c (Third portrait type). – A hybrid portrait combines features of two types.

<sup>551</sup> The bust from Cyrene clearly shows a typological connection of the hair above the forehead with Type II while the frontal hair-scheme of the head in Cambridge reveals its dependence on both types (II and III).

<sup>552</sup> The numbers are based on an adjust the following: Wegner 1979, 139–81; Wegner 1980, 115–16; Albertson 1981, 150; Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 73 n. 9 (under no. 67); Albertson 2004, 295 n. 142.

<sup>553</sup> Rome, Museo Nazionale Romano – Museo delle Terme 726, inv. 108598: Felletti Maj 1953, 211–12, no. 217, fig. 217; Wegner 1939, 40–42, pl. 20. – Dresden, Skulpturensammlung, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, inv. Hm 386: Knoll – Vorster 2013, 288–93, no. 65, figs. 65. 1–4 (J. M. Daehner); bust-foot restored.

<sup>554</sup> See Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 72 with n. 10 (under no. 67) for a list of these versions.

The distinguishing characteristics of the underlying type can be specified as follows: compared to Type II, the hairstyle consists now of denser and less protruding curls, forming a more compact mass of hair with a more uniform contour.<sup>555</sup> A salient feature of the type is the pattern of curls above the forehead. The central motif consists of two closely linked curls, one of them winding from the right (viewed from the head) towards the centre while the other emerges from the forehead and coils up directly above. To the left, the central motif is framed by a 'corkscrew-curl'; to the right, a loop-like curved curl is depicted. The tripartite formation of the frontal hair is evidently related to the hairstyle of the preceding type.<sup>556</sup> However, the vibrant pattern of large protruding curls of Type II (Fig. 236), lavishly hanging down over the forehead, was clearly replaced by a more unified frontal hair-scheme, clinging slightly closer to the head. Altogether, the coiffure with its carefully scissored contour is now 'calmer' and more restrained than before, expressing *cultus* and *elegantia* but avoiding the impression of extravagance.<sup>557</sup>

Brows, eyes and mouth of Type III only show minor alterations in comparison to the preceding type: the brows are highly arched; the bulging eyes feature the characteristic heavy upper lids. The lips are thinner, and the nose is slightly curved.<sup>558</sup> As far as can be reconstructed from the surviving versions, the type shows the first indications of ageing with slight bags below the eyes and more pronounced nasolabial folds. The portrait with its marked facial features looks more mature than the previous type and clearly shows a further distinctive advance in age.<sup>559</sup>

Compared to the latest metropolitan versions of the previous type, the beard is now thicker and fuller and lengthens below the chin, tapering especially in profile. The front is slightly parted in the middle, with wavy or curly strands of hair flowing down. In addition, the moustache, always

---

<sup>555</sup> Cf. Albertson 1981, 31 for a related observation.

<sup>556</sup> Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 70; see also Wegner 1939, 41.

<sup>557</sup> For the shift in imperial portraiture in the second century A.D. to a cultured image of luxurious civilian elegance (*elegantia*) cf. Smith 1998, 62–63 with n. 31; 91–92 with n. 187; cf. also Bartman 2001, 3 for the carefully scissored contour of the male hair to avoid the impression of extravagance.

<sup>558</sup> Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 70.

<sup>559</sup> Bergmann 1978, 23.

connected to the beard on the cheeks, and the tuft of hair below the lower lip are now more pronounced.<sup>560</sup>

An important innovation in comparison to the preceding types, first observed by Bergmann, is the posture of the head, that was probably typologically set in bust form: it is no longer actively turned to the side with the eyes following the same direction, but only turned as much as necessary to avoid full frontality, with the glance almost straight forwards, conferring more presence and perhaps some grandeur to the likeness of the (future) emperor.<sup>561</sup> Evidence for this observation comes from completely preserved metropolitan busts (Fig. 250) but also heads with surviving necks that allow conclusions to be drawn on the original posture. As far as is discernible, portraits other than busts could adapt the posture of the head more freely, depending on the type of support and the context, as for example the Capitoline equestrian bronze statue of Marcus Aurelius may prove (Fig. 251), with its head distinctively turned to the right, following the direction of the outstretched right arm.<sup>562</sup>

*Variation and adjustments.* The hairstyle of the portraits can be subject to a certain degree of variation and simplification, especially on the sides and even more so on the back of the head.<sup>563</sup> This can also involve details of the frontal hair, as the central motif above the forehead may prove: the two closely linked curls are frequently combined into a single curved or wavy strand running to the portrait's left, here exemplified by a bust in the Vatican (Sala dei Busti 285) (Fig. 252).<sup>564</sup> Some versions also feature slight furrows on the forehead.

---

<sup>560</sup> Albertson 1981, 30.

<sup>561</sup> Bergmann 1978, 23.

<sup>562</sup> Equestrian bronze statue: Rome, Museo Capitolino (formerly Piazza del Campidoglio): Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 72–74, no. 67, pls. 76–77.

<sup>563</sup> Cf. Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 71 with n. 2 (under no. 66) for the variation on the back of the head.

<sup>564</sup> Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 71 n. 2 (under no. 65) with further examples. According to Fittschen this simplification is particularly observable with provincial versions. – Vatican, Sala dei Busti 285, inv. 704: Spinola 1999, 130–32, no. 113, fig. 22; nose restored.

Bergmann argued that the beard style of most versions of Type III can be connected with the well-known portrait heads in the Museo delle Terme 726 in Rome (Fig. 249) and in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek 700 in Copenhagen (Fig. 253).<sup>565</sup> However, a few versions with a longer, less tapered in profile, fuller beard let her suggest that the type was probably revised or reissued ('Typusneuaufgabe'): for example the metropolitan versions in Dresden 386 (Fig. 250), the Louvre (MA 1159) (Fig. 254), the Vatican (Sala dei Busti 285) (Fig. 252) and especially the Capitoline equestrian bronze statue of Marcus Aurelius (Fig. 251).<sup>566</sup>

F. C. Albertson argued for a comparable division of the type into what he calls 'Replica Series 1' and 'Replica Series 2'.<sup>567</sup> His understanding was that a 'replica series' is a group of portraits of the same type that are, in his own words, 'replicas not of the prototype itself but of a common model derived from that prototype' and in relation to it adjusted in some way or another.<sup>568</sup> His 'Replica Series 1' is represented by the aforementioned head in the Museo delle Terme 726 (Fig. 249), presumably standing close to the prototype and consisting of the majority of the known examples of Type III. 'Replica Series 2' is characterised by 'a lengthened beard consisting of individual corkscrew-curls which hang down vertically from the chin' that is in this respect 'noticeably different from the compact, tapered beard' of the former series. The latter of Albertson's series comprises of only four portraits, all of them (and a few more) also collected by Bergmann, notably the above-mentioned metropolitan versions in the Louvre (MA 1159) (Fig. 254), the Vatican (Sala dei Busti 285) (Fig. 252) and the Capitoline equestrian bronze statue (Fig. 251).<sup>569</sup>

---

<sup>565</sup> Bergmann 1978, 41. – Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek 700, inv. 1424: Poulsen 1974, 97–98, no. 81, pls. 131–32; Johansen 1995, 196–97, no. 80, figs. pp. 196–97.

<sup>566</sup> Bergmann 1978, 41; the longer beard of some versions was first observed by Wegner 1939, 41–42. – Paris, Musée du Louvre, MA 1159: de Kersauson 1996, 230–31, no. 101, figs. pp. 230–31; part of the nose restored.

<sup>567</sup> Albertson 1981, 32–33.

<sup>568</sup> Albertson 1981, 10–12; Albertson 2004, 262.

<sup>569</sup> Albertson 1981, 32–35. The fourth example of 'Replica Series 2' is a marble head with a more simplified hair-scheme from Capua, now in Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 150820: De Franciscis 1972, 331–34, pls. 138, 140. 1–2.

Albertson attempted to further refine his classification and subdivided his 'Replica Series 1' into two 'model groups', distinguished primarily by a minor difference in the arrangement of the curls above the forehead. In his terminology, a 'model group' is 'a group of portraits which display an interconnection within a replica series'.<sup>570</sup> 'Model Group 1' is represented by the head in the Museo delle Terme 726, characterised by its central motif of two closely linked curls and by what Albertson identified as a 'shallow wisp of hair over the forehead', but what should be better understood as a strand of hair emerging from the forehead and curling directly above.<sup>571</sup> 'Model Group 2' is exemplified by the bust in Dresden 386 (Fig. 250) and is, according to Albertson, in comparison to the former group characterised by a simplification of the central motif and a lack of the 'wisp of hair over the forehead': a single central curl (or wavy strand), distinctively separated from the forehead, runs to the left.<sup>572</sup>

Already, Albertson's featured examples show the limitations of such a classification: starting with the two model groups, the central formation of the frontal hair of the head in the Museo delle Terme 726 ('Model Group 1') shows much less distance or difference from the bust in Dresden 386 ('Model Group 2') than the variation of this motif routinely permitted between the versions of 'Model Group 2', as a comparison of the latter portrait in Dresden with Albertson's primary provincial example for 'Model Group 2', a cuirassed bust from near Probalinthos in the Louvre (MA 1161) (Fig. 255), reveals.<sup>573</sup> The lack of the 'wisp of hair' and the single wavy strand instead of two curls are probably better understood as a variation that is within a standard range of adjustment we should allow for the type, rather than employing them as diagnostic criteria for a subdivision.

---

<sup>570</sup> Albertson 1981, 12; see also Albertson 1988, 1–4.

<sup>571</sup> Albertson 1981, 41–43. For the correct interpretation of the 'wisp' cf. also Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 70.

<sup>572</sup> Albertson 1981, 43–50.

<sup>573</sup> The comparison with a provincial example from the 'Greek East' is in this case legitimate, as Albertson understands the bust in the Louvre as closely linked to metropolitan workshops (Albertson 1981, 46–47). – Bust from near Probalinthos: Paris, Musée du Louvre, MA 1161: de Kersauson 1996, 226–27, no. 99, figs. p. 227.

Moving on to the two replica series, the limitations of Albertson's refined typology becomes even more obvious: in terms of the lengthened beard the portrait versions in the Louvre (MA 1159) (Fig. 254) and in the Vatican (Sala dei Busti 285) (Fig. 252) can be classified under 'Replica Series 2'; however, in terms of the simplified formation of the central hair-scheme above the forehead they stand closer to the cuirassed bust in the Louvre (MA 1161) (Fig. 255), or more precisely to 'Model Group 2', one of the subdivisions of 'Replica Series 1'. A final example may suffice to demonstrate the shift between the groups or series we have to consider under such a classification: in frontal view, the beard of the bust in Dresden 386 ('Replica Series 1'/'Model Group 2') (Fig. 250) closely conforms with the bust in the Vatican (Sala dei Busti 285) ('Replica Series 2') (Fig. 252); however, in profile view it clearly features the tapered shape of the beard seen with the head in the Museo delle Terme 726 ('Replica series 1'/'Model Group 1') (Fig. 249).

*Discussion.* The apparent subjectivity of such groupings designating common models was noted by Albertson himself in his revised and expanded study of Marcus Aurelius Type IV.<sup>574</sup> He probably reads the sculptural evidence too closely, giving minor variations more importance than advisable: the observable deviation of the central scheme of the frontal hair between different versions is not a real change of the motif but a variation or simplification around this design element, without any clear system or pattern that would allow a subdivision of the type.

The only remaining potential real change in motif that probably follows a system or pattern is the longer and fuller beard of some versions, first observed by Bergmann and interpreted as a possible revision or reissuing of the underlying type. However, contrary to her, Fittschen sees in these adjustments no system or order that would allow them to be understood as evidence for a revision

---

<sup>574</sup> Albertson 2004, 262.

or reissuing of the underlying type. He ascribes the longer and fuller beard to the hand of individual marble carvers and regards these adjustments as variations of the type.<sup>575</sup>

#### **Fourth portrait type of Marcus Aurelius (Type IV)**

Literature and designation of type: Wegner 1939, 43–47: '*Typus Museo Capitolino, Imperatori 38*' (currently 28); Bergmann 1978, 26, 41–42: '*Typus IV*'; Albertson 1981, 56–92: '*Type Museo Capitolino, Imperatori 38*'; Albertson 2004: '*Type IV*'; Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 74–78: '*4. Bildnistypus*'.

The fourth portrait type of Marcus Aurelius is known from at least 53 surviving versions in the round and on historical reliefs. A total of 30 % of them (16 versions) are of provincial (non-Italian) origin.<sup>576</sup>

The almost completely preserved metropolitan bust in the Palazzo Braschi (Salone 234) (Fig. 256) serves as a starting point that the description of the type may be oriented on.<sup>577</sup> The most salient characteristic of the underlying type is a highlighted bunch of upswept curls emerging from the hairline centrally above the forehead and parting in the middle (*anastolé*), framed by flame-like strands of hair at the temples.<sup>578</sup> This arrangement contrasts distinctively with the frontal hair-scheme of the preceding type and confers a more vibrant appearance to the portrait. The individual curls on the rest of the head are, compared to Type III, larger and slightly more 'animated', nevertheless forming a compact mass of hair with a uniform contour. Altogether, the coiffure is less 'calm' and restrained than before and clearly more energetic, however, carefully scissored and avoiding the extravagance of the flowing hair of heroic or divine images.<sup>579</sup>

---

<sup>575</sup> Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 70–71 with n. 5.

<sup>576</sup> The numbers are based on an adjust the following: Wegner 1979, 139–81; Wegner 1980, 115–16; Albertson 1981, 151; Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 76 n. 5 (under no. 68); Albertson 2004 with appendix.

<sup>577</sup> Rome, Palazzo Braschi, Salone, inv. 234: Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 74–76, no. 68, pls. 78, 80, 82; bust-foot restored. – The hairstyle of the portrait in the Palazzo Braschi is closely repeated on all four sides by a number of metropolitan versions, suggesting that they stand close to the original model (See Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 74–75 with n. 8 for these versions).

<sup>578</sup> Wegner 1939, 45; Bergmann 1978, 26, 32; Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 75; Albertson 2004, 261.

<sup>579</sup> Cf. Bartman 2001, 3 for general remarks on the avoidance of extravagance in male portraiture.

Compared to the preceding type, the dimension and volume of beard has clearly further increased: the moustache now entirely covers the upper lip, with individual strands reaching to the lower lip. The beard now also covers larger areas of the cheeks, especially where it connects to the moustache. Likewise, the chin is now further covered by facial hair, integrating the tuft of hair below the lower lip that no longer stands out as an individual feature. Below the chin the beard falls down in long wavy or curly strands. Especially in profile view it becomes obvious that the beard is now much longer and fuller. The two distinct isolated strands of hair extending on either side from the edge of the beard towards the neck do not occur on all versions but are most probably also a feature of the prototype, as the imperial medallions discussed above in Chapter 5 on the coinage of Marcus Aurelius may prove.<sup>580</sup>

Brows, eyes and mouth of Type IV exhibit the typical features seen with the preceding type(s): the brows are highly arched, the eyes are bulging with the characteristic heavy upper lids. The mouth is small and the nose is slightly curved.

*Variation and adjustments.* While the hair-scheme above the forehead and at the temples is a very constant feature among the versions of the type, the rest of the hairstyle, especially on the sides and the back, can be subject to wider variation.<sup>581</sup> The physiognomy can in some cases also vary quite substantially, especially with respect to individualised features as the indication of age: it can range from idealised and youthful, suppressing signs of ageing, as seen with the bust in the Palazzo Braschi (Fig. 256), to distinctive signs of advanced age, with the depiction of more pronounced furrows and wrinkles combined with a leaner face, here exemplified by a head in the Museo delle Terme (inv. 638) (Fig. 257). Therefore, the physiognomic features of the underlying type cannot be established beyond doubt.<sup>582</sup> However, a number of metropolitan versions closely repeat the hairstyle of the

---

<sup>580</sup> Wegner 1939, 45; Bergmann 1978, 26; Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 75; Albertson 2004, 261–62, 264.

<sup>581</sup> Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 75 with nn. 9–10 for examples. For variations of the *anastolé* see Jucker 1981, 14; Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 78, no. 70.

<sup>582</sup> Bergmann 1978, 32–33; Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 76 n. 7.

portrait in the Palazzo Braschi (Salone 234) on all four sides and Fittschen legitimately suggested, in consequence, that they probably faithfully reflect the original model. As most of these versions show a rather ageless smooth face, comparable to the portrait in the Palazzo Braschi, Fittschen's theory followed that the prototype was probably conceived the same way.<sup>583</sup> What might speak against Fittschen's assumption, though, is that one of his examples, the head in the Museo delle Terme (inv. 638) (Fig. 257), shows quite pronounced indications of advanced age.<sup>584</sup> It is therefore not unlikely that the type featured a more sophisticated and nuanced, subtle physiognomy that mediated between idealised characteristics and individualised features as the indication of advanced age, allowing the respective carvers or marble workshops to depart from this image in either way and to emphasise what they perceived as important.<sup>585</sup>

The arched, slightly contracted brows the type was likely conceived with, together with the upswept frontal hair (*anastolé*), are reminiscent of heroic or divine images. They would set the emperor apart from his peers in his visual representation, while the indication of advanced age as a more individualised feature would express that, in principle, he is not a different kind of person from other citizens – in combination ensuring a 'recognisable identity' of the emperor's portrait.<sup>586</sup>

Conspicuous are also differences among the versions of Type IV with respect to the shape and the style of the beard. Bergmann first described these variations systematically and divided the type accordingly into Variant A ('Variante A') and Variant B ('Variante B').<sup>587</sup> Variant A features a beard that is divided into (more or less) distinct wavy or curly strands of hair flowing down, here exemplified by the bust in the Palazzo Braschi (Fig. 256), while the beard of Variant B forms a more

---

<sup>583</sup> Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 74–75 with n. 8 for the respective versions.

<sup>584</sup> Rome, Museo Nazionale Romano – Museo delle Terme, inv. 638: Felletti Maj 1953, 112, no. 218, fig. 218; nose restored, original bust?

<sup>585</sup> Cf. Bergmann 1978, 32–33 with n. 70 for a closely related observation.

<sup>586</sup> Bergmann 1978, 32; Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 75 with n. 15. For the 'recognisable identity' of the emperor's portrait cf. Smith 1996, 33.

<sup>587</sup> Bergmann 1978, 26, 41–42 with a list of versions assigned to each variant; Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 76 n. 7; 78 with n. 4 (under no. 70).

vigorously animated and denser mass, featuring transversal wavy strands of hair and a central cleft below the chin, well observable on a portrait head in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna (Fig. 258).<sup>588</sup> Variant B also covers slightly more of the face and the moustache is hanging down more fully at the corners of the mouth. As both variants occur on the Aurelian panels in the Palazzo dei Conservatori in Rome from an honorific monument for Marcus Aurelius (Figs. 259–60), Bergmann suggested that they are probably concurrent conceptions of two metropolitan workshops.<sup>589</sup> According to Bergmann, one of them is possibly dominating the ‘export of models’, as both variants (A and B) occur in Italy, while in the provinces almost exclusively Variant B is found.<sup>590</sup>

However, caution may be advisable when drawing such wide-reaching conclusions, as many portraits are not (readily) accessible and the state of photographic documentation often does not allow a thorough comparison especially of the profiles and the back of the head: the range of variation within the two variants and the overlap and shift between them is at present hard to assess but seems to be considerable.<sup>591</sup> The difference between Variant A and Variant B is probably less strongly marked than suggested by Bergmann.

Albertson attempted in his re-evaluation of Type IV a further subdivision of Bergmann’s Variants A and B primarily according to the non-existence (A1, B1) or existence (A2, B2) of ‘expressive signs of old age’ (sic!) and proposed an additional Variant C, exhibiting features seen on versions of both Variant A and Variant B (Series A–C in his terminology).<sup>592</sup> The limitations of his refined classification are comparable to the observations made under Type III: the grouping of the portraits involves a

---

<sup>588</sup> Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. I 65: von Sacken 1873, no. 64 a; head set on bust that does not belong, nose restored.

<sup>589</sup> Bergmann 1978, 26; Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 78 (under no. 70). – ‘Sacrifice Panel’ (Variant A), Museo Capitolino, inv. 807: La Rocca 1986, 40, pls. 37, 43–44. – ‘Triumph Panel’ (Variant B), Museo Capitolino, inv. 808: La Rocca 1986, 39–40, pls. 31, 33.

<sup>590</sup> Bergmann 1978, 26.

<sup>591</sup> Cf. Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 78 n. 4 (under no. 70) for a related thought.

<sup>592</sup> Albertson 1981, 70–76; Albertson 2004. In his dissertation (1981), Albertson divided the versions of Type IV into ‘Replica Series A–C’. In his revised and expanded study from 2004 he changed the designations to ‘Series A–C’ to follow Bergmann.

certain degree of subjectivity depending on the prominence given to characteristics of the physiognomy as well as the hair- and beard-style as diagnostic features. The versions of Series A and B do not perform particularly well under such a rigid subdivision. The variation within and the shift between the series is considerable.<sup>593</sup> The classification of the portraits is further complicated by so-called hybrid versions, combining in some way or another features of Marcus Aurelius Types III and IV and indicating that we also have to expect a certain shift between types, as already observed between Types II and III.<sup>594</sup>

As for Albertson's Series C, the single example is the relief portrait of Marcus Aurelius represented on the so-called 'Clementia Panel' in the Palazzo dei Conservatori in Rome (Fig. 261).<sup>595</sup> This series has to be rejected as entirely hypothetical for several reasons: first, a single portrait does not constitute a series.<sup>596</sup> Second, to transfer a portrait in the round into relief, we must allow for a certain range of variation and also have to consider media-specific practices, such as the alteration of proportions, to account for a specific angle of view.<sup>597</sup> Third, the deviation of the portrait of Marcus Aurelius on the 'Clementia Panel' from the portrait versions of Series A and B on the other two Aurelian panels and in the round should be understood as a shift between the series rather than a deliberate distinction from them, as it is closely related to both series.<sup>598</sup>

The result of Albertson's subdivision of Bergmann's Variants A and B is smaller and smaller subgroups that show various connections between each other but do not reveal a clear system or pattern

---

<sup>593</sup> Albertson's Series B especially does 'not present a consistent group of replicas'. It 'shows a great variety and mixing of models' (Albertson 2004, 273).

<sup>594</sup> For the hybrid versions see Albertson 2004, 270–74, 301–02.

<sup>595</sup> Albertson 2004, 284–85. – 'Clementia Panel' (Variant C), Museo Capitolino, inv. 809: La Rocca 1986, 39, pls. 23, 25–26.

<sup>596</sup> One of the depictions of Marcus Aurelius on his column, described by Albertson as 'conforming to the head on the Clementia Panel' (Albertson 2004, 285 with n. 82, fig. 43) should be excluded from the discussion, as the majority of the hair is no longer preserved due to weathering.

<sup>597</sup> The latter explains for example the 'broad, squarish face' noted by Albertson (Albertson 2004, 284), as the head on the Clementia Panel is turned more towards a profile view than on the other two Aurelian panels in the Palazzo dei Conservatori. The altered proportions of the face take into account the perspective foreshortening when viewing the panel frontally.

<sup>598</sup> The variation routinely permitted between the versions especially of Albertson's Series B is larger than the distance or difference of the portrait on the 'Clementia Panel' to either series.

behind them that would allow methodologically sound insights into the ancient processes of creation and dissemination of the portraits, going beyond Bergmann's initial findings.<sup>599</sup>

*Discussion.* It is probably better not to evaluate the evidence so far: Bergmann convincingly argued that with respect to the indication of different levels of age, the versions of Type IV most likely do not stem from different models but are the result of the interpretation and adjustment of the prototype by individual marble carvers or workshops. The extant examples can hardly be grouped consistently according to age as the markers of age vary from version to version<sup>600</sup> – the same is probably true for the beard of Bergmann's Variants A and B.

## C. ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

The reassessment of the typology of sculptured portraits of Marcus Aurelius does not – in contrast to those of Faustina – necessitate a fundamental rearrangement or adjustment of the types. All four types, as can be shown, are firmly established in sculpture by reliable 'core-groups' of faithfully 'copied' examples and a large number of surviving versions each. The previously suggested subdivisions of Types II, III and IV into groups or variants, however, are more problematic, as has been demonstrated in several different ways.

### **Subdivision of types**

Fittschen's subdivision of Type II into five groups (Groups a–e) according to discernible advance in the growth of the beard, is an attempt to closely connect the sculptured portraits with the portraits on coins, where the same phenomenon of gradual adjustment is observable. This match between

---

<sup>599</sup> See Albertson's 'Stemma of Marcus Aurelius Type IV' for the various subgroups (Albertson 2004, 304).

<sup>600</sup> Bergmann 1978, 32 with n. 70. Distinctive signs of advanced age are the exception rather than the rule; they represent only one end of the depicted range of age. It is therefore not surprising that Albertson identified only a limited number of widely varying versions of his Series A2 and B2 (Albertson 2004, 267–70, 279, 301–02, 304).

coins and sculpture, however, is pressed too closely, as the evidence presented above demonstrates. Both coins and sculptured portraits show independently of one another that the represented advance in growth of the beard is variable to an extent that makes it highly unlikely that these adjustments of the imperial image were accomplished in a centrally organised manner for both media, closely following a series of several officially approved 'updates' of Type II, as has been suggested.

The different renderings of the beard on the sculptured versions suggest that some variations in image were probably accomplished by the marble workshops, using workshop-drawings as a model to update the imperial portrait. The adjustments of the physiognomy towards a more elongated face with a more mature look could equally have originated in the marble workshops, as the individual versions are quite varied in detail.

The subdivision of Type III by small alterations of the hair-scheme has been rejected above because it gives minor variations greater importance than they deserve. There is no clear system or pattern behind them that would allow insight into the ancient processes of creation and dissemination of the type. The longer and fuller beard of a few versions, however, first observed by Bergmann, is of interest because it probably reflects a change in the real appearance of Marcus Aurelius, as a comparison with coins might suggest. In this case, it was probably an adjustment of the type in the marble workshops rather than an officially approved revision, as will be argued in more detail in the following chapter.

Finally, the subdivision of Type IV according to the shape and structure of the beard most probably has to be rejected as well, because the difference between Bergmann's Variants A and B is less strongly marked than suggested, and the shift between them is considerable. As for the different age

levels represented, her argument that they are the result of the interpretation and adjustment of the prototype by individual marble carvers or workshops is entirely convincing.

### **Shift between types**

Type III is the most flexible of Marcus' sculptured portrait types and a certain shift between Types II and III as well as between Types III and IV can be observed. The bust from Cyrene in the British Museum (Fig. 238) and the hybrid head (Type II/III) in Cambridge (Fig. 248) clearly demonstrate that, especially in the provinces, features of Type II and III were combined. Accordingly, we can be near-certain that (at least) outside Italy both types were used side by side for a while until Type III prevailed. The shift between Types III and IV is well illustrated by a number of metropolitan portraits combining features of both types, but some provincial versions also display combined characteristics – such as a bust of high quality in Istanbul from Kandilli (Fig. 262) that links the central curl-motif of Type III with the flame-like strands of hair at the temples of Type IV.<sup>601</sup> Again, it is almost certain that both types were used concurrently at least for some time, as the hybrid metropolitan versions suggest.<sup>602</sup>

### **Bust types**

Only a fraction of the portraits of Marcus Aurelius are preserved with their original supports (bust or statue). Like Faustina's portraits, many of them were probably busts – the most common portrait format in second-century Rome and Italy, where the majority of the surviving examples originate from. We may assume that at least some types of Marcus Aurelius (if not all) were created and issued as 'bust types', setting the posture of the head and neck in relation to the shoulders and the chest, as it is unlikely that the 'original model' or 'prototype' was conceived as head and neck only.<sup>603</sup>

---

<sup>601</sup> For the hybrid versions of Type III/IV see Albertson 2004, 270–74, 301–02. – Bust from Kandilli, Istanbul, Museum inv. 5129: Inan – Rosenbaum 1966, 76–77, no. 45, pls. 28. 1–2; 29. 1; Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 74 n. 11 b; Fittschen 1999, 133 with n. 730.

<sup>602</sup> Cf. Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 70 (under no. 65).

<sup>603</sup> The importance of the correct posture as part of the conception of a portrait type, only guaranteed by some kind of bust support, should not be underestimated.

This is suggested by portraits of Type I with its distinct turn to the right and the slight downward look: the two paludamentum-busts in the Capitoline Museum, Galleria 36 and Stanza degli Imperatori 29 (Fig. 231), are scale ‘copies’ of one another. Furthermore, most other heads of Type I without their original support indicate the same posture by the turn of the eyes and, where preserved, the position of the neck. In consequence, we can be near-certain that these features were typologically set and ‘copied’ in the marble workshops.

## D. MARBLE TECHNOLOGY AND MARBLE WORKSHOPS

The focus of this chapter has so far been on the typology of the sculptured portraits of Marcus Aurelius. However, to better understand the workings of the imperial image in sculpture, it has to be seen against the background of contemporary metropolitan marble technology and workshops to allow for a more comprehensive picture of the production in metropolitan Rome.

### **Marble technology and styling of the portraits in the second century A.D.**

In the Hadrianic and Antonine period, increasingly sophisticated marble techniques and stylistic effects were employed by metropolitan sculptors and marble workshops to enhance the effect of the portraits. Refined undercutting and drill-work as well as a virtuoso use of the flat chisel and channelling tool were devised by marble sculptors to constantly keep up with the latest hair- and beard-styles – there was a deep interaction between the technology of the marble and the styling of the portraits. Clearly, high-quality marble portraits were driving the top-end production in Rome, even imitated by bronze portraits.<sup>604</sup>

In general, Antonine metropolitan portraits of the highest quality are carefully worked on all four sides; the level of finish on the back, however, can vary. The amount of drill-work deployed for

---

<sup>604</sup> Smith 1998, 62; Fejfer 2008, 405.

rendering the voluminous curly hairstyles (and beards) of male portraits in combination with a further subdivision of strands or curls of hair with fine grooves is the main indication of quality.<sup>605</sup> The drill was primarily used to define the hair by creating deep (narrow) channels and undercut areas: holes were drilled in a row adjacent to each other and the 'bridges' between them were subsequently removed with a flat chisel or channelling tool, often leaving (hidden) drill marks at the bottom of the channel or undercut, confirming this process. The result of this technically demanding and time-consuming procedure that created a textured surface with shadowed cavities, was a chiaroscuro effect – that is, a striking contrast of light and shadow, characterising the pinnacle of Antonine metropolitan portrait carving.<sup>606</sup>

Contemporary metropolitan female portraits demanded different techniques of execution. The wavy and braided Antonine coiffures of women were frequently rendered with flat chisels and channelling tools to define the individual strands of hair with grooves and to texture the surface, while the use of the drill for the hair was not needed (or subordinated). Pieces of the highest quality are again carefully worked on all sides, but in contrast to male portraits, the marker of quality is here the quantity of grooves that were painstakingly executed to indicate individual strands of hair and their internal subdivision – the fine chisel-work serves the same basic purpose as the drill-work of male portraiture: to render the hair as close to nature as marble will allow.<sup>607</sup>

This high level of sophistication of metropolitan Antonine portraiture was not restricted to hair- and beard-styles but was carried through in the whole image: the faces of many metropolitan examples were polished and contrast strongly with the chiaroscuro of the male hair, but also with the textured surface of the female coiffure. Details that would before the late Hadrianic/early Antonine period

---

<sup>605</sup> Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 71; Fittschen 1999, 18, 27. The ratio between the use of the chisel and the drill very much depended on the respective hairstyle: for strands of hair more use was made of the chisel and channelling tool while curls were preferably drilled.

<sup>606</sup> Cf. Albertson 1981, 32 for the chiaroscuro effect.

<sup>607</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1978, 37 with n. 42 for this contrast between male and female (metropolitan) portraiture that is observable from the Hadrianic period onwards; see also Bartman 2001, 3.

have been painted, were now executed in marble: eye-engravings started to appear on the portraits in the round, and they were commonplace by the middle of the second century. The border of the iris is indicated by a shallowly incised three-quarter circle while the pupil is most commonly marked by an off-centred kidney- or crescent-shaped drilled cavity that partly also represents the highlight of the eye.<sup>608</sup> The heads were usually slightly turned on their supports with the eyes following this direction. The purpose of these refined adjustments was to give the portraits life and movement. Finally, we should not forget that the sculptured portraits were painted to various degrees, but in many cases only traces of the pigments are left as the organic binding agents have disintegrated. Accordingly, little is known about this practice with certainty, but we can be absolutely sure that the paint substantially influenced the appearance of the portraits.<sup>609</sup> It is equally unclear if the painting of the portrait was at the discretion of the workshops or if templates or models existed.

### **Models and ‘replication’**

The high degree of accordance especially of the hairstyle of many of the sculptured versions of imperial portrait types, often on three or even four sides, can only be explained by the assumption that they derive from three-dimensional models, involving some sort of measuring system for transferring them. This is supported by small bosses (knobs) with a circular cavity in the centre, occasionally preserved on the extant portraits and generally interpreted as measuring points. Presumably, they were frequently employed but have in most cases been removed after the portrait was finished. Two metropolitan versions of Marcus Aurelius’ Type III in the Capitoline Museum (Salone 32) and in the Louvre (MA 1159), for example, each show a boss on the chin, while two

---

<sup>608</sup> For the emergence of engraved eyes see Daltrop 1958, 71 with n. 117; Fittschen 1999, 18 with n. 135. On some versions of Marcus Aurelius Type I engraved eyes are still completely absent (Fittschen 1999, 14–15, A 18–21, 24), while the carving of the pupil of others is still somewhat experimental in its shape (see Fittschen 1999, 18); the eye-engraving is probably also missing on a version of Faustina the Younger’s Type I; however, the face has been cleaned and possibly smoothed (Fittschen 1982, 46, no. 10, with n. 10, pl. 13. 3–4).

<sup>609</sup> For ongoing interdisciplinary research on the subject see ‘[www.trackingcolour.com](http://www.trackingcolour.com)’ (The Copenhagen Polychromy Network); Østergaard 2009–2013 (Preliminary reports).

provincial versions of Type IV at Cyrene and in the Liebieghaus, Frankfurt preserve three bosses each: one on the chin and two on the frontal hair and on the forehead, respectively.<sup>610</sup>

While it is accordingly near-certain that most sculptured imperial portraits must have derived from three-dimensional models, it should not be underestimated what an experienced and skilled marble-carver can accomplish working only by eye, with the help of workshop-drawings and a basic measuring device (compass) rather than three-dimensional models. This has been asserted by the sculptor P. Rockwell from his own experience and observations in modern workshops in Italy.<sup>611</sup>

This possibility appears especially suitable when only some adjustments to the type were made, such as the 'growing' beard of the versions of Marcus Aurelius' Type II. We have no such evidence of workshop-drawings used as a model for sculpture from ancient times, and these two-dimensional media are normally restricted to a single angle of view, not showing multiple sides of a portrait subject, unless they were intended as an intermediary step for a sculptured replication. Precisely this procedure, however, is occasionally known from the Renaissance and later periods, where paintings are preserved showing the portrait subjects in (more or less) frontal view and from two sides. With the right choice of different angles of view, two-dimensional images can be sufficient to attain a clear three-dimensional perception of the subject, and it can be assumed that comparable techniques were occasionally also used in ancient times for some adjustments to the type (e.g. the beard of Marcus' Type II) or in special situations (e.g. for provincial versions).<sup>612</sup>

---

<sup>610</sup> Fittschen 1999, 17 with n. 128; for the assumed 'copying' process see Bergmann 1978, 16–17 with n. 31; Pfanner 1989, 176–222. – Portrait head of Marcus Aurelius in Rome, Museo Capitolino, Salone 32, inv. 650 (Type III): Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 70–71, no. 65, pl. 75. – Paris, Musée du Louvre, MA 1159: de Kersauson 1996, 230–31, no. 101, figs. pp. 230–31; part of nose restored. – Cyrene, museum, no inv. (Type IV): Albertson 2004, 279–81 with n. 68, figs. 34–35 (in late antiquity set into a female statue). – Frankfurt, Liebieghaus (Type IV): Bergmann 1978, 3–4, pls. 1–5, presumably from Asia Minor.

<sup>611</sup> Rockwell 2008, 98.

<sup>612</sup> Fittschen 1974, 494 with nn. 26–27 for further references. The best-known example is a painting of A. van Dyck depicting King Charles I of England from three sides, that was used by Bernini to create a sculptured bust that unfortunately is not preserved.

## Metropolitan workshops

Generally, there is little known about sculptors' workshops and none have been archaeologically identified in Rome so far.<sup>613</sup> Such workshops of course must have existed. In the absence of physical remains of these workshops, the debate is frequently conducted on a theoretical, art-historical level, with a modern understanding of workshops as (a group of) sculptors working in a distinct and comparable manner that allows us to assign the extant portraits to individual 'schools'.<sup>614</sup> Attempts to identify metropolitan workshops ('schools') on the basis of such stylistic and technical characteristics of the extant portraits, however, have so far not been convincing. Moreover, this methodological approach is in general problematic, as the evidence very much suggests that individual workshops could work in a variety of styles, techniques and qualities at the same time.<sup>615</sup> Apparently, the organisation and functioning of the workshops was highly specialised and far more complicated than generally assumed.<sup>616</sup>

The prevalent perception of workshops as 'schools', in consequence, is not particularly useful. Modern art-historical categorisations then are probably of little help for a correct historical interpretation of the phenomenon of 'replicated' portraits. Furthermore, D. Boschung and M. Pfanner pointed out that not only were the models for sculpture interchangeable between workshops but possibly, to a certain degree, the sculptors as well. Under such circumstances, individual sculptor's workshops are difficult to trace if not identified archaeologically. Further

---

<sup>613</sup> The ancient texts are also silent (cf. for this issue Fittschen 2010, 234–35; Fejfer 2008, 419–25). See, however, for a sculptor's workshop at Aphrodisias: Rockwell 1991; Rockwell 2008; Smith 2011; Van Voorhis 2018.

<sup>614</sup> Boschung – Pfanner 1988, 24. – For technical aspects involved in the manufacture of Roman portraits see Pfanner 1989, 176–222; cf. also more generally Pfanner 1988; Rockwell 1990; Rockwell 1993.

<sup>615</sup> For such attempts see: Soechting 1972; Balty 1983; Evers 1994; Evers 1995. – Cf. Fejfer 2008, 422 for a brief discussion with further references; cf. also Trillmich 1974 (review of Soechting 1972); Boschung 1998, esp. 651 (review of Evers 1994); Fittschen 2008b, 171 with n. 11 for further critical remarks. – For a convincing example of two high-quality Severan 'private' busts carved in the same workshop after the same model that stylistically/technically differ from one another see Boschung – Pfanner 1988, 20–23, figs. 12–15 (Munich, Glyptothek, inv. 382 and 383).

<sup>616</sup> Fittschen 2008b, 174. For example, in some cases, there are indications that the chest piece of the bust was not made by the same sculptor as the head, and we most probably have to expect such a division of labour on a more regular basis (see Boschung – Pfanner 1988, 21, fig. 12a for the example of one of the Severan busts mentioned in the reference above).

detailed studies are needed before more comprehensive questions concerning the functioning and organisation of workshops can be answered.<sup>617</sup>

To conclude, it is evident that the portrait production in metropolitan Rome was highly sophisticated and complex. No simple model can account for the observable phenomena of 'replication' and adjustment of imperial portrait types. Competing possibilities have to be considered. Consequently, any classification has to allow sufficient flexibility for a coherent picture of the ancient processes and practices behind these phenomena to emerge, as the sculptured portraits of Marcus Aurelius clearly demonstrate.

---

<sup>617</sup> Boschung – Pfanner 1988, 24–26; cf. also Fittschen 2008b, 171 n. 11; Fittschen 2010, 235.

## CHAPTER 7

### Marcus Aurelius: Discussion

The preceding two chapters on the coinage and the sculptured portraits of Marcus Aurelius further underline what has already been demonstrated for Faustina: there is no complete correspondence between coins and sculpture. In this chapter, the four types (Types I–IV) in both media are discussed in combination. The absolute date in the heading for each type stands for the proposed date of creation; the age of Marcus Aurelius at this date is given in parentheses. Except for Types I and IV, which were most likely made in connection with the adoption of Marcus Aurelius and the Parthian victory respectively, the suggested date of their introduction in the mint serves as a *terminus ante quem* for their creation, supposing that this date roughly coincides with their conception.

#### **First portrait type of Marcus Aurelius (Type I) – A.D. 138 (aged 16)**

Type I was introduced in the mint in late A.D. 139 and it was soon after, possibly still in the same year, superseded by Type II. That the first type was so quickly ‘replaced’ suggests that it was already used in sculpture for a while before it was employed by the mint. It was probably already outdated at this point (in late A.D. 139), when the young prince was 18 years old, but a more up-to-date image was not yet available. Most likely, Type I with its boyish appeal was created almost two years earlier, when Marcus Aurelius was still 16 years old: in connection with his adoption by Antoninus Pius on the 25th of February A.D. 138, as a portrait identity for the young prince was needed from that time onwards.<sup>618</sup> This is also supported by the vibrant and flamboyant coiffure of a boy or youth with its uneven and irregular contour.

---

<sup>618</sup> Cf. Bergmann 1978, 40; Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 67; Fittschen 1999, 20 for part of this conclusion.

Type I marks the initial creation of a portrait identity for Marcus Aurelius and we can be near-certain that it was ‘officially’ commissioned by the court, involving a portrait sitting with the young prince. It is known from 30 sculptured versions.

Of the 260 statue bases for Marcus Aurelius collected by J. M. Højte, 74 (28 %) were dedicated between A.D. 138 and 161, before the accession of the prince. Only 18 of them are precisely dated. They are more or less evenly spread over the period and the low numbers do not allow us to relate portrait honours to specific historical events nor to check the chronology of the sculptured types.<sup>619</sup> The ratio of pre-accession portraits (71 versions or 38 %) to portraits dedicated after the accession (115 versions or 62 %) roughly corresponds with the evidence of the statue bases, but there is no way to assess how many of the latest versions of Type II were made after the accession, nor to determine the number of portraits of Type III – most likely created in A.D. 160 – that were in use before Marcus Aurelius was emperor.

### **Second portrait type of Marcus Aurelius (Type II) – A.D. 139/40 (aged 18/19)**

Type II had already emerged in the mint in late A.D. 139 or in A.D. 140, when a more mature portrait is more clearly discernible on the coins. It was most probably conceived shortly before.<sup>620</sup> Besides the updated physiognomy, the new type still features a vibrant and flamboyant hairstyle as known from surviving ‘private’ portraits of youths or young men.<sup>621</sup> The main difference to the hairstyle of Type I is that the coiffure no longer exhibits the wavy mixture of curls and strands but is now formed of lavish large curls that are set against each other in different directions. The contour, however, is already slightly more uniform than before.

---

<sup>619</sup> Højte 2005, 130, tab. SE 44, fig. C 16. The number of 77 pre-accession bases stated by Højte cannot be verified: I counted 74 instead (Højte 2005, 531–69).

<sup>620</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1999, 20, 31 for the creation of the type in A.D. 139/40. A creation in A.D. 144, as suggested by Bergmann 1978, 22, 40, is in the light of the numismatic evidence presented in this study too late.

<sup>621</sup> See Fittschen 1999, 78–107 for a selection of ‘private’ portraits of boys, youths and young men in the Antonine period. The variety of these portraits is vast and shows that Marcus’ hairstyle is just a choice out of many and most likely emerged from fashionably metropolitan styles (cf. Smith 1998, 91 on this relationship).

The creation of Type II should most probably not be connected with the elevation of Marcus Aurelius to the rank of Caesar nor with his subsequent first consulship, as has been attempted.<sup>622</sup> In both cases we could expect that the coinage would have started with the employment of Type II. Rather, the evidence speaks for looser control of the imperial image than generally assumed: only the outdated Type I was at hand at the mint in late A.D. 139, while Type II was created and made available (shortly) later. That the new type, thereafter, was used parallel to Type I for a while demonstrates, once again, that there was no perceived need or desire to control the imperial image in the mint closely. The die-cutters only gradually adopted the new type.

The reason for the creation of Type II was most probably the need for an updated and recognisable image of the adolescent prince – a replacement of the outdated Type I – as it is marked by a more mature physiognomy. This need can partly be explained by his new official functions (Caesar and Consul) and the associated change of standing, but it should not be seen in direct connection with them as a kind of commemoration. The new type is a careful re-think of the portrait image of Marcus Aurelius and its creation must again have involved a portrait sitting with the young prince. It was, therefore, almost certainly officially commissioned by the court. Type II was used for a considerable period of time up to ca. A.D. 160 and is known from 41 sculptured versions.

In this period, it was adjusted from the likeness of a youth with no beard – or only a very faint adolescent beard – to the portrait of a mature young man with a full beard and a more elongated face. These adjustments of the portraits on coins and in sculpture were most likely made independently in both media, without a series of several ‘officially’ approved revisions of the type, as there is a high variability of these features within the two media and no close correspondence between them. The interpretations and adjustments of Type II in the mint and in the marble

---

<sup>622</sup> For this attempt see Fittschen 1999, 31.

workshops were possibly accomplished using adjusted workshop-drawings as a model to update the imperial portrait.

It has been argued in previous studies that despite the described adjustments, the general appearance of Marcus Aurelius' second portrait type is more or less steady, possibly expressing continuity and reliability (*constantia*) of the dynasty.<sup>623</sup> This interpretation is tempting, as it could explain why Type II was used for such a long period of time, but it probably confuses modern art-historical classification with correct historical interpretation: too much emphasis is given to constant typological features of the type (particularly the hairstyle) in relation to the adjusted beard as a reflection of a real-life changing appearance. A new portrait type was clearly not thought necessary by the court at this stage, and the type was adjusted in the mint and in the marble workshops to ensure the recognisability of the prince as he grew up – the basic verifiable likeness between subject and image, between life and marble.<sup>624</sup>

### **Third portrait type of Marcus Aurelius (Type III) – A.D. 160 (aged 38/39)**

The numismatic evidence clearly shows that Type III was not created in connection with the accession. This event had no influence on Marcus' coin portrait, apart from the addition of a laurel wreath as an attribute of the emperor on some dies.<sup>625</sup> Instead, the coins and their comparison with sculptured portraits suggest that Type III was most probably already introduced in the mint in A.D. 160, before the designation of Marcus Aurelius to the third consulship later in the same year. Hairstyle and beard of the sculptured versions closely match the same features of the portrait on a number of dies and we may assume that Type III was created shortly before it was first employed by

---

<sup>623</sup> Fittschen 1999, 29 with n. 187.

<sup>624</sup> For the recognisability of imperial portraits cf. Smith 1996, 33 in a more general context.

<sup>625</sup> This has already been suggested by Fejfer 1998, 48. For the assumption that Type III was the 'accession type' see Wegner 1939, 41; Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 73 with n. 12.

the mint.<sup>626</sup> It was quickly adopted by the die-cutters and from A.D. 161 it is omnipresent on coins and medallions, pointing towards its high significance.

A creation of Type III of Marcus Aurelius in A.D. 160 has already been suggested – not based on numismatic evidence – by Bergmann and later Fittschen. They assumed that the type was conceived together with the fourth portrait type of Lucius Verus for their joint consulship in the following year (A.D. 161).<sup>627</sup> However, as can be shown, Type III had already been introduced in the mint before the designation of Marcus Aurelius to the third consulship (and Lucius Verus to the second). Other reasons for the creation of Marcus' Type III (and the fourth portrait type of Lucius Verus) have to be found.

As the preceding type, Type III is a careful re-think of the portrait image of Marcus Aurelius. The youthful and flamboyant coiffure of the first two types (Types I–II) was altered to a 'calmer' and more restrained hairstyle, expressing, as already mentioned, *cultus* and *elegantia* but avoiding any impression of extravagance. The marked, and in relation to the preceding types, more mature physiognomy and the posture with the almost front-facing head as well as the glance nearly straight forwards confer presence and perhaps some grandeur to the portrait image – all of this most probably reflecting in the image preparations for a change of political stance from prince to (future) emperor. Clearly, Type III was officially commissioned by the court and involved a portrait sitting with Marcus Aurelius.

---

<sup>626</sup> Fejfer 1998, 48 considered, based on numismatic material, that the type was possibly conceived either in A.D. 157/58 or in A.D. 163/64. Both dates are hardly compatible with my findings: a more mature portrait with longer beard is discernible as early as A.D. 156 on some dies; however, the hairstyle closely matches the sculptured portraits only from A.D. 160 onwards. The later date must be clearly rejected because Type III is firmly established on coins well before A.D. 163/64 and the 'more mature elderly man' J. Fejfer describes is simply a stylistic conversion of the portrait type on coins, as was pointed out in Chapter 5.

<sup>627</sup> Bergmann 1978, 23, 41; Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 73 with n. 13; 80. The dating of the fourth portrait type of Lucius Verus to A.D. 160 depends on a dated relief in Ostia as earliest proof for the type and the assumption that it was not created long before (Fuhrmann 1939, figs. 1–2; Fittschen 1971, 224 n. 30; Bergmann 1978, 41; Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 80 with n. 9).

Clearly, an updated and recognisable image of the now full-grown prince was thought necessary. What hints at the main reason for the creation of Marcus' Type III, however, are the preparations for a change of political stance reflected in the image. Rather than the designation of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus to their joint consulship as the motive for the creation of their portrait types, both – designation and creation – may have been prompted by the historical situation in A.D. 160: Antoninus Pius turned 74 in that year, and both measures probably reflect his care for the continuity of the dynasty and the succession. The joint consulship and the new portrait types should be seen as part of a carefully orchestrated, planned transition in this final stage of his life, as he may have been ill – reducing the effect of the crisis moment of the 'death of the king'.<sup>628</sup>

The accession of Marcus Aurelius (and Lucius Verus) in A.D. 161 caused a significant increase in the number of portrait dedications for the emperor up to A.D. 167, as the number of surviving statue bases suggests.<sup>629</sup> This corresponds well with the high number of 61 sculptured versions of Type III, making it the most common of Marcus' types in the round – the portrait of the ruling emperor went everywhere. As was shown in Chapter 4 above, many portraits of Faustina's Types VII and VIII were also probably dedicated in the first years after the accession. We may expect that the portraits of the imperial couple were paired and combined with likenesses of other imperial persons on a regular basis – for example the co-emperor Lucius Verus. This is suggested by the evidence of Antonine 'portrait galleries', some of them even preserving portraits of Marcus' Type III in combination with Faustina's Types VII or VIII.<sup>630</sup>

The longer and fuller beard of some sculptured versions of Type III probably reflects a change in the real appearance of Marcus Aurelius, as the beard of the coin portraits also lengthens between ca. A.D. 163 and the introduction of the succeeding type (Type IV) in A.D. 166. However, there is little

---

<sup>628</sup> Cf. Strack 1937, 161–62; Birley 1987, 114; Fittschen 1971, 224 n. 30 for related assumptions.

<sup>629</sup> Højte 2005, 154, fig. C 17. Højte sees this increase lasting only until A.D. 164 as he adds up the statue bases for Marcus Aurelius (fig. C 17) and Lucius Verus (fig. C 15).

<sup>630</sup> For Antonine portrait galleries see Fittschen 1999, 108–38, esp. 115–16, no. 24 (Cyrene); 116, no. 25 (Leptis Magna); 133, no. 56 (Kandilli); see also Deppmeyer 2008, esp. 52–56, nos. 77–159.

accordance between these adjustments in the two media (sculpture and coins), and they were most probably accomplished independently of one another in the marble workshops and in the mint, rather than depending on an officially approved revision of the type.

#### **Fourth portrait type of Marcus Aurelius (Type IV) – A.D. 166 (aged 45)**

The creation of the fourth and last portrait type of Marcus Aurelius (Type IV) has conventionally been dated sometime between A.D. 169 and 176.<sup>631</sup> A date prior to A.D. 169 has been excluded by Fittschen as he thought it hardly imaginable that a new type for Marcus Aurelius (Type IV) would be conceived while his co-emperor Lucius Verus retained his fourth portrait type up to his death in A.D. 169.<sup>632</sup> He is probably wrong, and there is no need to assume that the creation of new portrait types for Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus necessarily had to coincide.<sup>633</sup> This is supported by the fact that Marcus, as A. Birley pointed out, was without doubt the senior emperor in the perception of the people.<sup>634</sup>

As demonstrated above in Chapter 5, the numismatic evidence strongly suggests that Type IV had already been introduced in the mint in later A.D. 166 in connection with the Parthian victory and triumph in that year.<sup>635</sup> It was most probably conceived shortly before, and its creation should be linked to this historical event. The distinctive long flowing beard divided into thick wavy (or curly) strands of hair, first seen on coins in A.D. 166 in connection with the fourth imperatorial acclamation (TRP XX IMP IIII) and the reverse type with Victoria alluding to the Parthian victory, perfectly matches the same feature on sculptured versions of Type IV. The new type was unusually quickly adopted by

---

<sup>631</sup> Wegner 1939, 43–44, 46–47; Bergmann 1978, 26, 42; Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 73, 75 with n. 12; see also Flisi 1989, 66 n. 28; Albertson 2004, 286–87 for a brief account of the research history.

<sup>632</sup> Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 75 with n. 12. Fittschen revised on this occasion his earlier assumption that Type IV was created in connection with the Parthian victory in A.D. 166 (Fittschen 1970, 550) because the early date of his main evidence, a statue group from Bulla Regia (Tunisia) including statues of Marcus Aurelius (Type IV) and Lucius Verus, cannot be maintained (cf. Bergmann 1978, 42). However, the later date of the statue group (ca. A.D. 178–182) does not exclude an early date for the creation of Type IV.

<sup>633</sup> Cf. Albertson 2004, 290–91 for this assumption.

<sup>634</sup> Birley 1987, 117.

<sup>635</sup> This date and the association with the Parthian victory was already proposed by Poulsen 1974, 98; Flisi 1989, 65–68 and most recently Albertson 2004, 287.

the die-cutters and is from A.D. 167 omnipresent on coins and medallions. Clearly, it was thought important.

A date earlier than A.D. 169 for the creation of Type IV is also supported by the large number of 53 surviving sculptured versions of the type in relation to the low frequency of statue bases for Marcus Aurelius in the A.D. 170s. The year A.D. 166 for the creation of Type IV fits particularly well with the epigraphic evidence since it falls into the last two 'peak years' of increased portrait dedications for Marcus Aurelius, before there is a clear decline after A.D. 167.<sup>636</sup> The early date can furthermore explain a disproportion of numbers between the versions of Marcus' Type III (61 examples) and the fourth portrait type of Lucius Verus (96 examples): during the eight years of co-rulership, when most of the portraits of Lucius' fourth portrait type were presumably made, Type III of Marcus was used first and then 'superseded' by Type IV in A.D. 166.<sup>637</sup> 'Superseded', however, is not precisely the correct term, as Type III was to a certain degree still used thereafter.<sup>638</sup>

Type IV is again (as Types II and III) a re-think of the portrait image. Apart from the slightly contracted brows and the large, widely opened eyes, the hairstyle and the beard especially were considerably adjusted in relation to Type III. The point of reference for most of these changes, however, is presumably not only the real-life changing appearance of the emperor but also other images.<sup>639</sup> The upswept frontal hair (*anastolé*) and the contracted brows are reminiscent of heroic or divine images.<sup>640</sup> A salient feature that most probably referred to a real-life changing appearance is the lengthened beard, also indicating an advance in age.

---

<sup>636</sup> Højte 2005, 84, fig. C 17.

<sup>637</sup> For the fourth portrait type of Lucius Verus see Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 79–81 with n. 2; the number of extant versions for Lucius' type four is drawn from Albertson 2004, 295 with n. 143.

<sup>638</sup> For a certain shift between types cf. above Chapter 6.

<sup>639</sup> Cf. Pfanner 1989, 208–10 for the technical aspects involved.

<sup>640</sup> Bergmann 1978, 32; Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 75 with n. 15.

The type is an image worthy of a triumphant emperor, best understood in its historical context: the Parthian victory was an important event for Rome and the Antonine dynasty. The triumph held on the 12th of October A.D. 166 was the first triumph celebrated in Rome for nearly 50 years and on the same day Marcus Aurelius' sons Commodus and Annus Verus were elevated to the rank of Caesar.<sup>641</sup> Most likely, Type IV was officially commissioned by the court.

### **Reception of the types**

It has been shown in the preceding two Chapters 5 and 6 that the portrait types of Marcus Aurelius were received and (independently) adjusted on coins and in sculpture after they came into existence. On coins especially it can be difficult to divide the images into types without the knowledge of the sculptured portraits (Types I–IV), as adjustments over time are often only gradual. Even within the same issue, the portraits can sometimes differ widely, demonstrating the flexibility of the mint. Likewise, the sculptured types are far less 'static' than generally assumed. Between Types II and III as well as between Types III and IV especially a certain shift can be observed, and we can be near-certain that these types were used side by side for a while, occasionally combining features of both types. Furthermore, the beard especially of Type II was adjusted in the workshops and lengthens further under Type III.

*Reception of the sculptured types in the provinces.* The low number of provincial versions of Type I (three portraits or 10 %) in comparison to the subsequent type(s) indicates that the young prince did not yet play an important role in the honorific system outside Italy at this early stage. Of Type II, 39 % of the versions (16 portraits) are already of provincial origin. Eleven of them (almost 70 %) feature a near-full or full beard, pointing within the period of use of the type towards a chronologically late date of manufacture. Evidently, Marcus was by that time established as the designated heir to the

---

<sup>641</sup> SHA, vita Marci 12. 7–10; SHA, vita Comm. 11. 13 (date); Birley 1987, 147.

empire in the provinces as well.<sup>642</sup> Types III and IV were received everywhere in the empire, although the percentage of provincial versions (46 % and 30 % respectively) suggests that Type IV was less common in the provinces.

### **Need for an updated image of young subjects as reason for the creation of types**

While Types I and IV of Marcus Aurelius were created in connection with historical events, to provide an initial portrait identity (Type I), and to commemorate the Parthian victory (Type IV), the remaining types (Types II and III) primarily reflect the need for an updated and recognisable image of the maturing prince. This can be verified by the concurrent imperial image of Lucius Verus: four portrait types were created for him before the joint rule with Marcus, despite the absence of any official functions prior to the mid A.D. 150s.<sup>643</sup> This strongly suggests that imperial portrait types, especially of young subjects, do not necessarily have to coincide with a change in standing or a specific event. While the first portrait type of Lucius Verus was most likely made in connection with his adoption (and that of Marcus Aurelius) by Antoninus Pius in A.D. 138 (aged 7), the subsequent three types simply reflect his growing up from a boy to a young man.<sup>644</sup> There is, in fact, no need to connect the creation of the latter three types with specific events, as has been attempted.<sup>645</sup> It is, however, likely that the fourth portrait type of Lucius Verus, probably created in A.D. 160 (aged 29), reflects in the image preparations for a future change of political stance, comparable to Type III of Marcus Aurelius.

Seen in the historical context, the first three portrait image types of Marcus Aurelius and, to a lesser degree, the four types of Lucius Verus have to be understood as the assurance of the continuity of

---

<sup>642</sup> This is also broadly supported by the evidence of the statue bases: of a total of 194 provincial statue bases for Marcus Aurelius, only 47 (24 %) have a pre-accession date, as compared to 27 out of 66 Italian statue bases (41 %). More precision in terms of their chronological distribution cannot be reached because too few of the bases are precisely dated. For the numbers see Højte 2005, 130, 531–69.

<sup>643</sup> For the absence of official functions see Bergmann 1978, 41; Fittschen 1999, 37 with further references.

<sup>644</sup> For the first to the third type of Lucius Verus see Fittschen 1999, 32–45 (Types C–E); for the fourth type see Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 79–81; cf. also Bergmann 1978, 41. – Fittschen 1999, 38 n. 233; 45 overlooked that there is in terms of portraiture a difference of one ‘age-level’, from boy to youth, between Lucius Verus and Marcus Aurelius when they were adopted by Antoninus Pius in A.D. 138, at the age of 7 and 16, respectively. This explains why there are four types for Lucius while Marcus has ‘only’ three types in the same period.

<sup>645</sup> For this attempt see Fittschen 1999, 40, 44; Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 80 with n. 10.

the Antonine dynasty. The pre-accession types of both princes present them by means of their dissemination and reception to a wider audience, assuring the public that the second generation of the young dynasty is growing up well, thus consolidating the power of the Antonines.

## CHAPTER 8

# Imperial Portrait Practice: Norms and Models in the Second Century

### A. EVALUATION

The reassessment and adjustment of the prevailing typology of Faustina the Younger's and Marcus Aurelius' portraits on coins and in sculpture has significant consequences for the interpretation of imperial portrait types in general. The main findings of this study are outlined right below. They necessitate an adjusted model of an imperial portrait 'system', following in section B of this chapter.

Based on a close investigation of the numismatic evidence, Fittschen's theory that most if not all portrait types of Faustina (Types I–X) were created successively, coinciding with the birth of Faustina's children, to commemorate these historical moments as an assurance of dynastic continuity, clearly has to be rejected. Demonstrably, there is considerable overlap and shift in the usage of portrait types on coins and there appears to be little consistency in the way the imperial image was controlled in the mint especially from the late A.D. 150s onwards, from Type V to Type IX. Furthermore, child-related reverse types were frequently shared between portrait types. This flexibility of the mint makes it doubtful that specific reverse types could be associated with specific portrait types – such a connection was probably never intended.

Most importantly, only Types I, VII and possibly VIII relate at their introduction in the mint (in A.D. 147, 161 and 162/63 respectively) to reverse types reflecting real births of Faustina. Of those three types, however, Type I was most likely already created in A.D. 145 in connection with the marriage of Faustina, and Type VII in connection with Marcus' accession in A.D. 161. The remaining Type VIII is problematic as the connected child-related reverse type was either already introduced

under Type VII and continued under Type VIII or shared between the two portrait types. Consequently, Fittschen's theory of 'portrait types for births' cannot be maintained.

This finding is important and has considerable impact on the assumption that imperial portrait types were in general officially commissioned and created to mark or commemorate specific historical events, as Faustina's portrait types are Fittschen's primary example to support this theory.<sup>646</sup> The concept of connecting specific historical events with imperial portrait types to date their creation precisely can be traced back to Wegner, but the theory of 'portrait types for events' was never clearly proven nor seriously questioned.<sup>647</sup>

This theory is further challenged by the portraits of Marcus Aurelius on coins and medallions. No change or adjustment of the portrait in connection with new titles or specific events can be traced on the numismatic evidence until A.D. 166, for Types I–III. Neither the conferral of the tribunician power on Marcus in A.D. 147, nor the three consulships (COS I–III) or the 'accession' in A.D. 161 had any influence on the coin portrait. Only Type IV may be connected with the Parthian victory in A.D. 166 and was most probably even conceived to commemorate this important historical event.

Consequently, in the light of the new evidence for Faustina the Younger and Marcus Aurelius presented in this study, it is unlikely that (most) imperial portrait types were conceived to mark or commemorate specific historical events. They could be, but in most cases they probably simply were not. Other explanations have to be found as to why imperial portrait types were created – frequently even multiple types for the same imperial subject – and what they were for.<sup>648</sup>

---

<sup>646</sup> See most recently Fittschen 2010, 231.

<sup>647</sup> See e.g. Wegner 1939. For a brief discussion of this practice see Fejfer 1998, 46–47; Fejfer 2008, 410–11; Fittschen 2010, 228 with n. 25. – Fittschen 2010, 229 noted himself that the evidence is often ambiguous and that the suggested connections with specific events cannot be understood as established facts. – For criticism of the theory of 'portrait types for births' see for example Alexandridis 2004, 28–29 with further references.

<sup>648</sup> Clearly, the accession of a new emperor with no pre-existing portrait type necessitated the creation of an initial portrait identity; however, probably rather out of an urgent need than to commemorate the event.

### **Reasons for the creation of imperial portrait types**

Various reasons – on their own or in combination – may account for the creation and dissemination of imperial portrait types, as can be shown. No single explanation can account for all types: in broad terms of imperial society, they reflect the need for a recognisable and identifiable portrait of the imperial subject. In narrow terms of metropolitan elite circles, they have to be understood as embedded in the norms of high society in Rome, as an interaction with aristocratic self-styling, reflecting metropolitan fashions. In imperial ideological terms, however, imperial portrait types can make visible or reflect aspects of imperial rule such as dynastic conceptions and the care for the continuity and prosperity of the empire, as can be shown – this also includes portrait types that mark specific historical events.

*Recognisability and identification of the imperial image.* The centrally defined portrait types for the emperors were highly sophisticated and complex creations with elaborate hairstyles and a nuanced and subtle physiognomy that defined an individualised and sharply distinguished portrait identity for the imperial subject, as clearly reflected by many of the metropolitan versions. The basic ancient purpose of their creation, dissemination and replication was to ensure recognisability.<sup>649</sup> In theory, this was recognisability in relation to the real person but in ‘reality’ recognisability in relation to other images, as the omnipresent crystallisation of his appearance. Especially outside Rome only a few people will ever have seen the emperor in real life, but most must have ‘known’ him from his visual representation.

In Rome, the personal participation of the imperial family in public events as a display and legitimisation of imperial power will have made their real appearance known to a certain degree. Consequently, we have to expect a basic verifiable likeness between subject and image – a genuine overlap between the real appearance of the emperor and certain physiognomic traits of his

---

<sup>649</sup> Cf. Smith 1996, 33 in a more general context.

typologically set portrait image, such as the hanging upper eyelids of Marcus Aurelius, that can be found in all of his types. There was presumably also a basic match between life and image in the general arrangement of the coiffure and the length of the beard, but we can be absolutely certain that they did not accord in every detail. Hair in real life is variable – the image, in contrast, features a typologically set artistic transformation of the arrangement of individual locks and strands.<sup>650</sup>

The perception that the physical presence of the emperor is a guarantor for the prosperity of the empire and the people was widespread.<sup>651</sup> The simple fact that he could not be everywhere in person explains both the importance of a recognisable portrait image of the emperor (and his family) and the significance of an imperial portrait ‘system’ to spread it. The portrait types mediated the imperial family to the empire and the reception of imperial types ensured recognisability even in the provinces. This was important, because imperial subjects had no distinguishing statue or bust types exclusively employed for the imperial family, or particular costumes that would have set them apart from other citizens in their visual representation.<sup>652</sup>

*Interaction of the imperial image with metropolitan aristocratic self-styling.* The metropolitan conceptions of the emperor’s portrait images in the Antonine period visualised a styled self that expressed *cultus* and *elegantia* – a cultured civilian posture and sophisticated elegance – and thus, the idea of the *civilis princeps*: the civilian Roman emperor of refined character and speech (*eloquentia*), still in principle not a different kind of person from his fellow elite members. This popular urban fashionable and elegant upper-class style was something in which the emperor shared.<sup>653</sup> We have to keep in mind, however, that the statue or bust supports most frequently

---

<sup>650</sup> Cf. Fejfer 2008, 404 for comparable thoughts. – For real physiognomic traits in the portrait image of Marcus Aurelius cf. Fittschen 1999, 29–30 with n. 191; Bergmann 1978, 22; for methodological remarks cf. Fittschen 1971, 220–21.

<sup>651</sup> Eck 2017, 272.

<sup>652</sup> Of course, the context and an inscription would have facilitated the identification in most cases.

<sup>653</sup> See Wallace-Hadrill 1982 for the *civilis princeps*; Smith 1996, 33; Smith 1998, 62–63, 91–92 with n. 187. – The language of *eloquentia* and *elegantia* were closely related, see e.g. Fronto, ad amicos l. 4 (ed. Loeb, pp. 288–89); see also SHA, vita Hadr. 26. 1–5; vita Aelii 5. 1–3; vita Pii 2. 1–2; vita Veri 10. 6–9.

employed in the second century A.D. emphasised a different role of the emperor: cuirass and/or cloak (*paludamentum*) stood for the military *virtus* of the *princeps*.

The empress, too, shared in the phenomenon of metropolitan aristocratic self-styling, as has been demonstrated in this study. Elaborate female hairstyles expressed a cultured posture and beauty. Hair was ‘a major determinant of a woman’s physical attractiveness’.<sup>654</sup> Her image was visually often only slightly drawn away from female portraits of high society in Rome. Compared to the strongly individualised likeness of the emperor, that clearly set him apart from his contemporaries, the image of the empress was frequently less obviously differentiated but defined by a more subtle visual identity worked into her portrait features – to a certain degree, individuality here was often superimposed on an idealised beauty.<sup>655</sup>

The imperial image – both of the emperor and the empress – emerged then from fashionable aristocratic styles in the capital.<sup>656</sup> To what extent they were embedded in the norms of high society in Rome, is best understood in the historical context of the imperial court.<sup>657</sup> In the early and middle empire, the court was firmly centred on the city of Rome, and particularly the Palatine.<sup>658</sup> As a space, it was not only the stage for the emperor and the imperial family but also for the Roman elite, for senators and members of the upper stratum of the equestrian order and their wives and children – they came to see and be seen. Social ties interconnected the Roman high society and linked them to the emperor. This is vividly reflected, as A. Wallace-Hadrill notes, by Pliny’s report of the outbreak of a facial disease in Tiberius’ reign that only spread among the upper orders in Rome by the exchange

---

<sup>654</sup> Bartman 2001, 1, 5–6; Fejfer 2008, 351–52.

<sup>655</sup> See Smith 1985, 214–15. In most cases context and added attributes would have set her apart in her visual representation from non-imperial portraits. – Cf. however the strongly individualised portraits of the empress Plotina, the wife of Trajan (Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 8–9, no. 7, pl. 9, supplements 8–9).

<sup>656</sup> Cf. Smith 1998, 91 in the context of male portraiture.

<sup>657</sup> For the imperial court see Wallace-Hadrill 1996 (early empire); Wallace-Hadrill 2011; an excellent discussion of the court as social phenomenon remains Friedlaender 1919, 32–102. The majority of the direct (literary) information about the court is anecdotal (Wallace-Hadrill 1996, 284).

<sup>658</sup> Wallace-Hadrill 1996, 286.

of kisses at the salutation.<sup>659</sup> Seen in this context, it becomes absolutely clear that these upper orders at large shaped fashions and aristocratic metropolitan self-styling and that the court was a catalyst for their spread.<sup>660</sup>

Female hairstyles especially appear to have played a prominent role in these narrow elite circles, as the wide range of fashionable aristocratic coiffures suggests. It has been further argued in this study that, in the narrow elite circles where these fashionable styles emerged, there was surely some overlap or accordance between hairstyles worn in real life and those represented in the images.<sup>661</sup> In the case of Faustina the Younger, it is clear that she interacted with metropolitan elite culture and followed changing fashions – her portrait image was frequently updated to reflect the main changes of her hair in real life as they occurred. This would be, however, too simple an explanation to account for the creation of all of her types or that of other empresses. Rather, a new portrait type can coincide with a new hairstyle in real life but does not necessarily have to. In other words, changing fashions are only one possible reason among others for the creation of a new type.

*The imperial image and aspects of imperial rule.* By means of their dissemination and reception, imperial portrait types can also make visible or reflect aspects of imperial rule, such as dynastic conceptions and the care for the continuity and prosperity of the empire. In most cases, however, we should not think of a strong programmatic statement based on a radical change of design elements in comparison to preceding imperial portrait types – this would mean disregarding the strong relation and interaction of imperial portraiture with ‘private’ portraiture and elite styles.<sup>662</sup> Rather, we have to expect a much more subtle visualisation or reflection of prevailing imperial ideology: for example, the considered assimilation of certain physiognomic traits of Faustina’s later portrait types

---

<sup>659</sup> Plin. Nat. Hist. 26. 3. – Wallace-Hadrill 1996, 291; Wallace-Hadrill 2011, 98, 101.

<sup>660</sup> Cf. Wallace-Hadrill 1996, 292.

<sup>661</sup> This accordance or overlap is far from sure for the wider social circles imitating these styles.

<sup>662</sup> See Smith 1998, 87–92 for the relation and interaction of imperial portraiture with private portraiture and elite styles; cf. Fittschen 2010, 230 for the few imperial portrait types that probably can be read as programmatic statements.

to the portrait image of Marcus Aurelius, expressing her position and relation to the emperor – or Marcus' Type III, expressing *cultus* and *elegantia* and reflecting in the image preparations for a change in political stance. Likewise, the simple fact that multiple types for Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus as boys or youths were created, despite the absence of any official functions for Lucius prior to the mid A.D. 150s, suggests that these types carried a programmatic statement: they assured the public that the second generation of the Antonines was prospering. In some cases, finally, portrait types were created in connection or coinciding with historical events, but rarely to mark or commemorate these historic moments, as can be demonstrated.

The way these different reasons for the creation of imperial portrait types can be interconnected and for whom it mattered is best exemplified by a brief joint examination of the portrait types of Marcus Aurelius, Lucius Verus, and Faustina the Younger: the first portrait types of Marcus and Lucius were officially commissioned in connection with their adoption on the 25th of February A.D. 138 because no portrait identity for the young princes existed at that point. Clearly, recognisable and identifiable portrait image types for Marcus and Lucius were needed. This was important to Antoninus Pius, because it was by means of the types' dissemination and reception that the second generation of the young Antonine dynasty was mediated to a wider audience, expressing continuity of the reign and consolidating the power of the new emperor at this early stage.

Type II of Marcus Aurelius was most probably officially commissioned in late A.D. 139 or in A.D. 140. It was an update of the outdated Type I with its boyish appeal, to secure a basic verifiable likeness between imperial subject and imperial image. Besides recognisability, the new portrait image of the adolescent prince assured the public by means of its dissemination and reception in honorific contexts that the second generation of the Antonine dynasty was well and growing up, further consolidating the position and power of the Antonines. This function is also confirmed by the second and third portrait types of Lucius Verus, likewise updating the appearance of the young imperial

subject from a boy to a young man, despite the lack of any official functions at that stage of his life. Clearly, the creation of these types mattered to the dynasty.

Faustina's first portrait type (Type I) was most probably officially commissioned in A.D. 145 in connection with her marriage, since the young princess did not have a preexisting portrait identity. The newly created portrait type ensured a recognisable and identifiable portrait image of Faustina. As the wife of Marcus Aurelius Caesar and future empress she played an important role in the dynastic conception of Antoninus Pius: she was the prospective mother of the third generation of the Antonine dynasty and symbolised continuity and prosperity for a long time to come. Her physiognomy changed in the succeeding types from the 'marriagable girl' of Type I through the more mature image of the 'young mother' to the image of the 'young matron' with a fuller and rounder face, most clearly seen on coins and in sculpture from Type V onwards. Her updated portrait image types also ensured a basic verifiable likeness between imperial subject and imperial image. Moreover, every new portrait type introduced a new hairstyle, reflecting Faustina's interaction with metropolitan elite culture and suggesting that she followed changing fashions.

Marcus' Type III and Lucius Verus' Type IV – the portrait images of full-grown, mature men – were almost certainly officially commissioned in A.D. 160, as can be shown, to visually manage power transitions in real life, represented through the portrait 'system'. They reflect an imbricated transition of imperial power in the final stage of Antoninus Pius' life, to avoid the crunch moment of the 'death of the king'. Clearly, the creation of these portrait types was considered important by the emperor.

No new portrait types were created for the accession of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus in A.D. 161 as it was probably not thought necessary by the new co-emperors to adjust the recently updated portrait images. However, Faustina's Type VII was most likely commissioned by the court in

connection with Marcus Aurelius' accession in A.D. 161 to visually express her position and relation to him, as already mentioned above.

The creation of Marcus' Type IV clearly has to be dated to A.D. 166 and so may be connected with the Parthian victory. It was most probably even conceived to commemorate this important historical event. The triumph held on the 12th of October A.D. 166 was the first triumph celebrated in Rome for nearly 50 years and Commodus and Annus Verus were elevated to the rank of Caesar on the same day. The *Historia Augusta* further informs us that the two co-emperors carried with them in the triumphal procession all of Marcus' children of both sexes, even the unmarried daughters, allowing a rare glimpse of the physical self-representation of the Antonine dynasty – imperial power was a 'family operation' and had to be constantly reaffirmed.<sup>663</sup>

### **Correspondence between coins and sculpture**

As clearly demonstrated by the evidence presented, the relation between portraits on imperial coins and sculptured portraits is not as tight as generally assumed. There is no complete correspondence between the portraits in the two media, as we would expect under the prevailing model of an imperial portrait system. This finding has various implications for received positions regarding the functioning of imperial portrait types, outlined below. Most importantly, it has been suggested in this study that 'updates' of the imperial image were not restricted to official commissions only, but that some adjustments could equally have originated within the mint or in the marble workshops. These 'updates' should probably be seen as initiatives within the mint and the workshops to ensure a basic up-to-date and verifiable likeness between imperial subject and imperial image.

---

<sup>663</sup> SHA, vita Marci 12. 7–10.

### **Portrait types put through the mint only or originating within the mint**

Four out of ten portrait types of Faustina on coins and medallions (Types II, IV, VI and IX) are not represented in sculpture, and it is not certain that they existed in the round. This evidence casts important doubts on the assumption that all portrait types were officially commissioned by the court and made available to both the mint and the marble workshops. Consequently, it has been argued that some adjustments or modifications of the image were put through the mint only, without making the model available for a distribution in the round. Instead of an impetus from outside the mint, they equally may have emerged within the mint. The types or rather hairstyles of Faustina known from coins but not represented in sculpture (Types II, IV, VI, IX) probably simply remained in the mint where they were created. Moreover, three of these four types were not used for a particularly long time (Types II, IV, IX). It is possible, but not necessary, that they captured short-lived hairstyles worn by the empress.

### **'Non-court' types in the metropolitan workshops**

Furthermore, it also cannot be excluded that some of the sculptured types, such as Faustina's Type VIII were not officially commissioned but evolved in the environment of the metropolitan marble workshops. This possibility might be considered when the types are not a complete re-think but rather an adjustment of an existing type that only involves some modifications such as an adapted hairstyle. These types did not necessarily involve a portrait sitting, as workshop-drawings from different sides and a three-dimensional model of the preceding type would have been sufficient for the adjustments. Such types evolving in the marble workshops could have been disseminated in Rome and beyond by interconnected workshops in exactly the same way as officially commissioned types. The only difference would be the absence of an official prototype.<sup>664</sup>

---

<sup>664</sup> No evidence has been found in this study to support the assumption of competing workshops, concurrently creating imperial portrait types for the same subject. For this idea see first Fittschen 1977, 7 (suggesting an official approval); for competing workshops in relation to the three portrait types of Faustina the Elder see Fittschen 1977, 83; Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 14. Fittschen's arguments are not convincing, since we should expect that the different coiffures of Faustina the Elder's portrait types are not just made up but reflect real

While types only put through the mint or originating within the mint were largely restricted to their medium by the profile view, their scale and the simplification of detail, such three-dimensional non-court types could have been much more influential, even being adopted by the mint. It is possible that these types were officially approved, but we probably should not think of too much imperial involvement in such cases.

### **‘Update’ of the imperial image in the mint and in the marble workshops**

It has in principle been acknowledged that some variations in image were probably accomplished by individual marble carvers or marble workshops.<sup>665</sup> Fittschen, for example, noted that the longer and fuller beard of some versions of Marcus’ Type III is most probably an alteration of the type by individual marble carvers.<sup>666</sup> Likewise, the differences in the indicated level of age between versions of Marcus’ Type IV are most probably the result of the interpretation and adjustment of the type by individual marble carvers or workshops, as Bergmann argued.<sup>667</sup> Furthermore, as demonstrated in this study, Marcus’ Type II was over its period of use most likely not officially revised or reissued, but gradually adjusted in the metropolitan workshops – from the portrait of a youth with a faint adolescent beard (or no beard at all) to the likeness of a mature young man with a full beard. At least some of these adjustments, such as certainly the gradual development of Type II, reflect a change in the real appearance of Marcus and we may assume that workshop-drawings were used to accomplish them. However, not every variation in image should be mistaken for a change in real life.

Likewise, the imperial image was adjusted in the imperial mint to reflect the real-life changing appearance of Marcus. The coins and medallions feature a gradual adjustment of Marcus’ Type II from an adolescent to a mature young man. Furthermore, the beard of Marcus’ Type III lengthens on coins from ca. A.D. 163 and a thinner face and a leaner neck is observable on some coin dies from ca.

---

hairstyles worn by the empress. – The model of competing workshops was taken up by Fejfer 1998, 47; Fejfer 2008, 418–19; cf. also Fittschen 2010, 230 for a (now) sceptical view.

<sup>665</sup> See for example Zanker 1983, 46.

<sup>666</sup> Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 70–71 with n. 5.

<sup>667</sup> Bergmann 1978, 32 with n. 70.

the mid A.D. 170s onwards. It has been suggested in this study that these adjustments were made in the mint at the level of ‘work-models’. However, these developments are neither continuous nor linear and one has to be careful, as already pointed out for sculpture, not to mistake every variation in image for a change in real appearance.

The evidence of the coins and sculptured portraits suggests that these ‘updates’ were accomplished independently in both media, without central organisation or official approval, as there is a high variability of the adjusted features within the two media and no close correspondence between them – the match between coins and sculptured portraits is often pressed too closely and the correspondence appears to be much looser than proposed under the prevailing model of an imperial portrait ‘system’.

It is difficult to assess what these ‘updates’ of the imperial image in the mint and in the marble workshops are ultimately based on, whether they refer to other images for the ‘work-models’ and workshop-drawings or to first-hand observations made in real life. Paintings (and drawings) may have played a significant role in the mediation of the real appearance of the imperial subject. Important textual evidence for the existence of such painted images of the emperor (or Caesar, to be more precise) includes the famous reference in Fronto (*ad M. Caesarem* 4. 12. 6) and the tombstone of a certain Aurelius Felicianus found near Clusium (Chiusi), which informs us that he was a *pinctor Augustorum sive omnium bonorum virorum* (‘painter of emperors as well as of all men of honour’).<sup>668</sup>

We may infer from Fronto’s reference that paintings of the emperor (and Caesar) must have been ubiquitous. Almost nothing is preserved but we can be near-certain that vast quantities of painted imperial images existed.<sup>669</sup> In contrast to sculpture, painting is a very flexible medium and changes in

---

<sup>668</sup> CIL XI, 7126; Fejfer 2008, 419, fig. 329. Dated to the second century A.D. based on the *nomen* Aurelius.

<sup>669</sup> The only known painted portrait of an emperor is the famous ‘tondo’ painting in Berlin from Egypt, showing Septimius Severus with his family: Severan ‘tondo’, tempera on wood, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. 31329: Schwarzmaier et al. 2012, 269, no. 154; Mathews – Muller 2016, 74–83.

real appearance could be quickly adopted. It is entirely possible that the ‘work-models’ or workshop-drawings for adjustments of the imperial portrait types on coins or in sculpture were in some way or another based on such paintings, but personal observation of the appearance of the imperial subject by someone in the mint or in the marble workshops, while perhaps unlikely, also cannot be excluded.

## B. OUTLINE OF AN ADJUSTED MODEL OF AN IMPERIAL PORTRAIT ‘SYSTEM’

### **Creation of the ‘original model’ or prototype of officially commissioned types**

The initial stage of the creation of most if not all officially commissioned portrait types must have been a portrait sitting with the subject, a model taken from life. Most likely, clay was used for such a portrait, as this pliable material facilitated a fluent and swift modelling.<sup>670</sup> The product of the portrait sitting, the three-dimensional prototype or ‘original model’ (‘Palatine model’), is the first link in the process of dissemination. Made of non-durable material, it was never meant to be ‘published’ as a public monument but was ‘concealed’.<sup>671</sup>

### **First steps of dissemination**

The prototype or ‘original model’ was probably the basis for a limited number of direct plaster casts that were made available to the imperial mint and (the leading) metropolitan sculptor’s workshop(s), rather than making directly available the single fragile prototype.<sup>672</sup>

*The imperial image in the mint of Rome.* The mint, presumably, transformed the direct plaster cast of the prototype into an ‘authorised mint model’, as it is near-certain that the die-cutters did not

---

<sup>670</sup> For clay modelling and the wide use of clay models in other branches of sculpture see Plin. Nat. Hist. 35. 45; Swift 1923, 294–95. Plaster (stucco) has been suggested, but it is not as pliable a material that can easily be worked with to create a three-dimensional model. Wax, on the other hand, cannot be ruled out but does not allow a swift modelling that comes anywhere near to clay.

<sup>671</sup> Cf. Smith 1996, 37 for the concept of the ‘concealed original’.

<sup>672</sup> This would have been the fastest way of dissemination, rather than directly transforming it into more durable material (e.g. marble or bronze).

convert the three-dimensional model into coin-format without intermediary steps.<sup>673</sup> Most probably, as has been demonstrated in this study, it can also be ruled out that the ‘authorised mint model’ was directly referred to by all die-cutters.<sup>674</sup> Rather, it appears that it was the basis for ‘work-models’, either two-dimensional or in relief, that set the die design and were the point of reference for the die-cutters when engraving the dies. Some of these ‘work-models’ could apparently be influential and were ‘copied’ by various die-cutters. Several of them must have existed at any time.

Types that were only put through the mint or that originated within the mint possibly followed a two-dimensional rather than a three-dimensional model, as the profile view would have been sufficient for a conversion into coin-format. The other steps of the procedure were probably the same as just outlined above. It is likely that a new ‘authorised mint model’ was only necessary when a distinctively different model or type was meant to be converted into coin-format, while some adjustments such as the growing beard of Marcus Aurelius could be put through at the level of ‘work-models’.

It is important to note that new portrait types were not necessarily immediately employed by all die-cutters after their ‘introduction’, as can be shown. They were made available to the mint or originated within the mint and could be adopted quickly – if thought important – or taken up more gradually. There was no need for stricter control of the imperial image in the mint.

*The imperial image in the sculptors’ workshops of Rome.* The sculptors’ workshops presumably transformed the direct plaster cast of the prototype or ‘original model’ into marble and bronze versions. The result of this transformation was the first and most directly sculptured ‘copies’ after the

---

<sup>673</sup> The evidence of corresponding repeated typological features of the portraits on coins and in sculpture strongly suggests that the coins (and medallions) follow in one way or another the three-dimensional prototypes (for those types existent on coins and in sculpture).

<sup>674</sup> The same observation was made by H.-M. von Kaenel in the context of the coinage of Claudius (von Kaenel 1986, 263–73, esp. 264–65).

prototype ('original copies'). These 'original copies' – or plaster casts of them – were most probably made available to other workshops in Rome and exported.<sup>675</sup>

We have to be aware that these 'original copies' were also the first variations or interpretations of the sculptured type.<sup>676</sup> Little can be said about the bronzes as too few are preserved, but in the Antonine period they appear to follow and imitate marble techniques. Yet, they do not come close to the best metropolitan marbles in their technical sophistication, especially because refined undercutting and drill-work for the hair- and beard-styles was restricted to stone carving. In this respect marble is also superior to clay, and precisely there – in the 'translation' into marble of hair- and beard-styles – we have to expect a certain enhancement of the 'original copies' in relation to the prototype or 'original model'.

*Sculptured non-court types.* It has been argued here that it cannot be ruled out that some of the sculptured types were not officially commissioned but evolved in the environment of the metropolitan marble workshops. Such types could be disseminated in Rome and beyond by interconnected workshops in exactly the same way as officially commissioned types. The only difference would have been the absence of an official prototype.

It remains to briefly discuss how imperial portrait types were further disseminated and 'replicated', that is, how they were circulated and received throughout the empire in the early and middle imperial period.

### **Wider deployment**

It is evident that soon after the creation of a sculptured type in Rome, many versions must have been made that not only reached Italy and the provincial centres, but also remote areas of the empire, and

---

<sup>675</sup> Smith 1996, 37.

<sup>676</sup> Cf. Fittschen 1999, 11 in a more general context.

we can assume that besides exported metropolitan versions, plaster casts may have played an important role in this process.<sup>677</sup> We also have to consider workshop-drawings as models in the provinces, at least for some adjustments of the types, such as for example the bust of Marcus Aurelius from Cyrene, in the British Museum (Fig. 238) suggests: despite repeating the main characteristics of the hairstyle of Type II, it features the longer beard of Type III. A three-dimensional model of the new type was presumably not yet available, but the sculptors already had knowledge of the metropolitan update of the imperial image.

Whether or not we have to expect a centrally administered 'official' distribution of the imperial image before the middle of the third century A.D. and especially the late Roman period, where this practice is confirmed by an abundance of literary sources, is subject to a long-running debate.<sup>678</sup> The fact that imperial portraits of 'new' emperors could be erected within a short time-span does not necessarily support the assumption of a (widely practised) 'official' distribution of the imperial image, but nor does Højte's finding that the dedication of imperial statues upon accession was generally not very rapid rule it out.<sup>679</sup>

There are no clear indications of a centrally organised and administered portrait 'system' in the period under discussion; rather, the varied imperial portraits and the epigraphic evidence of the statue bases from all over the empire speak against such a practice. Officially commissioned portrait

---

<sup>677</sup> Zanker 1983, 8; for the use of plaster casts in antiquity for the reproduction of sculpture in general see Swift 1923, 295 (with literary sources); for archaeological evidence for the reproduction in plaster of Classical Greek sculpture in the first century A.D. see von Hees-Landwehr 1982; Landwehr 1985 for the fragmentary casts from Baiae.

<sup>678</sup> An assumed involvement of the central administration in the distribution of the imperial image was first systematically expressed by Swift 1923, most recently advocated by Ando 2000, 228–32 (with further references); cf. also Pekáry 1985, 23–25. – The idea that imperial portraits 'were distributed without governmental intervention through the ordinary channels of the art trade' goes back to Stuart 1939 (see there, p. 616 for the quote), followed (besides others) by Zanker 1983, 8–9 in his influential study on provincial Roman imperial portraits. – For the late Roman literary sources and the transmission of the *imagines laureatae* see Friedlaender 1920, 57–58; Swift 1923, 297–98; Bruun 1976; Pekáry 1985, 24–25; Ando 2000, 228–32.

<sup>679</sup> For imperial images rapidly erected after the accession see Friedlaender 1920, 61–62; Swift 1923, 299–300; Pekáry 1985, 23–24 (all with literary sources); Højte 2005, 144 with n. 338. – For the evidence of statue bases suggesting a relatively slow setting up of imperial statues upon accession see Stuart 1939; Højte 2005, 155–56.

types were created and made available to the marble workshops (and the mint) in Rome but the emperor or the central administration were in most cases apparently neither concerned with their dissemination nor their reception.<sup>680</sup> Most probably, the distribution of the imperial image in the early and middle imperial period was in the majority of cases not centrally organised but facilitated by the economics of the Roman stone and sculpture trade and the connection of workshops between each other, as M. Stuart first suggested.<sup>681</sup> However, at least in the realm of the military we have to expect a certain degree of central 'official' involvement in the spread of a new emperor's likeness (without a preexisting portrait identity), as an image (*imago*) of the commander-in-chief was of vital importance for official and ceremonial reasons.<sup>682</sup> The same might hold true for provincial governors, who needed an image of the (new) emperor for official acts.<sup>683</sup>

### **Replication and provincial reception**

Communities or individuals intending to set up a sculptured imperial portrait (head combined with statue or bust support) in the provinces had in principle two possibilities: they could order a portrait from Rome, which for sure – depending on the distance and available trade routes – was an expensive and rather complicated option or they could commission it with a local or regional workshop.<sup>684</sup> The quality and recognisability of the resulting imperial portrait would depend on the ability of the sculptor and the accuracy of the model available in relation to the type, but also on local stylistic or workshop preferences.<sup>685</sup> Further factors influencing the appearance of a local version after an imperial type are the scale, material, setting and posture.<sup>686</sup>

---

<sup>680</sup> Stuart 1939; Zanker 1983, 44–45; cf. also Pekáry 1985, 4–12; Fejfer 1998, 53; Fejfer 2008, 408.

<sup>681</sup> Stuart 1939; Zanker 1983, 8–9. The term 'art trade', in this context first introduced by Stuart, is here avoided, as it is entirely modern and strongly influenced by modern perceptions. – The dissemination should be seen against the background of metropolitan and local elites as an initial catalyst.

<sup>682</sup> Tac. Ann. 12. 17; Tac. Hist. 1. 36; 4. 37; see Friedlaender 1920, 57, 61; Swift 1923, 298–99 for further literary sources; cf. also Pekáry 1985, 9, 43; Ando 2000, 230; Højte 2005, 144; Eck 2017, 272–74.

<sup>683</sup> Cf. Plin. Epist. 10. 96. 5; Pekáry 1985, 43.

<sup>684</sup> Zanker 1983, 9.

<sup>685</sup> Zanker 1983, 9, 46.

<sup>686</sup> Smith 1996, 34.

For most sculptors, probably except for Rome itself where there was a chance to see the imperial family in person, versions of the imperial image in whatever form (sculptured, casted, painted, drawn or minted on coins) must have been the only detailed information on the physical appearance of the imperial subjects they had.<sup>687</sup> These versions – functioning to a varying degree as models for the sculptors or influencing them – could be several stages removed from the first ‘original copies’ made in the metropolitan workshops or conform to them very closely.<sup>688</sup> For an intended version of a type, the sculptors could take as much as they needed or wanted from the model – or what they had, if no good model was available.

The versions standing closest to the imperial portrait types tend to come from Rome and central Italy.<sup>689</sup> However, there are no firm rules as even the metropolitan workshops interpreted and adjusted types, best exemplified by the differences in the indicated age level of Marcus’ Type IV.<sup>690</sup> Furthermore, we know that not all imperial portraits in Rome and Italy were of high quality. This is suggested by Fronto’s letter to Marcus Aurelius but also supported by surviving sculptured examples that feature a simplification of the design, such as a head in Naples found near Capua (Fig. 263).<sup>691</sup>

In the provinces, a reduction of complexity of the nuanced and subtle physiognomy and the hairstyles as well as a modification of the centrally defined portrait types is frequently discernible.<sup>692</sup> Two main reasons may account for the observable deviation: on the one hand, the making of a faithful version of a type was often clearly hindered by the insufficient ability of the sculptor, as imperial portrait types were subtle and complex images. This can be observed on portraits from all over the empire reflecting various grades of ability and experience, ranging from highly skilled to very

---

<sup>687</sup> Zanker 1983, 9.

<sup>688</sup> Cf. Boschung 1989, 31 (with diagram). Details of the portrait type can get more and more blurred in a ‘chain of copied versions’, that is, versions being the model for further versions.

<sup>689</sup> Smith 1996, 41.

<sup>690</sup> Cf. Chapter 6 above and Zanker 1983, 46.

<sup>691</sup> Zanker 1983, 9 n. 7. – Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 150820: De Franciscis 1972, 331–34, pls. 138, 140. 1–2.

<sup>692</sup> Zanker 1983, 12; Smith 1985, 213; cf. also Boschung 1989, 32.

modestly crafted, but sufficient for their particular contexts.<sup>693</sup> The process of manually copying the portraits resulted in these cases in a loss of detail or simplification of the design.

On the other hand, especially in the Greek East of the empire with its long tradition and in general high quality-level of portrait production, a deliberate modulation of the imperial types by the sculptors is frequently perceivable.<sup>694</sup> The motive here was to adapt the model to local ideas and perceptions of the emperor's role, not a search for originality.<sup>695</sup>

These processes of dissemination and replication of imperial portrait types in the provinces are not at all uniform. The evidence of the preserved portraits shows that versions of impressive accuracy can be found (and were sculptured) at remote places, while divergent portraits and stylistic cross-breeding are known from provincial centres that yielded examples standing close to the type. In fact, there seems to be no consistent 'provincialisation' of imperial portrait types, as R. Smith pointed out.<sup>696</sup> For example, the bust of Faustina in Istanbul from the remote village of Kandilli near Bozhöyük in Phrygia (Fig. 97) closely follows her Type VIII, while the neck pillar clearly shows that it is of provincial manufacture.<sup>697</sup> In contrast, the bust of Marcus Aurelius in the British Museum (Fig. 238) from the provincial centre of Cyrene does not closely conform to one of the central types but combines a simplified frontal hair-scheme of Type II with the longer and fuller beard of Type III.

Important literary evidence for the variety and diversity in the appearance of imperial portraits in the provinces is given by Flavius Arrianus. He informs us during his provincial governorship of Cappadocia under Hadrian (in a well-known account that took the form of a letter) of a statue of the emperor in Trapezus that was – in his eyes – poorly executed and did not resemble the emperor. He therefore

---

<sup>693</sup> Zanker 1983, 46; Smith 1985, 213. Usually, enough of the essential characteristics of a type are preserved to recognise versions even of a low level of technical ability.

<sup>694</sup> Zanker 1983, 15–18, 21–25, 47.

<sup>695</sup> Smith 1996, 34.

<sup>696</sup> Zanker 1983, 46; Smith 1985, 213; Smith 1996, 41.

<sup>697</sup> The portrait bust of Marcus Aurelius found together with it, however, combines the central curl-motif of Type III with the longer beard and the flame-like strands of hair at the temples of Type IV.

appealed to Hadrian to send an adequate replacement.<sup>698</sup> Although we do not know if Hadrian followed Arrian's appeal, the passage further suggests that at least in exceptional cases an imperial image could be (centrally) distributed.<sup>699</sup>

The possible latitude of reduction of complexity and variation of imperial portraits in the provinces is best exemplified by a comparison of different versions: a portrait of Marcus Aurelius from Gerasa in Jordan (Fig. 264), for example, simplifies the complex hair- and beard-style as well as the physiognomy of the metropolitan types substantially.<sup>700</sup> Nevertheless, the frontal hair-scheme clearly connects it with Type III while the wavy beard stands close to Type IV, in combination securing the identification. The widely opened 'staring' eyes, however, stand in the tradition of local Syrian workshops.<sup>701</sup>

A gold bust of Marcus Aurelius from Avenches (Fig. 265), hammered from a single sheet of metal, combines the upswept frontal hair of Type IV with the shorter beard of Type III.<sup>702</sup> The dissimilarity in relation to the types is best explained by the restrictions of the technique and material, resulting in a simplification of the hair- and beard-style, as well as by the skill of the sculptor working in a local tradition.<sup>703</sup>

The final example is of special interest since it allows us to contrast a high-quality (metropolitan) bronze head of Marcus Aurelius Type III from the Roman military camp Lugio/Dunaszekcső (Fig. 266), originally from an imported statue, with a possible portrait of Marcus Aurelius Type III (?) made of

---

<sup>698</sup> Arrian. *peripl. Pont. Eux.* 1. 1–4; Zanker 1983, 7; Pekáry 1985, 102 with n. 14; Riccardi 2000, 116–17 with n. 52. The passage does not tell us if the statue was of local manufacture (Eck 2017, 273).

<sup>699</sup> It is not stated where this replacement should come from (Eck 2017, 273).

<sup>700</sup> Head from Gerasa in Jordan, now in Jerusalem: Wegner 1939, 43, 176, pl. 33; Zanker 1983, 39–40, pl. 23. 1.

<sup>701</sup> Zanker 1983, 39–40.

<sup>702</sup> Gold bust from Avenches: Hochuli-Gysel – Brodard 2006, figs. 50–64; Zanker 1983, 40–41, pl. 22. 3.

<sup>703</sup> Zanker 1983, 40–41. Chasing and repoussé work, for example, do not allow undercutting or drill-work.

limestone from the military camp Contra-Aquincum/Budapest (Fig. 267).<sup>704</sup> Clearly, in relation to the type, the head from Conta-Aquincum is simplified and stylised to a degree that makes a secure attribution impossible, and one might think it would be better not to take the head into consideration as a portrait of Marcus. However, taking into account its size (36 cm) and find location, the curl pattern above the forehead, and the long beard, we should not exclude it from the discussion.<sup>705</sup> Both military camps are only 200 kilometres apart on the Danubian frontier line of Pannonia and the example illustrates at the most extreme the range of imperial portraits we might have to expect side by side.<sup>706</sup>

---

<sup>704</sup> Head from Lugio/Dunaszekcső, Pécs, Janus Pannonius Múzeum: Kovács 1984, 89–91, pls. 44–45; Lahusen – Formigli 2001, 227–28, no. 139, figs. 139. 1–2. – Head from Contra-Aquincum/Budapest, Aquincum Museum inv. 64.11.136: Kuzsinszky 1934, 98, no. 27, fig. 46; Szilágyi 1976, 18, no. 1, pl. 1; Zanker 1983, 42, pl. 23. 3–4.

<sup>705</sup> Szilágyi 1976, 18, gives the height as only 23,5 cm, which is incorrect; the correct height of 36 cm can be found in Kuzsinszky 1934, 98. The piece is therefore slightly over life-size, as frequently observed for imperial portraits.

<sup>706</sup> This is especially true for the northern provinces with their lack of tradition of sculptured portraits; cf. Zanker 1983, 41–43 for other examples.

## CHAPTER 9

### Conclusion

Case studies of Faustina the Younger and Marcus Aurelius show that more flexibility than currently allowed for is needed to describe ancient practices and processes behind the phenomenon of 'replicated' imperial portraits. Possible norms have been investigated, and an adjusted and more flexible model of an imperial portrait 'system' in the second century A.D. has been outlined in the preceding chapter to better account for its workings.

Key concepts of the prevailing model of an imperial portrait 'system', first systematically expressed by K. Fittschen, are the assumption that all imperial portrait types were officially commissioned by the court and made available to both the mint and the marble workshops, the belief that types were created in connection with specific events to commemorate them, and the view of a close correspondence between imperial coins and sculpture. All of this, however, has never been clearly proven and the new evidence presented in this study has made it necessary to adjust the model in certain ways, always keeping in mind that without Fittschen's groundbreaking research to build on, this study would never have been possible.

A close examination of the preserved evidence of imperial coins and medallions as well as marble portraits of Faustina and Marcus allows new insights into the functioning of the imperial image in the mint of Rome and in the marble workshops. It has been shown how imperial portrait types were received and adjusted in both media after they came into existence, and it has been possible to prove that the presumed close relation between portraits on imperial coins and sculptured portraits is in many cases too closely pressed. There is no complete correspondence between the two media.

It has been further suggested that the creation of imperial portrait types and their adjustment was not necessarily restricted to official commissions only. It is very likely that besides types that were officially commissioned by the court, some types or images designated as new types by archaeology originated within the mint or in the environment of the metropolitan marble workshops and were then further disseminated. Someone seems to have thought an up-to-date imperial image important, even if it was not thought necessary by the court. Most probably we should understand these 'non-court' types and adjustments as initiatives within the mint and the workshops to ensure a basic correspondence between imperial subject and imperial image.

Furthermore, a different view of the (basic) purpose of imperial portrait types has been argued for in this study, allowing for a more diverse and flexible picture of the historical circumstances of their creation and explaining why successive types for the same subject were created. It can be shown that in most cases new types were not about the commemoration of historical moments, as frequently assumed, but about (a) recognisability and identification, (b) changing elite styles and fashions, and (c) dynastic conceptions and strategies to affirm imperial power.

While the creation of imperial portrait types was a distinctively central matter, their reception was fundamentally local, mattering to communities and individuals from below. Combined with a statue or bust support or depicted on provincial coinage – only to name a few media – they mediated the imperial family to the empire. Precisely in this provincial reception of the centrally defined imperial image lies the biggest potential for further studies: a better understanding of the centrally defined models and their workings in metropolitan Rome obtained from this study will facilitate assessment of the functioning of imperial portrait types in the provinces and the significance of local variants.

## Appendix: Portrait Lists of Faustina and Marcus

The lists are based on and adjust the following: Wegner 1980, 12–37; Fittschen 1982, 44–65 (Faustina Type I–X). – Wegner 1979, 139–81; Fittschen 1999, 13–15 (Marcus Type I). – Wegner 1979, 139–81; Fittschen 1999, 22–26 (Marcus Type II). – Wegner 1979, 139–81; Wegner 1980, 115–16; Albertson 1981, 150; Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 73 n. 9; Albertson 2004, 295 n. 142 (Marcus Type III). – Wegner 1979, 139–81; Wegner 1980, 115–16; Albertson 1981, 151; Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 76 n. 5; Albertson 2004 with appendix (Marcus Type IV).

If not specified, the material is marble. Additions to the above-mentioned lists are indicated by an asterisk (\*). In some cases, it has not been possible to obtain sufficient images.

### A. FAUSTINA THE YOUNGER

#### Faustina Type I

##### From Italy:

1. Erbach, Schloss: Head on bust that does not belong.  
Fittschen 1977, 84–88, no. 31, pls 34. 3–4; 36; here Fig. 63.
2. Munich, Glyptothek 408: Head.  
Fittschen 1982, 46, no. 9, pl. 13. 1–2; here Fig. 67.
- 3.\*New York, art market: Head.  
Sotheby's New York, Sale 5 June 2013, Lot 50; here Fig. 57.
4. Rome, Museo Capitolino, Salone 34, inv. 652: Mars-Venus statue group from the Isola Sacra, Ostia.  
Fittschen 1982, 46, no. 7, pl. 12. 1–2; here Figs. 65–66.
5. Rome, Museo Capitolino, Stanza degli Imperatori 32, inv. 449: Bust from Hadrian's Villa, Tivoli.  
Fittschen 1982, 44, no. 1, pl. 8. 1–4; here Fig. 64.
6. Rome, Palazzo Colonna: Bust.  
Fittschen 1982, 46, no. 10, pl. 13. 3–4; here Fig. 68.
7. Rome, Palazzo Spada, Galleria Spada: Head on bust that does not belong.  
Fittschen 1982, 44, no. 4, pl. 10. 1–4; here Fig. 62.
8. Rome, Vatican, Braccio Nuovo 54, inv. 2193: Head on bust that does not belong.  
Fittschen 1982, 44, no. 2, pl. 9. 1–4; here Fig. 61.
9. Rome, Vatican, Museo Chiaramonti XXXV 8, inv. 1740: Head on modern bust.  
Fittschen 1982, 44, no. 3, pl. 11. 1–2; here Fig. 69.

##### From North Africa:

10. Cyrene, Museum inv. C 17042: Head, without find location.  
Fittschen 1982, 45, no. 6, pl. 11. 3–4.

##### From the East:

- 11.\*New York, Metropolitan Museum, inv. 1986.40: Head of a statue, presumably from Asia Minor.  
Zanker 2016, 218–19, no. 82, figs. pp. 218–19; here Fig. 58.

**Excluded:**

1. Munich, Glyptothek 535: Head, reportedly from Jordan.  
Fittschen 1982, 46, no. 8, pl. 12. 3–4; here Fig. 60.
2. Tripoli, Archaeological Museum, inv. 483: Head from the theatre in Leptis Magna.  
Caputo – Traversari 1976, 95, no. 73, pls. 78–79; here Fig. 59.

**Faustina Type II**

No extant portraits.

**Faustina Type III**

**From Italy:**

1. Rome, Palazzo Spada, Galleria Spada: Head on bust that does not belong.  
Fittschen 1982, 49, no. 2, pl. 16. 1–4; here Fig. 72.
2. Rome, Vatican, Museo Chiaramonti XV 9, inv. 1416: Head on modern bust.  
Fittschen 1982, 49, no. 1, pl. 15. 1–4; here Fig. 71.

**Faustina Type IV**

No extant portraits.

**Excluded:**

1. Athens, National Museum, inv. 442: Head.  
Fittschen 1982, 50, no. 2, pl. 18. 1–4; here Fig. 76.
2. Rome, Villa Albani, inv. 152: Head.  
Fittschen 1982, 50, no. 1, pl. 17. 2–4; here Fig. 75.

**Faustina Type V**

**From Italy:**

1. London, British Museum 1905: Head on modern bust, from Pozzuoli.  
Fittschen 1982, 52, no. 5, pl. 21. 1–4; here Fig. 82.
2. Rome, Museo Torlonia 408: Bust.  
Fittschen 1982, 51, no. 3, pl. 20. 4.
3. Rome, Vatican, Braccio Nuovo 48, inv. 2195: Head on bust that does not belong.  
Fittschen 1982, 51, no. 1, pl. 19. 1–4; here Fig. 80.
4. Rome, Vatican, Museo Chiaramonti XXXI 9, inv. 1676: Head.  
Fittschen 1982, 51, no. 2, pl. 20. 1–3; here Fig. 81.

**From North Africa:**

5. London, British Museum 1468: Bust from the so-called ‘House of Jason Magnus’ in Cyrene.  
Fittschen 1982, 52, no. 6, pl. 22. 1–4; here Fig. 77.

**Excluded:**

1. Rome, Villa Doria Pamphilj: Head on statue that does not belong.  
Calza 1977, 288–89, no. 358, pl. 196; here Fig. 83.

**Faustina Type VI**

No extant portraits.

**Faustina Type VII**

**From Italy:**

1. Adolphseck, Schloss Fasanerie: Head.  
Fittschen 1982, 56, no. 4, pl. 29. 1–2.
2. Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Antikensammlung, R 81: Head on modern bust.  
Fittschen 1982, 56, no. 5, pl. 27. 1–2.
3. Florence, Galleria degli Uffizi, inv. 1914.172: Head on modern bust.  
Fittschen 1982, 56, no. 6, pl. 27. 3–4.
4. Florence, Galleria degli Uffizi, inv. 1914.173: Bust.  
Fittschen 1982, 56, no. 7, pl. 24. 3–4.
5. Florence, Palazzo Pitti, inv. 618: Head on modern bust.  
Fittschen 1982, 56, no. 8, pl. 28. 1–2.
6. Hampton Court Palace, Royal Collection: Bust (addendum Fittschen 1982, 65).  
Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 21 n. 3, supplement 13d.
7. London, art market: Head.  
Fittschen 1982, 56, no. 9, pl. 30. 1.
8. Munich, Residenz (formerly), now missing: Head on bust that does not belong.  
Fittschen 1982, 56, no. 10, pl. 30. 2.
9. Paris, Musée du Louvre, MA 1049: Head on statue that does not belong.  
Fittschen 1982, 56, no. 12, pl. 33. 1.
10. Paris, Musée du Louvre, MA 1144: Bust.  
Fittschen 1982, 56, no. 11, pl. 26. 1–4; here Fig. 86.
11. Paris, Musée du Louvre, MA 1147: Bust.  
Fittschen 1982, 56, no. 13, pl. 33. 4.
12. Paris, Musée du Louvre, MA 1177: Head on modern bust.  
Fittschen 1982, 56, no. 14, pl. 33. 3.
13. Rome, Museo Capitolino, Galleria 56, inv. 250: Bust.  
Fittschen 1982, 55, no. 1, pl. 24. 1–2; here Fig. 85.
14. Rome, Museo Nazionale Romano, inv. 691: Head from the Via Merulana.  
Fittschen 1982, 55, no. 2, pl. 32. 1–3; here Fig. 87.
15. Rome, Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Profano, inv. 9849: Head on bust that does not belong.  
Fittschen 1982, 56, no. 3, pl. 25. 1–4.
16. Seville, Casa de Pilatos: Statue.  
Fittschen 1982, 56, no. 15, pl. 32. 4.
17. Toronto, Royal Ontario Museum, inv. 930.23.1: Head on bust that does not belong.  
Fittschen 1982, 57, no. 16, pl. 29. 3–4.

18. Venice, Museo Archeologico, inv. 211: Head on modern bust.

Fittschen 1982, 57, no. 17, pl. 28. 3–4.

#### **From North Africa:**

19. Carthage, Museum: Head from the Antonine baths.

Fittschen 1982, 57, no. 21, pl. 30. 4.

20. Paris, Musée du Louvre, MA 1175: Head from Markouna.

Fittschen 1982, 57, no. 18, pl. 31. 1–4; here Fig. 88.

21. Timgad, Museum: Statue, presumably from the theatre in Timgad.

Fittschen 1982, 57, no. 19, pl. 33. 2.

22. Tripoli, Archaeological Museum, inv. 484: Head from the theatre in Leptis Magna.

Fittschen 1982, 57, no. 20, pl. 30. 3.

#### **Excluded:**

1. Athens, National Museum, inv. 359: Head.

Wegner 1939, 210, pl. 38 a.

2. Athens, National Museum, inv. 1687: Head from Ambelokipi.

Wegner 1939, 210–11, pl. 38 c–d; here Fig. 90.

3. Athens, National Museum, inv. 4536: Bust.

Wegner 1939, 211, pl. 38 b; here Fig. 91.

4. Bucharest, National Museum of Antiquities, inv. L 621: Head from Ostrov.

Fittschen 1982, 59, no. 28, pl. 34. 4; here Fig. 93.

5. Marathon, Museum (formerly Athens, National Museum, inv. 3712): Head from Marathon.

Fittschen 1982, 59, no. 27, pl. 34. 3.

6. Rome, Museo Torlonia 81: Head of a statue.

Fittschen 1982, 59, no. 23, pl. 34. 2; here Fig. 92.

7. Sperlonga, Museum: Head of a statue from the Villa of Tiberius.

Fittschen 1982, 58, no. 22, pl. 34. 1; here Fig. 89.

## **Faustina Type VIII**

#### **From Italy:**

1. Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, inv. Sk 445 (formerly), now missing: Head on modern bust.

Fittschen 1982, 61, no. 8, pl. 40. 1.

2. Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek 709, inv. 1748: Head.

Fittschen 1982, 61, no. 9, pl. 38. 1–4.

3.\*Florence, Galleria degli Uffizi, inv. 1914. 194: Head.

Fittschen – Zanker 1983, 23 n. 1 (under no. 21).

4.\*New York, art market: Head.

Christie's New York, Sale 8 June 2012, Lot 236.

5. Norway, private collection: Head.

Fittschen 1982, 61, no. 11, pl. 40. 2–4.

6. Paris, Musée du Louvre, MA 1174: Head on modern bust, from Ostia.

Fittschen 1982, 61, no. 10, pl. 35. 3–4.

7. Rome, Museo Capitolino, Salone 11, inv. 632: Head on statue that does not belong.  
Fittschen 1982, 60, no. 2, pl. 43. 1–2.
8. Rome, Museo Capitolino, Salone 46, inv. 666: Bust.  
Fittschen 1982, 60, no. 1, pl. 35. 1–2; here Fig. 95.
9. Rome, Museo Nazionale Romano, inv. 642: Head from the House of the Vestals at the Forum.  
Fittschen 1982, 60, no. 3, pl. 36. 1–4; here Fig. 96.
10. Rome, Museo Torlonia 557: Bust from Acquatraversa.  
Fittschen 1982, 60–61, no. 7, pl. 42. 4.
11. Rome, Palazzo Massimi alle Colonne: Head on modern bust, hair restored.  
Fittschen 1982, 60, no. 5, pl. 39. 1–2.
12. Rome, Palazzo Sacchetti: Head on statue that does not belong.  
Fittschen 1982, 60, no. 6, pl. 41. 1–2.
13. Rome, Vatican, Museo Chiaramonti XXXI 7, inv. 1674: Head on modern bust.  
Fittschen 1982, 60, no. 4, pl. 37. 1–4.
14. Syracuse, Museo Nazionale, inv. 743: Head.  
Fittschen 1982, 61, no. 12, pl. 39. 3–4.

**From North Africa:**

15. Cyrene, Museum, inv. C 17010: Head from the Agora.  
Fittschen 1982, 61, no. 13, pl. 42. 1–2.
16. Cyrene, Museum, inv. C 17032: Head from the Temple of Zeus.  
Fittschen 1982, 61, no. 14, pl. 42. 3.

**From the East:**

17. Istanbul, Archaeological Museum, inv. 5130: Bust from Kandilli near Bozhöyük.  
Fittschen 1982, 61, no. 15, pl. 41. 3–4; here Fig. 97.

**Faustina Type IX**

No extant portraits.

**Excluded:**

1. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, inv. GR 27.1850: Head.  
Fittschen 1982, 55, no. 2, pl. 23. 3–4; here Fig. 99.
2. Durazzo (?): Head from Dyrrachion.  
Korkuti 1971, 9, pl. 110; here Fig. 100.
3. Stockholm, National Museum, inv. 85: Head on bust that does not belong.  
Fittschen 1982, 55, no. 1, pl. 23. 1–2; here Fig. 98.

**Faustina Type X**

**From Italy:**

1. Rome, Museo Capitolino, Stanza degli Imperatori 33, inv. 310: Head.  
Fittschen 1982, 63, no. 1, pl. 43. 3–4; here Fig. 103.

**Excluded:**

1. Eichstätt, Museum (formerly), now missing: Head from Pfünz.  
von Sarwey et al. 1901, 43 no. 6, pl. 11 (B 1, 3); here Fig. 102.

## B. MARCUS AURELIUS

### Marcus Type I

**From Italy:**

1. Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Antikensammlung, R 78: Head.  
Fittschen 1999, 13, no. A 1, pl. 1.
- 2.\*Cologne, Römisch-Germanisches Museum, from a private collection: Head.  
Mlasowsky 2006, 73–75, no. 12, pl. 18
3. Farnborough Hall, inv. 18: Bust.  
Fittschen 1999, 13, no. A 2, pl. 2.
4. Germany, private collection: Head on modern bust.  
Fittschen 1999, 15, no. A 24, pl. 20.
5. Grosseto, Museo Civico: Head from Rusellae.  
Fittschen 1999, 13, no. A 3, pl. 3.
6. Holkham Hall: Head on modern bust.  
Fittschen 1999, 13, no. A 4, pl. 4; here Fig. 230.
7. London, art market: Head.  
Fittschen 1999, 15, no. A 25.
8. Malmö, Malmö Museum, inv. MM 54215: Fragmentary head.  
Fittschen 1999, 13, no. A 5, pl. 8 b.
9. Milan, art market (N. Longari): Head on modern bust.  
Fittschen 1999, 15, no. A 26, pl. 19 c–d.
10. Minturno, Antiquarium, inv. 3410: Fragmentary head from Minturnae.  
Fittschen 1999, 13, no. A 6, pl. 16 d.
11. Modena, Galleria Estense, inv. 620: Head on modern bust.  
Fittschen 1999, 13, no. A 7, pl. 5.
12. Paris, Musée du Louvre, MA 1178: Head from Gabii.  
Fittschen 1999, 13, no. A 8, pl. 6.
13. Pavlovsk, Great Palace, inv. YX-187-VIII: Head on modern bust.  
Fittschen 1999, 13–14, no. A 9, pl. 7 a–b.
14. Petworth House, Collection Leconfield: Head on modern bust.  
Fittschen 1999, 14, no. A 10, pl. 8 a, c–d.
15. Rome, Museo Capitolino, Galleria 36, inv. 279: Bust.  
Fittschen 1999, 14, no. A 11, pls. 7 c, 9; here Figs. 229, 231.
16. Rome, Museo Capitolino, Magazine, no inv.: Fragmentary head.  
Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 68–69, no. 63, pl. 74.

17. Rome, Museo Capitolino, Stanza degli Imperatori 29, inv. 450: Bust from Lanuvium?  
Fittschen 1999, 14, no. A 12, pls. 7 d, 10; here Fig. 231.
18. Rome, Museo Torlonia 117 B: Head on modern bust.  
Fittschen 1999, 14, no. A 16, pl. 13 a–b.
19. Rome, Palazzo Corsini, inv. 1207: Head on modern bust.  
Fittschen 1999, 14, no. A 17, pl. 13 c–d.
20. Rome, Vatican, Braccio Nuovo 94, inv. 2233: Head on bust that does not belong.  
Fittschen 1999, 14, no. A 14, pl. 11.
21. Rome, Vatican, Croce Greca 583, inv. 227: Head from Ostia.  
Fittschen 1999, 14, no. A 15, pl. 12; here Fig. 232.
22. Rome, Via di Porta San Sebastiano, formerly in private possession: Fragmentary head.  
Fittschen 1999, 14, no. A 23, pl. 19 a–b.
23. St. Petersburg, Hermitage A 63, inv. 249: Head on modern bust.  
Fittschen 1999, 14, no. A 18, pl. 14.
24. Varese, Sacromonte, Museo Pogliaghi: Head.  
Fittschen 1999, 14, no. A 19, pl. 15.
25. Wilton House: Head on bust that does not belong.  
Fittschen 1999, 14, no. A 20, pl. 16 a–c.
26. Worcester, Massachusetts, Art Museum, inv. 1915.74: Head.  
Fittschen 1999, 14, no. A 21, pl. 17.
27. Zagreb, Archaeological Museum: Head on modern (?) bust, presumably from Minturnae.  
Fittschen 1999, 14, no. A 22, pl. 18.

#### **From the West:**

28. Rodez, Musée Fenaille: Bust from (near) Saint-Martin-des-Champs.  
Fittschen 1999, 15, no. A 27, pl. 21 a–d.
29. Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. I 143: Head from Styria.  
Fittschen 1999, 15, no. A 28, pl. 22.

#### **From the East:**

30. Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. I 864: Relief panel from the 'Parthian Frieze', Ephesus.  
Fittschen 1999, 15, no. A 29, pl. 21 e; here Fig. 233.

## **Marcus Type II**

#### **From Italy:**

1. Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Antikensammlung, R 79: Head on bust that does not belong.  
Fittschen 1999, 24, no. B 15, pl. 35 a–d.
2. Civitavecchia, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 67142: Head.  
Fittschen 1999, 22, no. B 3, pl. 27 a–d.
3. Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek 699, inv. 785: Head, from Tusculum?  
Fittschen 1999, 24, no. B 18, pl. 37.
4. Farnborough Hall, inv. 12: Head on original (?) bust.  
Fittschen 1999, 24, no. B 16, pl. 36; here Fig. 236.

5. Florence, Galleria degli Uffizi, inv. 1914.179: Bust.  
Fittschen 1999, 23, no. B 6, pls. 29, 31 a–b; here Fig. 234.
6. Florence, Palazzo Pitti, inv. 682: Head on modern bust.  
Fittschen 1999, 23, no. B 7, pl. 30 a, c–d; here Fig. 246.
7. Frascati, Villa Aldobrandini: Head from Ostia.  
Fittschen 1999, 23, no. B 8, pl. 31 c–f; here Fig. 241.
8. Hampton Court Palace: Bust.  
Fittschen 1999, 24, no. B 17, pl. 35 e–f; here Fig. 247.
9. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum, inv. 74 AA 38: Fragmentary head.  
Fittschen 1999, 25, no. B 32, pl. 48 a–b.
10. Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 6090: Head on modern bust.  
Fittschen 1999, 24, no. B 19, pl. 38; here Fig. 242.
11. Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 6091: Fragmentary bust.  
Fittschen 1999, 24, no. B 20, pl. 39.
12. Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 6093: Head on modern bust.  
Fittschen 1999, 24, no. B 21, pl. 40.
13. Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 6094: Head.  
Fittschen 1999, 24, no. B 22, pl. 41.
14. Ostia, Museum, inv. 434: Head from the Horrea dell'Artemide, Ostia.  
Fittschen 1999, 22, no. B 4, pl. 27 e–f.
15. Paris, Musée du Louvre, MA 1156: Head from Lanuvium.  
Fittschen 1999, 22, no. B 1, pl. 25; here Fig. 239.
16. Paris, Musée du Louvre, MA 2258: Head, upper part restored.  
Fittschen 1999, 24, no. B 23, pl. 42.
17. Rome, Antiquario Forense, inv. 3683: Head from near San Teodoro.  
Fittschen 1999, 23, no. B 10, pl. 32.
18. Rome, Museo Capitolino, Salone 34, inv. 652: Mars-Venus statue group from the Isola Sacra, Ostia.  
Fittschen 1999, 23, no. B 9, pl. 30 b.
19. Rome, Museo Torlonia 552: Head on original (?) bust.  
Fittschen 1999, 25, no. B 25, pl. 43 d–e.
20. Rome, Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Profano, inv. 4074: Fragmentary head.  
Fittschen 1999, 24, no. B 24, pl. 43 a–c.
21. San Antonio, Museum of Art, inv. 85.136.1: Head on statue that does not belong.  
Fittschen 1999, 22–23, no. B 5, pl. 28.
22. St. Petersburg, Hermitage, inv. 215: Head on statue that does not belong.  
Fittschen 1999, 26, no. B 33, pl. 48 c–d.
23. Switzerland, private collection (coll. Ennetwies): Head.  
Fittschen 1999, 26, no. B 34, pl. 49.
24. Venice, Museo Archeologico, inv. 115: Head on modern bust.  
Fittschen 1999, 25, no. B 26, pl. 44.
25. Wörlitz, Schloss: Head.  
Fittschen 1999, 25, no. B 27, pl. 45.

### **From the West:**

26. Avignon, Musée Calvet, inv. 172: Head from Methamis (Vaucluse).  
Fittschen 1999, 23, no. B 11, pl. 34 a–b.
27. Bucharest, National Museum of Antiquities, inv. L 1708: Head.  
Fittschen 1999, 25, no. B 31, pl. 47.
28. Seville, Museo Arqueológico Provincial, inv. VIII 5: Head from Italica.  
Fittschen 1999, 25, no. B 28, pl. 46 a, c–d.
29. Tarragona, Museo Nacional Arqueológico, inv. 386: Head from near the forum of Tarragona.  
Fittschen 1999, 26, no. B 35, pl. 50; here Fig. 237.
30. Toulouse, Musée Saint-Raymond, inv. 30107: Bust from Chiragan.  
Fittschen 1999, 23, no. B 12, pl. 33; here Fig. 235.

### **From North Africa:**

31. Alexandria, Graeco-Roman Museum, inv. 3250: Cuirassed statue.  
Fittschen 1999, 26, no. B 38, pls. 51, 52 b.
32. Cairo, Egyptian Museum, inv. 27488: Fragmentary alabaster head.  
Fittschen 1999, 26, no. B 39, pl. 54 a–d.
33. Carthage, Museum: Fragmentary head.  
Fittschen 1999, 23, no. B 13, pl. 34 c–d.
34. Cyrene, Museum, inv. C 17026: Bust from the Agora of Cyrene, found in the temple of Demeter.  
Fittschen 1999, 26, no. B 36, pl. 52 c.
35. Guelma, Museum: Cuirassed statue.  
Fittschen 1999, 25, no. B 29, pl. 52 a.
36. London, British Museum 1464: Bust from the so-called ‘House of Jason Magnus’ in Cyrene.  
Fittschen 1999, 26, no. B 37, pls. 52 d, 53; here Fig. 238.
37. Tunis, Musée National du Bardo: Head from the ‘Maison à la Cascade’ in Utica.  
Fittschen 1999, 25, no. B 30, pl. 46 b.

### **From the East:**

38. Istanbul, Archaeological Museum, inv. 4492: Upper part of head.  
Fittschen 1999, 24, no. B 14, pl. 34 e–f.
39. Olympia, Museum, inv. II 524 and 537 a: Fragmentary statue, nymphaeum of Herodes Atticus.  
Fittschen 1999, 26, no. B 40, pl. 54 e.
40. Vathy (Samos), Museum, depot no. 130: Head.  
Fittschen 1999, 22, no. B 2, pl. 26; here Fig. 240.
41. \*Yale, University Art Gallery, 2010.40.1: Head, from the Eastern provinces?  
YaleBull 2010, online supplement (recent acquisitions) p. 28, with fig.

## Marcus Type III

### From Italy:

1. \*Chicago, Art Institute (on loan): Head on bust that does not belong (joint restored and invisible).  
Christie's New York, Sale 5 Dec 2012, Lot 171.
2. Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek 700, inv. 1424: Head.  
Poulsen 1974, 97–98, no. 81, pls. 131–32; here Fig. 253.
3. Dresden, Skulpturensammlung, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, inv. Hm 386: Bust from Rome.  
Knoll – Vorster 2013, 288–93, no. 65, fig. 65. 1–4; here Fig. 250.
4. Florence, Palazzo Pitti, inv. 685: Head on modern bust.  
Saletti 1974, 31, 35–36, pls. 11–12.
5. Geneva, Musée d'art et d'histoire, inv. 19.050: Bust.  
Campagnolo – Chamay 1996, 78, with fig. (J. Chamay).
6. Holkham Hall: Head on modern bust.  
Angelicoussis 2001, 128–29, no. 31, pls. 62. 1–2; 63. 1–4.
7. Ince Blundell Hall: Head on bust that does not belong.  
Poulsen 1923, 97–98, no. 88, with fig.
8. London, British Museum 1907: Veiled head on modern bust.  
Smith 1904, 162, no. 1907, pl. 16. 2.
9. London and New York, art market (from the Bardini Collection): Bust.  
Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 73 n. 9 b.
10. Madrid, Museo del Prado, inv. 213-E: Head on modern bust.  
Schröder 1993, 244–46, no. 68, with figs.
11. Mantua, Palazzo Ducale 132, inv. 6915: Head on bust that does not belong.  
Flisi 1989, 47–48 with n. 1, pls. 7–9.
12. Munich, Glyptothek (ex private collection, Switzerland; formerly Wilton House): Bust.  
Jucker – Willers 1983, 140–41, no. 57, with figs.
13. Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 6092: Head on statue that does not belong.  
Gasparri 2009, 104–05, no. 80, figs. 76. 1–5.
14. Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 150820: Head from Capua.  
De Franciscis 1972, 331–34, pls. 138, 140. 1–2 ; here Fig. 263.
15. Oslo, Nasjonalgalleriet 599, inv. 1432: Head.  
Thue 1971, 6, no. 599.
16. Paris, Musée du Louvre, MA 1159: Bust.  
de Kersauson 1996, 230–31, no. 101, with figs.; here Fig. 254.
17. Paris, Musée du Louvre, MA 1162: Head on modern bust.  
de Kersauson 1996, 228–29, no. 100, with figs.
18. Paris, Musée du Louvre, MA 1166: Bust from Acquatraversa.  
de Kersauson 1996, 232–33, no. 102, with figs.
19. Potsdam, formerly Berlin, Sk 373: Head on bust that does not belong.  
Heres et al. 1981, 27, no. 31, with fig. (H. Hoffmann).
20. Poznań, Muzeum Narodowe, inv. A 599 (before 378): Head on modern bust.  
Sadurska 1972, 36, no. 31, pl. 27.

21. Raleigh, North Carolina Museum of Art, acc. 92-1: Bust.  
Albertson 2004, 295 n. 142, figs. 48–49.
22. Rome, Museo Capitolino (formerly Piazza del Campidoglio): Equestrian bronze statue.  
Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 72–74, no. 67, pls. 76–77; here Fig. 251.
23. Rome, Museo Capitolino, Salone 32, inv. 650: Head on statue that does not belong.  
Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 70–71, no. 65, pl. 75.
24. Rome, Museo Capitolino, Salone 73, inv. 695: Head on modern bust.  
Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 71, no. 66, pl. 75.
25. Rome, Museo Nazionale Romano, inv. 338: Under life-size bust.  
Felletti Maj 1953, 113, no. 220, fig. 220.
26. Rome, Museo Nazionale Romano ('Terme 726'), inv. 108598: Head from Hadrian's Villa, Tivoli.  
Felletti Maj 1953, 111–12, no. 217, fig. 217; here Fig. 249.
27. Rome, Palazzo Corsini, inv. 1210: Head on modern bust.  
de Luca 1976, 72, no. 37, pl. 61.
28. Rome, Palazzo Doria Pamphilj, Salone Aldobrandini: Head on modern bust.  
Calza 1977, 286–87, no. 355, pl. 193.
29. Rome, Vatican, Sala dei Busti 285, inv. 704: Bust from Hadrian's Villa, Tivoli.  
Wegner 1939, 41–42, pl. 21; here Fig. 252.
30. Seville, Casa de Pilatos: Head on modern bust.  
Albertson 1981, 286, no. 83.
31. Syon House: Bust.  
Poulsen 1923, 97, no. 87, with fig.
32. Venice, Museo Archeologico, inv. 2: Head on modern bust.  
Traversari 1968, 75–76, no. 57, figs. 57 a–b.
33. Woburn Abbey: Head on bust that does not belong.  
Angelicoussis 1992, 61–62, no. 36, figs. 169, 173–176.

#### **From the West:**

34. Doclea: Fragmentary head from Doclea.  
Srejović 1968, 100, pl. 1. 1–4.
35. \*Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, inv. AN 2011.46: Small bronze head found near Brackley.  
<http://britisharchaeology.ashmus.ox.ac.uk/highlights/marcus-head.html>
36. Pécs, Janus Pannonius Múzeum: Bronze head from Lugio/Dunaszekcső.  
Lahusen – Formigli 2001, 227–28, no. 139, fig. 139. 1–2; here Fig. 266.
37. Toulouse, Musée Saint-Raymond inv. no. 30.111: Head from Chiragan.  
Espérandieu 1908, 69, no. 966, with fig.
38. Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. I 238: Head, from the Western provinces?  
Albertson 1981, 308–09, no. 97.
39. Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. I 250: Under life-size bust, from Noricum?  
Albertson 2004, 293 with n. 135, fig. 45.
40. Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. VI 3208: Small bronze bust from Carnuntum.  
Fleischer 1967, 165–66, no. 224, pl. 114.
41. Vigo (Spain).  
Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 73 n. 9 e.

### **From North Africa:**

42. Alexandria, Graeco-Roman Museum, inv. 21640: Bust from Kôm Troughi.  
Graindor 1937, 61, no. 17, pl. 16 b.
43. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum inv. GR. 10.1850: Head on bust that does not belong.  
Budde – Nicholls 1964, 71–72, no. 114 a, pl. 38.
44. Carthage, formerly Musée Lavigerie de Saint Louis: Head from Carthage.  
Martin 1915, 17, no. 6, pl. 4. 6.
45. Cyrene, Museum, inv. C 17002: Fragmentary head from Cyrene.  
Rosenbaum 1960, 64, no. 65, pl. 41. 3–4.
46. Cyrene, Museum, inv. C 17020: Head from the agora in Cyrene.  
Rosenbaum 1960, 59, no. 51, pl. 35. 3–4.
47. London, British Museum 1470: Fragmentary head from the Temple of Zeus in Cyrene.  
Rosenbaum 1960, 63, no. 64, pl. 43. 2–3.
48. Paris, Musée du Louvre, MNE 1038: Head, presumably from Markouna.  
Fless et al. 2006, 138, no. 361.
49. \*Skikda (Algeria), stolen and returned: Head.  
Christie's New York, Sale 9 June 2004, Lot 69.
50. Tripoli, Archaeological Museum, inv. 482: Head from the theatre in Leptis Magna.  
Caputo – Traversari 1976, 92–94, no. 71, pls. 74–75.

### **From the East:**

51. Athens, National Museum, inv. 514: Head from Athens.  
Papadimitriou 1937, 698–703, figs. 3–4.
52. Athens, National Museum, inv. 572: Head from Athens.  
Papadimitriou 1937, 703–04, figs. 5–6.
53. Athens, National Museum, inv. 4910: Fragmentary bust from Rhamnus.  
Petraikos 1976, 54–55, no. 22, pl. 22. 2.
54. Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, inv. 1971.93: Head, presumably from Greece?  
Comstock – Vermeule 1976, 232, no. 365, with figs.
55. Eleusis, Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: Tondo with bust from the Greater Propylaea at Eleusis.  
Jucker 1961, 91–92, no. St 38, pl. 35.
56. Heraklion, Archaeological Museum, inv. 574: Head from Gortyn.  
Lagogianni-Georgakarakos 2002, 54–55, no. 10, pl. 11.
57. Istanbul, Archaeological Museum 586, inv. 406: Head from Ayvalık.  
Inan – Rosenbaum 1966, 76, no. 44, pl. 27. 2–3.
58. Kerkyra (Corfu), Archaeological Museum 137: Head with part of bust.  
Papadimitriou 1937, 698–703, pl. 2.
59. Paris, Musée du Louvre, MA 1161: Bust from near Probalinthos.  
de Kersauson 1996, 226–27, no. 99, with figs.; here Fig. 255.
60. Selçuk, Ephesus Museum: Bust from Terrace House 2 in Ephesus.  
Vetters 1983, 121, pls. 16–17.

*with features of Type II ('hybrid'):*

61. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, inv. GR. 33.1850: Head, probably from the Eastern provinces.  
Budde – Nicholls 1964, 72, no. 115, pl. 39; here Fig. 248.

## **Marcus Type IV**

### **From Italy:**

1. Baltimore, Walters Art Museum, inv. 23.215: Head.  
Albertson 2004, 264 with n. 17, figs. 9–11.
2. Bloomington, Indiana University Museum of Art, inv. 62.2: Head, reportedly from Ostia.  
Albertson 2004, 270 with n. 41, figs. 18–19.
3. Bochum, Kunstsammlungen der Ruhr-Universität Bochum, inv. S 576: Bust.  
Kunisch 1979, 14–16, figs. 8–10.
4. Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek 698, inv. 1538: Head on modern bust.  
Poulsen 1974, 98, no. 82, pl. 133.
5. Florence, Galleria degli Uffizi, inv. 1914.186: Head on modern bust.  
Mansuelli 1961, 102, no. 122, fig. 122.
6. Florence, Giardino Boboli: Head on statue that does not belong.  
Albertson 2004, 266 with n. 24.
7. Florence, Palazzo Medici-Riccardi, no. G 4: Head on modern bust.  
Saladino 1998, 291–96, no. 109, pls. 122–23 (L. Buccino).
8. Lidingsö, Millesgården A 29: Bust, reportedly from the Theatre of Marcellus in Rome.  
Andrén 1965, 110, no. 35, pl. 33.
9. Madrid, Museo del Prado, inv. 664-E: Head.  
Schröder 1993, 248–50, no. 70, with figs.
10. Mantua, Palazzo Ducale 131, inv. 6726: Head on modern bust.  
Flisi 1989, 61 with n. 1, pls. 10–12.
11. Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 6079: Head on modern bust.  
Gasparri 2009, 102, no. 77, fig. 73. 1–4 (F. Coraggio).
12. Paris, Musée du Louvre, MA 1179: Head on modern bust, from Acquatraversa.  
de Kersauson 1996, 236–37, no. 104, with figs.
13. Rome, Museo Capitolino, Magazine 96: Upper part of head.  
Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 78, no. 71, pl. 82.
14. Rome, Museo Capitolino, Stanza degli Imperatori 28, inv. 448: Bust.  
Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 76–77, no. 69, pls. 79, 81–82.
15. Rome, Museo Capitolino, Stanza dei Filosofi 79, inv. 524: Head on modern bust.  
Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 78, no. 70, pl. 82.
16. Rome, Museo Nazionale Romano, inv. 638: Head on original (?) bust. From the Forum.  
Felletti Maj 1953, 112, no. 218, fig. 218; here Fig. 257.
17. Rome, Museo Nazionale Romano, inv. 8625: Restored and reworked head on modern bust.  
Felletti Maj 1953, 170, no. 5.
18. Rome, Museo Torlonia 553: Bust, reportedly from near Ardea.  
Albertson 2004, 273 with n. 47, figs. 22–23.

19. Rome, Palazzo Braschi, Salone, inv. 234: Bust from Lanuvium.  
Fittschen – Zanker 1985, 74–76, no. 68, pls. 78, 80, 82; here Fig. 256.
20. Rome, Palazzo Valentini: Head on statue that does not belong.  
Albertson 2004, 274 with n. 55.
21. Rome, private collection: Head.  
Schazmann 1940, 75, pl. 29. 12.
22. Rome, Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Profano, inv. 10223: Head on bust that does not belong.  
Giuliano 1957, 57, no. 63, pl. 39.
23. Rome, Villa Albani (Porticus), inv. 72: Head on statue that does not belong.  
Bol 1990, 155–57, no. 195, pls. 95–97 (K. Stemmer).
24. Rome, Villa Albani, inv. 1038: Head on modern support.  
Bol 1989, 472–73, no. 155, pls. 274–75 (M. Bergmann).
25. Rome, Villa Borghese: Head on statue that does not belong.  
Vermeule 1959/60, pl. 21. 63.
26. Rome, Villa Vecchia, no. E5: Head on modern bust.  
Benocci 1998, 273, no. E5 with fig. (B. Cacciotti).
27. Stratfield Saye House: Head on modern bust.  
Albertson 2004, 266 with n. 23.
28. Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. I 13: Head on original (?) bust.  
McCann 1968, 104, pl. 42. 1.
29. Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. I 65: Head on bust that does not belong.  
Bergmann 1978, 27, fig. 38; here Fig. 258.
30. Woburn Abbey: Head on bust that does not belong.  
Angelicoussis 1992, 62–63, no. 37, figs. 170, 177–80.

*With features of Type III ('hybrid'):*

31. Princeton, Princeton University Art Museum, inv. y1958-1: Head.  
Padgett 2001, 63–66, no. 15, with figs. (M. Fuchs).
32. Rome, Museo Nazionale Romano, inv. 125960: Head from Rome.  
Felletti Maj 1953, 112–13, no. 219, fig. 219.

*Historical reliefs:*

33. Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek 701, inv. 1471: Relief fragment, reportedly from Rome.  
Poulsen 1974, 98–99, pls. 134–35.
34. Rome, Column of Marcus Aurelius: Helical frieze with various portraits.  
see for example Scheid – Huet 2000.
35. Rome, Museo Capitolino, inv. 807: Relief panel from Rome ('Sacrifice Panel').  
La Rocca 1986, 40, pls. 37, 43–44; here Fig. 259.
36. Rome, Museo Capitolino, inv. 808: Relief panel from Rome ('Triumph Panel').  
La Rocca 1986, 39–40, pls. 31, 33; here Fig. 260.
37. Rome, Museo Capitolino, inv. 809: Relief panel from Rome ('Clementia Panel').  
La Rocca 1986, 39, pls. 23, 25–26; here Fig. 261.

### **From the West:**

38. \*Castelculier, Villascopia: upper part of head, from the Villa de Lamarque (Lot-et-Garonne).  
Ugaglia 2011, 68–69, with fig. (J.-C. Balty).
39. Lausanne, Musée cantonal d'archéologie et d'histoire: Gold bust from Avenches.  
Hochuli-Gysel – Brodard 2006, 56–63, figs. 50–64; here Fig. 265.
40. \*Nérac, Château-Musée Henri IV, inv. 47.1.346: Head from the region of Nérac.  
Ugaglia 2011, 69, with fig. (J.-C. Balty).
41. Sassari, Museo Nazionale ›G. A. Sanna‹, inv. 7870: Head from Porto Torres.  
Equini Schneider 1979, 28, no. 14, pls. 16–17.
42. Toulouse, Musée Saint-Raymond, inv. 30.108: Bust from Chiragan.  
Espérandieu 1908, 66–67, no. 961, with fig.

### **From North Africa:**

43. Cyrene, Museum, no inv.: Head attached to a female statue, from the agora in Cyrene.  
Albertson 2004, 279 with n. 68, figs. 34–35.
44. London, British Museum 1906: Togate statue from Alexandria.  
Albertson 2004, 281 with n. 71, figs. 36–37.
45. Stuttgart, Württembergisches Landesmuseum, inv. 1.38: Head from Egypt.  
Hausmann 1975, 43–44, no. 13, figs. 39, 42.
46. Tunis, Musée National du Bardo, no inv.: Seated statue from Bulla Regia.  
Zanker 1983, 32, pls. 19. 2–4; 22. 4.
47. Tunis, Musée National du Bardo inv. C 965: Head from Carthage.  
Albertson 2004, 283 with n. 74, fig. 38.

### **From the East:**

48. \*Amman, Jordan Archaeological Museum, inv. JP 7944: Head from Qasr Al-Bint, Petra.  
Dentzer-Feydy 2017, 135, fig. 10. 8.
49. Frankfurt, Liebieghaus, inv. St. P. 392: Head, presumably from Asia Minor.  
Bergmann 1978, 3–4, figs. 44–48.
50. New York, White – Levy Collection: Head, from Asia Minor?  
von Bothmer 1990, 218, no. 158, with fig.
51. Paphos, Museum, inv. 2098: Head made of limestone.  
Karageorghis 1975, 817, fig. 33.

### *with features of Type III ('hybrid'):*

52. Istanbul, Archaeological Museum, inv. 5129: Bust from Kandilli near Bozhöyük.  
Inan – Rosenbaum 1966, 76–77, no. 45, pls. 28. 1–2; 29. 1; here Fig. 262.
53. Jerusalem, Cloister of Saint-Étienne, inv. 05.4: Head from Gerasa.  
Wegner 1939, 43, 176, pl. 33; here Fig. 264.

### **Marcus Type III or IV**

1. Paris, Musée du Louvre, Br 25: Fragmentary face of a bronze portrait.  
de Kersauson 1996, 234–35, no. 103, with fig.

## Illustration Credits

Fig. 1: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 92, 24 May 2016, Lot 2250.

Fig. 2: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 78, 26 May 2014, Lot 990.

Fig. 3: Nomisma S. p. a., Auction 49, 13 May 2014, Lot 174.

Fig. 4: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 77, 26 May 2014, Lot 155.

Fig. 5: Baldwin's Auctions Ltd, The New York Sale 40, 11 Jan 2017, Lot 1233.

Fig. 6: Type I: Áureo & Calicó, Auction 241, 8 Feb 2012, Lot 125; Type II: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 31, 26 Oct 2005, Lot 57; Type III: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 91, 23 May 2016, Lot 25; Type IV: Classical Numismatic Group, Auction Triton 14, 4 Jan 2011, Lot 733; Type V: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 52, 7 Oct 2009, Lot 1127; Type VI: Leu Numismatik AG, Auction 93, 10 May 2005, Lot 37; Type VII: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 51, 5 Mar 2009, Lot 314; Type VIII: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 31, 26 Oct 2005, Lot 58; Type IX: Numismatik Lanz München, Auction 148, 4 Jan 2010, Lot 110; Type X: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 51, 5 Mar 2009, Lot 316.

Fig. 7: Classical Numismatic Group, Auction Triton 21, 9 Jan 2018, Lot 177.

Fig. 8: Auktionshaus H. D. Rauch GmbH, Auction 98, 21 Sep 2015, Lot 227.

Fig. 9: Classical Numismatic Group, Auction Triton 21, 9 Jan 2018, Lot 180.

Fig. 10: Auktionshaus H. D. Rauch GmbH, Auction 101, 19 Apr 2016, Lot 1435.

Fig. 11: Sincona AG, Auction 10, 27 May 2013, Lot 270.

Fig. 12: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 72, 16 May 2013, Lot 666.

Fig. 13: Hess-Divo AG, Auction 314, 4 May 2009, Lot 1569.

Fig. 14: Gemini, LLC, Auction 2, 11 Jan 2006, Lot 478.

Fig. 15: Leu Numismatik AG, Auction 1, 25 Oct 2017, Lot 229.

Fig. 16: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 33, 6 Apr 2006, Lot 505.

Fig. 17: Áureo & Calicó, Auction 241, 8 Feb 2012, Lot 125.

Fig. 18: Heidelberger Münzhandlung Herbert Grün e. K., Auction 53, 20 May 2010, Lot 321.

Fig. 19: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 31, 26 Oct 2005, Lot 57.

Fig. 20: Classical Numismatic Group, Electronic Auction 377, 29 Jun 2016, Lot 447.

Fig. 21: Bertolami Fine Arts – ACR Auctions, Auction 7, 20 May 2013, Lot 650.

Fig. 22: Áureo & Calicó, Auction 241, 8 Feb 2012, Lot 124.

Fig. 23: Classical Numismatic Group, Electronic Auction 274, 22 Feb 2012, Lot 371.

Fig. 24: Auktionshaus H. D. Rauch GmbH, Auction 96, 10 Dec 2014, Lot 380.

Fig. 25: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 46, 2 Apr 2008, Lot 1091.

Fig. 26: Classical Numismatic Group, Auction Triton 14, 4 Jan 2011, Lot 733.

Fig. 27: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 52, 7 Oct 2009, Lot 1127.

Fig. 28: Nomisma S. p. a., Auction 47, 13 Apr 2013, Lot 187.

Fig. 29: Numismatik Lanz München, Auction 145, 5 Jan 2009, Lot 118.

Fig. 30: UBS Gold & Numismatics, Auction 75, 22 Jan 2008, Lot 1058.

Fig. 31: Classical Numismatic Group, Auction Triton 19, 5 Jan 2016, Lot 575.

Fig. 32: Solidus Numismatik, Premium Auction 13, 25 Mar 2017, Lot 244.

Fig. 33: Grueber 1874, pl. 24.

Fig. 34: Grueber 1874, pl. 23.

Fig. 35: UBS Gold & Numismatics, Auction 78, 9 Sep 2008, Lot 1688.

Fig. 36: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 52, 7 Oct 2009, Lot 468.

Fig. 37: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 49, 21 Oct 2008, Lot 283.

Fig. 38: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 97, 12 Dec 2016, Lot 154.

Fig. 39: Leu Numismatik AG (1992–2005), Auction 93, 10 May 2005, Lot 37.

Fig. 40: Classical Numismatic Group, Auction Triton 8, 11 Jan 2005, Lot 1148.

Fig. 41: Fritz Rudolf Künker GmbH & Co. KG, Auction 158, 28 Sep 2009, Lot 635.

Fig. 42: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 92, 23 May 2016, Lot 600.

Fig. 43: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 51, 5 Mar 2009, Lot 314.

Fig. 44: Classical Numismatic Group, Auction 102, 18 May 2016, Lot 999.

Fig. 45: Sincona AG, Auction 4, 25 Oct 2011, Lot 4110.

Fig. 46: Münzen & Medaillen Deutschland GmbH, Auction 32, 26 May 2010, Lot 473.

Fig. 47: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 31, 26 Oct 2005, Lot 58.

Fig. 48: Auktionshaus H. D. Rauch GmbH, Auction 102, 7 Nov 2016, Lot 97.

Fig. 49: Gitbud & Naumann, Auction 26, 14 Dec 2014, Lot 609.

Fig. 50: Auktionshaus H. D. Rauch GmbH, Auction 103, 23 Mar 2017, Lot 379.

Fig. 51: Numismatik Lanz München, Auction 148, 4 Jan 2010, Lot 110.

Fig. 52: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/65812>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/65811>.

Fig. 53: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 31, 26 Oct 2005, Lot 58.

Fig. 54: Hess-Divo AG, Auction 314, 4 May 2009, Lot 1570.

Fig. 55: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 51, 5 Mar 2009, Lot 316.

Fig. 56: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 87, 8 Oct 2015, Lot 262.

Fig. 57: <http://www.sothebys.com/fr/auctions/ecatalogue/2013/antiquities-n09005/lot.50.html>.

Fig. 58: <https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/255868>.

Fig. 59: Caputo – Traversari 1976, pls. 78–79.

Fig. 60: Fittschen 1982, pl. 12. 3–4.

Fig. 61: Fittschen 1982, pl. 9. 1–4.  
Fig. 62: Fittschen 1982, pl. 10. 1–4.  
Fig. 63: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/166777>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/166778>;  
<https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/166779>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/166780>.  
Fig. 64: Fittschen 1982, pl. 8. 1–4.  
Fig. 65: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/5334456>.  
Fig. 66: Fittschen 1982, pl. 12. 1–2.  
Fig. 67: Fittschen 1982, pl. 13. 1–2.  
Fig. 68: Fittschen 1982, pl. 13. 3–4.  
Fig. 69: Fittschen 1982, pl. 11. 1–2.  
Fig. 70: Fittschen 1982, pl. 14. 1, 4.  
Fig. 71: Fittschen 1982, pl. 15. 1–4.  
Fig. 72: Fittschen 1982, pl. 16. 1–4.  
Fig. 73: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/238467>.  
Fig. 74: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/238459>.  
Fig. 75: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/418430>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/418431>;  
<https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/418432>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/418433>.  
Fig. 76: Fittschen 1982, pl. 18. 1–4.  
Fig. 77: Fittschen 1982, pl. 22. 1–4.  
Fig. 78: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 92, 23 May 2016, Lot 597.  
Fig. 79: Leu Numismatik AG (1992–2005), Auction 93, 10 May 2005, Lot 41.  
Fig. 80: Fittschen 1982, pl. 19. 1–4.  
Fig. 81: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/3097931>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/3097932>;  
<https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/3097933>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/3097934>.  
Fig. 82: Fittschen 1982, pl. 21. 1–4.  
Fig. 83: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/5571142>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/5571143>.  
Fig. 84: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/905743>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/905748>.  
Fig. 85: Fittschen 1982, pl. 24. 1–2.  
Fig. 86: Fittschen 1982, pl. 26. 1–4.  
Fig. 87: Fittschen 1982, pl. 32. 1–2.  
Fig. 88: Fittschen 1982, pl. 31. 1–4.  
Fig. 89: Fittschen 1982, pl. 34. 1.  
Fig. 90: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/1004894>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/1004895>;  
<https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/1004886>.  
Fig. 91: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/1004885>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/1004898>.

Fig. 92: Fittschen 1982, pl. 34. 2.

Fig. 93: Bordenache 1962, figs. 1, 3 a.

Fig. 94: Classical Numismatic Group, Auction Triton 17, 7 Jan 2014, Lot 727.

Fig. 95: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/137956>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/137958>;  
<https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/137964>.

Fig. 96: Fittschen 1982, pl. 36. 1–4.

Fig. 97: Fittschen 1982, pl. 41. 3–4; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/2265713>.

Fig. 98: Fittschen 1982, pl. 23. 1–2.

Fig. 99: Fittschen 1982, pl. 23. 3–4.

Fig. 100: Korkuti 1971, pl. 110.

Fig. 101: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 100, 29 May 2017, Lot 520.

Fig. 102: von Sarwey et al. 1901, pl. 11 (B1. 3).

Fig. 103: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/1936576>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/1936577>;  
<https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/1936578>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/1936579>.

Fig. 104: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/181832>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/222017>.

Fig. 105: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/406048>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/406050>.

Fig. 106: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/5568134>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/5568135>.

Fig. 107: Calza 1964, pl. 88. 148.

Fig. 108: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/137277>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/137278>;  
<https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/137279>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/137280>.

Fig. 109: Fittschen – Zanker 1983, pl. 122.

Fig. 110: Fittschen – Zanker 1983, pl. 120.

Fig. 111: Fittschen – Zanker 1983, pl. 16.

Fig. 112: Fittschen – Zanker 1983, pl. 123.

Fig. 113: Fittschen – Zanker 1983, pl. 152.

Fig. 114: Áureo & Calicó, Auction 241, 8 Feb 2012, Lot 110.

Fig. 115: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 54, 24 Mar 2010, Lot 1162.

Fig. 116: Cayón Numismática, Auction May 2012, 16 May 2012, Lot 4641.

Fig. 117: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 54, 24 Mar 2010, Lot 448.

Fig. 118: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 49, 21 Oct 2008, Lot 266.

Fig. 119: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 97, 12 Dec 2016, Lot 147.

Fig. 120: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 41, 20 Nov 2007, Lot 98.

Fig. 121: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 31, 26 Oct 2005, Lot 55.

Fig. 122: Áureo & Calicó, Auction 271, 8 Oct 2015, Lot 2118.

Fig. 123: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 25, 25 Jun 2003, Lot 463.

Fig. 124: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 54, 24 Mar 2010, Lot 437.

Fig. 125: Gemini, LLC, Auction 2, 11 Jan 2006, Lot 456.

Fig. 126: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 67, 27 Oct 2012, Lot 149.

Fig. 127: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 34, 24 Nov 2006, Lot 166.

Fig. 128: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 52, 7 Oct 2009, Lot 454.

Fig. 129: Classical Numismatic Group, Auction 90, 23 May 2012, Lot 1564.

Fig. 130: Fritz Rudolf Künker GmbH & Co. KG, Auction 216, 8 Oct 2012, Lot 1029.

Fig. 131: Hess-Divo AG, Auction 332, 31 May 2017, Lot 109.

Fig. 132: GNECCHI II, pl. 56. 3.

Fig. 133: Dr. Busso Peus Nachfolger, Auction 371, 14 Apr 2002, Lot 410.

Fig. 134: Cayón Numismática, Auction May 2012, 16 May 2012, Lot 4641.

Fig. 135: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 87, 8 Oct 2015, Lot 268.

Fig. 136: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction R, 17 May 2007, Lot 1542.

Fig. 137: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 92, 23 May 2016, Lot 587.

Fig. 138: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 54, 24 Mar 2010, Lot 448.

Fig. 139: Heritage World Coin Auctions, Auction 3032, 10 Apr 2014, Lot 23603.

Fig. 140: GNECCHI II, pl. 66. 10.

Fig. 141: GNECCHI II, pl. 65. 8.

Fig. 142: GNECCHI II, pl. 66. 6.

Fig. 143: GNECCHI II, pl. 56. 4.

Fig. 144: Fritz Rudolf Künker GmbH & Co. KG, Auction 273, 14 Mar 2016, Lot 774.

Fig. 145: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 97, 12 Dec 2016, Lot 147.

Fig. 146: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 80, 20 Oct 2014, Lot 104.

Fig. 147: Fritz Rudolf Künker GmbH & Co. KG, Auction 136, 10 Mar 2008, Lot 1042.

Fig. 148: Baldwin's Auctions Ltd, The New York Sale 40, 11 Jan 2017, Lot 1233.

Fig. 149: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 77, 26 May 2014, Lot 154.

Fig. 150: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 77, 26 May 2014, Lot 155.

Fig. 151: GNECCHI II, pl. 61. 10.

Fig. 152: Auktionshaus H. D. Rauch GmbH, Auction 94, 9 Apr 2014, Lot 951.

Fig. 153: Auktionshaus H. D. Rauch GmbH, Auction 96, 10 Dec 2014, Lot 361.

Fig. 154: Gitbud & Naumann, Auction 26, 14 Dec 2014, Lot 601.

Fig. 155: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 64, 17 May 2012, Lot 1195.

Fig. 156: Gorny & Mosch Giessener Münzhandlung, Auction 156, 5 Mar 2007, Lot 2160.

Fig. 157: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 92, 23 May 2016, Lot 589.

Fig. 158: Fritz Rudolf Künker GmbH & Co. KG, Auction 236, 7 Oct 2013, Lot 1079.

Fig. 159: Gorny & Mosch Giessener Münzhandlung, Auction 208, 16 Oct 2012, Lot 2087.

Fig. 160: Auktionshaus H. D. Rauch GmbH, Summer Auction 2013, 18 Sep 2013, Lot 664.

Fig. 161: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 98, 12 Dec 2016, Lot 1190.

Fig. 162: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 78, 26 May 2014, Lot 990.

Fig. 163: Nomisma S. p. a., Auction 49, 13 May 2014, Lot 174.

Fig. 164: GNECCHI II, pl. 64. 3.

Fig. 165: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 59, 4 Apr 2011, Lot 1020.

Fig. 166: Fritz Rudolf Künker GmbH & Co. KG, Auction 204, 12 Mar 2012, Lot 688.

Fig. 167: Gerhard Hirsch Nachfolger, Auction 279–80, 8 Feb 2012, Lot 2472.

Fig. 168: Auktionshaus H. D. Rauch GmbH, Auction 82, 23 Apr 2008, Lot 357.

Fig. 169: Maison Palombo, Auction 12, 6 Dec 2013, Lot 73.

Fig. 170: Jean Elsen & ses Fils S. A., Auction 110, 10 Sep 2011, Lot 367.

Fig. 171: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 54, 24 Mar 2010, Lot 1165.

Fig. 172: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 92, 24 May 2016, Lot 2250.

Fig. 173: LHS Numismatik AG, Auction 100, 23 Apr 2007, Lot 510.

Fig. 174: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 98, 12 Dec 2016, Lot 1191.

Fig. 175: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 97, 12 Dec 2016, Lot 148.

Fig. 176: Classical Numismatic Group, Auction 100, 7 Oct 2015, Lot 1891.

Fig. 177: Classical Numismatic Group, Auction Triton 18, 6 Jan 2015, Lot 1117.

Fig. 178: GNECCHI II, pl. 62. 5.

Fig. 179: Kent et al. 1973, pl. XII. 325.

Fig. 180: GNECCHI II, pl. 62. 7.

Fig. 181: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 41, 20 Nov 2007, Lot 97.

Fig. 182: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 88, 8 Oct 2015, Lot 656.

Fig. 183: Fritz Rudolf Künker GmbH & Co. KG, Auction 182, 4 Mar 2011, Lot 723.

Fig. 184: Ira & Larry Goldberg Coins & Collectibles, Auction 80, 3 Jun 2014, Lot 3168.

Fig. 185: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 54, 24 Mar 2010, Lot 449.

Fig. 186: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 52, 7 Oct 2009, Lot 459.

Fig. 187: UBS Gold & Numismatics, Auction 62, 25 Jan 2005, Lot 137.

Fig. 188: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 33, 6 Apr 2006, Lot 499.

Fig. 189: GNECCHI II, pl. 66. 8.

Fig. 190: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 62, 6 Oct 2011, Lot 2037.

Fig. 191: Classical Numismatic Group, Auction Triton 18, 6 Jan 2015, Lot 1118.

Fig. 192: Noble Numismatics Pty Ltd, Auction 99, 17 Apr 2012, Lot 3595.

Fig. 193: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 52, 7 Oct 2009, Lot 1122.

Fig. 194: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 87, 8 Oct 2015, Lot 270.

Fig. 195: MDC Monnaies de Collection sarl, Auction 1, 2 Dec 2016, Lot 97.

Fig. 196: Áureo & Calicó, Auction 241, 8 Feb 2012, Lot 118.

Fig. 197: Dr. Busso Peus Nachfolger, Auction 369, 31 Oct 2001, Lot 585.

Fig. 198: Nomos AG, Auction 13, 7 Oct 2016, Lot 275.

Fig. 199: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 33, 6 Apr 2006, Lot 504.

Fig. 200: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 52, 7 Oct 2009, Lot 465.

Fig. 201: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 31, 26 Oct 2005, Lot 55.

Fig. 202: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 97, 12 Dec 2016, Lot 152.

Fig. 203: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 51, 5 Mar 2009, Lot 310.

Fig. 204: Münzen & Medaillen Deutschland GmbH, Auction 35, 17 Nov 2011, Lot 212.

Fig. 205: GNECCHI II, pl. 62. 10.

Fig. 206: GNECCHI II, pl. 63. 1.

Fig. 207: GNECCHI II, pl. 59. 7.

Fig. 208: GNECCHI II, pl. 63. 2.

Fig. 209: GNECCHI II, pl. 60. 1.

Fig. 210: GNECCHI II, pl. 63. 8.

Fig. 211: Ira & Larry Goldberg Coins & Collectibles, Auction 46, 26 May 2008, Lot 109.

Fig. 212: Gemini, LLC, Auction 3, 9 Jan 2007, Lot 402.

Fig. 213: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 49, 21 Oct 2008, Lot 270.

Fig. 214: Heritage World Coin Auctions, Auction 3019, 26 Apr 2012, Lot 23417.

Fig. 215: Noble Numismatics Pty Ltd, Auction 111, 5 Apr 2016, Lot 4416.

Fig. 216: Classical Numismatic Group, Auction Triton 11, 8 Jan 2008, Lot 942.

Fig. 217: UBS Gold & Numismatics, Auction 64, 24 Jan 2006, Lot 199.

Fig. 218: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 27, 12 May 2004, Lot 417.

Fig. 219: Classical Numismatic Group, Electronic Auction 284, 8 Aug 2012, Lot 341.

Fig. 220: Fritz Rudolf Künker GmbH & Co. KG, Auction 182, 4 Mar 2011, Lot 728.

Fig. 221: Gitbud & Naumann, Auction 21, 7 Sep 2014, Lot 632.

Fig. 222: Auktionshaus H. D. Rauch GmbH, Auction 94, 9 Apr 2014, Lot 958.

Fig. 223: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 97, 12 Dec 2016, Lot 147.

Fig. 224: Fritz Rudolf Künker GmbH & Co. KG, Auction 136, 10 Mar 2008, Lot 1042.

Fig. 225: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 51, 5 Mar 2009, Lot 292.

Fig. 226: Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction 49, 21 Oct 2008, Lot 276.

Fig. 227: Ira & Larry Goldberg Coins & Collectibles, Auction 62, 1 Feb 2011, Lot 3202.

Fig. 228: Auktionshaus H. D. Rauch GmbH, Auction 94, 9 Apr 2014, Lot 951.

Fig. 229: Fittschen 1999, pl. 9 a–d.  
Fig. 230: Fittschen 1999, pl. 4 a–d.  
Fig. 231: Fittschen 1999, pl. 7 c–d.  
Fig. 232: Fittschen 1999, pl. 12 a–d.  
Fig. 233: Fittschen 1999, pl. 21 e.  
Fig. 234: Fittschen 1999, pl. 29 a–d.  
Fig. 235: Fittschen 1999, pl. 33 a–b. d; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/5796688>.  
Fig. 236: Fittschen 1999, pl. 36 a–d.  
Fig. 237: Fittschen 1999, pl. 50 a–d.  
Fig. 238: Fittschen 1999, pl. 52 d; [http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection\\_online/collection\\_object\\_details/collection\\_image\\_gallery.aspx?partid=1&assetid=1605156001&objectid=465566](http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details/collection_image_gallery.aspx?partid=1&assetid=1605156001&objectid=465566).  
Fig. 239: Fittschen 1999, pl. 25 a–d.  
Fig. 240: Fittschen 1999, pl. 26 a–d.  
Fig. 241: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/1007613>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/160465>.  
Fig. 242: Fittschen 1999, pl. 38 a–d.  
Fig. 243: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/1935812>.  
Fig. 244: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/5796626>.  
Fig. 245: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/56682>.  
Fig. 246: Fittschen 1999, pl. 30 a.  
Fig. 247: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/78634>.  
Fig. 248: Budde – Nicholls 1964, pl. 39. 115.  
Fig. 249: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/1923954>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/1923955>;  
<https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/1935813>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/1935816>.  
Fig. 250: Wegner 1939, pl. 19.  
Fig. 251: <https://www.bluffton.edu/homepages/facstaff/sullivanm/italy/rome/marcusaurelius/0150changed.jpg>; Fittschen 1989, pp. 76–77.  
Fig. 252: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/3635723>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/3635729>.  
Fig. 253: Albertson 2004, figs. 3–4.  
Fig. 254: de Kersauson 1996, pp. 230–31.  
Fig. 255: de Kersauson 1996, p. 227.  
Fig. 256: Fittschen – Zanker 1985, pl. 80.  
Fig. 257: Albertson 2004, figs. 14–15.  
Fig. 258: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/197883>.  
Fig. 259: <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/5335159>; <https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/5567953>.  
Fig. 260: Albertson 2004, figs. 32–33.

Fig. 261: Albertson 2004, figs. 41–42.

Fig. 262: Inan – Rosenbaum 1966, pl. 29. 1.

Fig. 263: De Franciscis 1972, pl. 138.

Fig. 264: Wegner 1939, 176, pl. 33.

Fig. 265: Campagnolo – Chamay 1996, figs. pp. 124–25.

Fig. 266: Campagnolo – Chamay 1996, figs. pp. 137–40.

Fig. 267: Zanker 1983, pl. 23. 3–4.

# Bibliography

Albertson 1981: F. C. Albertson, *The Sculptured Portraits of Lucius Verus and Marcus Aurelius (A.D. 161–180): Creation and Dissemination of Portrait Types* (Ann Arbor 1981).

Albertson 1988: F. C. Albertson, 'A Portrait of Marcus Aurelius from Syro-Palestine', *DM* 3, 1988, 1–9.

Albertson 2004: F. C. Albertson, 'The creation and dissemination of Roman imperial portrait types: The case of Marcus Aurelius type IV', *Jdl* 119, 2004, 259–306.

Alexandridis 2004: A. Alexandridis, *Die Frauen des römischen Kaiserhauses. Eine Untersuchung ihrer bildlichen Darstellung von Livia bis Julia Domna* (Mainz 2004).

Alföldi 1958/59: M. R. Alföldi, 'Epigraphische Beiträge zur römischen Münztechnik bis auf Konstantin den Großen', *SNR* 39, 1958/59, 35–48.

Ameling 1988: W. Ameling, 'Der Archon Dionysos. Zur Datierung einiger attischer Portraits der mittleren Kaiserzeit', *Boreas* 11, 1988, 62–70.

Ameling 1992: W. Ameling, 'Die Kinder des Marc Aurel und die Bildnistypen der Faustina minor', *ZPE* 90, 1992, 147–66.

Ando 2000: C. Ando, *Imperial ideology and provincial loyalty in the Roman empire* (Berkeley 2000).

Andrén 1965: A. Andrén, 'Greek and Roman Marbles in the Carl Milles Collection', *OpRom* 5, 1965, 75–117.

Angelicooussis 1992: E. Angelicooussis, *The Woburn Abbey Collection of Classical Antiquities* (Mainz 1992).

Angelicooussis 2001: E. Angelicooussis, *The Holkham Collection of Classical Sculptures* (Mainz 2001).

Balty 1983: J. Ch. Balty, 'Style et facture. Notes sur le portrait romain du III<sup>e</sup> siècle de notre ère', *RA* 1983, 301–15.

Balty et al. 2012: J. Ch. Balty – D. Cazes – E. Rosso, *Sculptures antiques de Chiragan (Martres-Tolosane): Les portraits romains. I.2 Le siècle des Antonins* (Graulhet 2012).

Banti 1985: A. Banti, *I grandi bronzi imperiali. III, 1. Faustina I – Marcus Aurelius: sesterzi e medaglioni classificati secondo il sistema Cohen* (Firenze 1985).

Bartman 2001: E. Bartman, 'Hair and the artifice of Roman female adornment', *AJA* 105, 2001, 1–25.

Beckmann 2014: M. Beckmann, 'The relationship between numismatic portraits and marble busts: the problematic example of Faustina the Younger', in: N. T. Elkins – S. Krmnicek (eds), 'Art in the Round'. *New approaches to ancient coin iconography* (Rhaden/Westf. 2014) 39–50.

Benocci 1998: C. Benocci (ed.), *Le virtù e i piaceri in Villa. Per il nuovo museo comunale della Villa Doria Pamphilj* (Milan 1998).

Bergmann 1978: M. Bergmann, *Marc Aurel*, Liebieghaus Monographie 2 (Frankfurt a. M. 1978).

Bergmann 1982: M. Bergmann, 'Zeittypen im Kaiserporträt?', *Römisches Porträt. Wege zur Erforschung eines gesellschaftlichen Phänomens. Wissenschaftliche Konferenz, Berlin 1981 = Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift Berlin* 31, 1982, 143–47.

Bernoulli 1891: J. J. Bernoulli, *Römische Ikonographie II. Die Bildnisse der römischen Kaiser und ihrer Angehörigen 2. Von Galba bis Commodus* (Stuttgart 1891).

Bernoulli 1894: J. J. Bernoulli, *Römische Ikonographie II. Die Bildnisse der römischen Kaiser und ihrer Angehörigen 3. Von Pertinax bis Theodosius* (Stuttgart 1894).

Birley 1987: A. Birley, *Marcus Aurelius. A biography*. Rev. ed. (London 1987).

Bol 1984: R. Bol, *Das Statuenprogramm des Herodes-Atticus-Nymphäums* (Berlin 1984).

Bol 1989: P. C. Bol (ed.), *Forschungen zur Villa Albani. Katalog der antiken Bildwerke I* (Berlin 1989).

- Bol 1990: P. C. Bol (ed.), *Forschungen zur Villa Albani. Katalog der antiken Bildwerke II* (Berlin 1990).
- Bonanno 1976: A. Bonanno, *Portraits and other heads on Roman historical relief up to the age of Septimius Severus* (Oxford 1976).
- Bordenache 1962: G. Bordenache, 'Un nuovo ritratto die Faustina Minore', *Dacia* (new series) 6, 1962, 489–95.
- Borg et al. 2005: B. Borg – H. von Hesberg – A. Linfert, *Die antiken Skulpturen in Castle Howard* (Wiesbaden 2005).
- Boschung 1989: D. Boschung, *Die Bildnisse des Caligula* (Berlin 1989).
- Boschung 1998: D. Boschung, review of: *Les portraits d'Hadrien. Typologie et ateliers* (Brussels 1994), in: *Gnomon* 70, 1998, 649–51.
- Boschung 2005: D. Boschung, review of: *K. Fittschen, Prinzenbildnisse antoninischer Zeit* (Mainz 1999), in: *Gnomon* 77, 2005, 539–41.
- Boschung et al. 1997: D. Boschung – H. v. Hesberg – A. Linfert, *Die antiken Skulpturen in Chatsworth* (Mainz 1997).
- Boschung – Pfanner 1988: D. Boschung – M. Pfanner, 'Antike Bildhauertechnik. Vier Untersuchungen an Beispielen in der Münchner Glyptothek', *MüJb* 39, 1988, 7–28.
- Börner 2012: S. Börner, *Marc Aurel im Spiegel seiner Münzen und Medaillons. Eine vergleichende Analyse der stadtrömischen Prägungen zwischen 138 und 180 n. Chr.* (Bonn 2012).
- Brendel 1931: O. Brendel, *Ikongraphie des Kaisers Augustus* (Nürnberg 1931).
- Bruun 1976: P. Bruun, 'Notes on the transmission of imperial images in late antiquity', in: K. Ascani – T. Fischer-Hansen – F. Johansen – S. Skovgaard Jensen – J. E. Skydsgaard (eds), *Studia Romana in honorem Petri Krarup septuagenarii* (Odense 1976) 122–31.

Budde – Nicholls 1964: L. Budde – R. Nicholls, *A Catalogue of the Greek and Roman Sculpture in the Fitzwilliam Museum Cambridge* (Cambridge 1964).

Burnett 1987: A. Burnett, *Coinage in the Roman World* (London 1987).

Calza 1964: R. Calza, Scavi di Ostia V. I ritratti. Parte I. *Ritratti greci e romani fino al 160 circa D. C.* (Rome 1964).

Calza 1977: R. Calza, *Antichità di Villa Doria Pamphilj* (Rome 1977).

Campagnolo – Chamay 1996: M. Campagnolo – J. Chamay (eds), *Bronze et or: visages de Marc Aurèle; empereur, capitaine, moraliste* (Geneva 1996).

Caputo – Traversari 1976: G. Caputo – G. Traversari, *Le sculpture del Teatro di Leptis Magna* (Rome 1976).

Carson 1956: R. A. G. Carson, 'System and product in the Roman mint', in: R. G. A. Carson – C. H. V. Sutherland (eds), *Essays in Roman coinage presented to Harold Mattingly* (Oxford 1956) 227–39.

Clay 1976: C. L. Clay, 'Roman imperial medallions: the date and purpose of their issue', in: H. A. Cahn – G. Le Rider (eds), *Proceedings of the 8th international congress of numismatics, New York – Washington, September 1973* (Paris 1976) 253–65.

Coarelli 1994: F. Coarelli, 'Moneta. Le officine della zecca di Roma tra Repubblica e Imperio', *AJN* 38–41, 1994, 23–66.

Comstock – Vermeule 1976: M. B. Comstock – C. C. Vermeule, *Sculpture in Stone. The Greek, Roman and Etruscan Collections of the Museum of Fine Arts Boston* (Boston 1976).

Dahmen 2001: K. Dahmen, *Untersuchungen zu Form und Funktion kleinformatiger Porträts der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Münster 2001).

Daltrop 1958: G. Daltrop, *Die stadtrömischen männlichen Privatbildnisse trajanischer und hadrianischer Zeit* (Münster 1958).

Delbrueck 1913: R. Delbrueck, 'Der römische Sarkophag in Melfi', *Jdl* 28, 1913, 277–308.

De Franciscis 1972: A. De Franciscis, 'Due ritratti di M. Aurelio', *RM* 79, 1972, 331–36.

de Kersauson 1996: K. de Kersauson, *Musée du Louvre. Département des Antiquités grecques, étrusques et romaines. Catalogue des portraits romains. II. De l'année de la guerre civile (68–69 après J.-C.) à la fin de l'Empire* (Paris 1996).

de Luca 1976: G. de Luca, *I monumenti antichi di Palazzo Corsini in Roma* (Rome 1976).

Dentzer-Feydy 2017: J. Dentzer-Feydy, 'The sanctuary of the Qasr Al-Bint in Petra: from Nabataean cult to Roman imperial celebration', in: R. Raja (ed.), *Contextualizing the sacred in the Hellenistic and Roman Near East. Religious identities in local, regional, and imperial settings* (Turnhout 2017) 126–42.

Deppmeyer 2008: K. Deppmeyer, *Kaisergruppen von Vespasian bis Konstantin. Eine Untersuchung zu Aufstellungskontexten und Intentionen der statuarischen Präsentation kaiserlicher Familien* (Hamburg 2008).

Dressel 1973: H. Dressel, *Die römischen Medaillone des Münzkabinetts der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin* (Dublin 1973).

Eck 2007: W. Eck, review of: J. M. Højte, *Roman Imperial Statue Bases from Augustus to Commodus* (Aarhus 2005), in: *Klio* 89, 2007, 524–28.

Eck 2017: W. Eck, 'Wie erreicht man sein „Publikum“? Der Kaiser und sein Portrait in der Kommunikation mit den Bewohnern des römischen Reiches', in: A. Pangerl (ed.), *Portraits. 500 years of Roman coin portraits* (Munich 2017) 271–75.

Emmett 2001: K. Emmett, *Alexandrian coins* (Lodi, Wisconsin 2001).

Equini Schneider 1979: E. Equini Schneider, *Catalogo delle sculture romane del Museo Naz. "G. A. Sanna" di Sassari e del comune di Porto Torres* (Sassari 1979).

Espérandieu 1908: É. Espérandieu, *Recueil général de bas-reliefs de la Gaule Romaine. II. Aquitaine* (Paris 1908).

Esty 1990: W. W. Esty, 'The theory of linkage', *NC* 150, 1990, 205–21.

Esty 2006: W. W. Esty, 'How to estimate the original number of dies and the coverage of a sample', *NC* 166, 2006, 359–64.

Evers 1994: C. Evers, *Les portraits d'Hadrien. Typologie et ateliers* (Brussels 1994).

Evers 1995: C. Evers, *Recherches sur les ateliers officiels de sculpture à Rome sous les Antonins: les portraits d'empereurs* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Université libre de Bruxelles, Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres, Bruxelles.

Fejfer 1998: J. Fejfer, 'The Roman emperor portrait. Some problems in typology', *Ostraka* 7, 1998, 45–56.

Fejfer 2008: J. Fejfer, *Roman portraits in context* (Berlin 2008).

Felletti Maj 1953: B. M. Felletti Maj, *Museo Nazionale Romano. I ritratti* (Rome 1953).

Fittschen 1970: K. Fittschen, review of: H. G. Niemeyer, *Studien zur statuarischen Darstellung der römischen Kaiser* (Berlin 1968), in: *BjB* 170, 1970, 541–52.

Fittschen 1971: K. Fittschen, 'Zum angeblichen Bildnis des Lucius Verus im Thermen-Museum', *Jdl* 86, 1971, 214–52.

Fittschen 1974: K. Fittschen, 'Über das Photographieren römischer Porträts', *AA* 89, 1974, 484–94.

Fittschen 1977: K. Fittschen, *Katalog der antiken Skulpturen in Schloss Erbach* (Berlin 1977).

Fittschen 1978: K. Fittschen, 'Two portraits of Septimius Severus and Julia Domna', *Indiana University Art Museum Bulletin* 1 (2), 1978, 28–43.

Fittschen 1982: K. Fittschen, *Die Bildnistypen der Faustina minor und die Fecunditas Augustae* (Göttingen 1982).

Fittschen 1986: K. Fittschen, 'Zur Entstehung und Funktion römischer Kaiserbildnisse', in: W. Eck – K. Fittschen – F. Naumann, *Kaisersaal. Porträts aus den kapitolinischen Museen in Rome. Exhibition Cologne* (Rome 1986) 19–24.

Fittschen 1989: K. Fittschen, 'Il ritratto del Marco Aurelio: considerazioni critiche dopo il restauro', in: A. Melucco Vaccaro – A. Mura Sommella (eds), *Marco Aurelio: storia di un monumento e del suo restauro* (Milan 1989) 75–82.

Fittschen 1992: K. Fittschen, 'Zum Bildnis eines Römers in Thera', in: O. Brehm – S. Klie (eds), *ΜΟΥΣΙΚΟΣ ΑΝΗΡ. Festschrift für Max Wegner zum 90. Geburtstag* (Bonn 1992) 115–18.

Fittschen 1996a: K. Fittschen, 'Courtly portraits of women in the era of the adoptive emperors (98–180) and their reception in Roman society', in: D. E. E. Kleiner – S. B. Matheson (eds), *I Claudia. Women in ancient Rome* (New Haven 1996) 42–52.

Fittschen 1996b: K. Fittschen, 'Ein neuzeitliches Frauenbildnis in Spoleto und sein antikes Vorbild im Capitolinischen Museum in Rom. Über die Möglichkeit der Identifizierung von Privatporträts mit Repliken', in: V. Casale – F. Coarelli – B. Toscano (eds), *Scritti di archeologia e storia dell'arte in onore di Carlo Pietrangeli* (Rome 1996) 209–13.

Fittschen 1999: K. Fittschen, *Prinzenbildnisse antoninischer Zeit* (Mainz 1999).

Fittschen 2006: K. Fittschen, 'Die Porträts am sogenannten Parthermonument. Vorbilder und Datierung', in: W. Seipel (ed.), *Das Partherdenkmal von Ephesos. Akten des Kolloquiums Wien, 27.–28. April 2003* (Wien 2006) 71–87.

Fittschen 2008a: K. Fittschen, 'Elagabal aus dem Steinhaufen', *BullCom* 109, 2008, 109–15.

Fittschen 2008b: K. Fittschen, 'Werkstattfragen. Zu den Büsten Hadrians mit Bildnissen im Typus »Imperator 32«', in: *Amicitiae Gratia: tomos stē mnēmē Alkmēnēs Stauridē* (Athens 2008) 169–78.

Fittschen 2010: K. Fittschen, 'The portraits of Roman emperors and their families. Controversial positions and unsolved problems', in: B. Ewald – C. F. Noreña (eds), *The Emperor and Rome. Space, Representation and Ritual* (Cambridge 2010) 221–46.

Fittschen 2012: K. Fittschen, 'Über die Haartrachten von Kaiserinnen und Bürgerinnen in der mittleren Kaiserzeit', *ÉtTrav* 25, 2012, 103–18.

Fittschen 2015: K. Fittschen, 'Methodological Approaches to the Dating and Identification of Roman Portraits', in: B. E. Borg (ed.), *A Companion to Roman Art* (Chichester 2015) 52–70.

Fittschen – Zanker 1983: K. Fittschen – P. Zanker, *Katalog der römischen Porträts in den Capitolinischen Museen und den anderen kommunalen Sammlungen der Stadt Rom III. Kaiserinnen- und Prinzessinnenbildnisse. Frauenporträts* (Mainz 1983).

Fittschen – Zanker 1985: K. Fittschen – P. Zanker, *Katalog der römischen Porträts in den Capitolinischen Museen und den anderen kommunalen Sammlungen der Stadt Rom I. Kaiser- und Prinzenbildnisse* (Mainz 1985).

Fleischer 1967: R. Fleischer, *Die römischen Bronzen aus Österreich* (Mainz 1967).

Fless et al. 2006: F. Fless – K. Moede – K. Stemmer (eds), *Schau mir in die Augen ... Das antike Porträt* (Berlin 2006).

Flisi 1989: E. Flisi, *Questioni di ritrattistica Antoniniana. Dalla collezione del Palazzo Ducale di Mantova* (Florence 1989).

Franke 1975: P. R. Franke, 'Zur Verwendungsdauer römischer Medaillonstempel', *Chiron* 5, 1975, 407–10.

Friedlaender 1919: L. Friedlaender, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms in der Zeit von August bis zum Ausgang der Antonine. I.* 9th ed. (Leipzig 1919).

Friedlaender 1920: L. Friedlaender, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms in der Zeit von August bis zum Ausgang der Antonine. III.* 9th ed. (Leipzig 1920).

Fuchs 1986: M. Fuchs, review of: R. Bol, *Das Statuenprogramm des Herodes-Atticus-Nymphäums* (Berlin 1984), in: *BjB* 186, 1986, 855–60.

Fuhrmann 1939: H. Fuhrmann, 'Ein Reliefbildnis des Prinzen L. Aelius Aurelius Commodus aus dem Jahre 160 n. Chr.', *AA* 54, 1939, 294–302.

Gasparri 2009: C. Gasparri (ed.), *Le sculture Farnese. II. I ritratti* (Naples 2009).

Geißen 1978: A. Geißen, *Katalog Alexandrinischer Kaisermünzen der Sammlung des Instituts für Altertumskunde der Universität zu Köln. 2. Hadrian – Antoninus Pius* (Opladen 1978).

Geißen 1982: A. Geißen, *Katalog Alexandrinischer Kaisermünzen der Sammlung des Instituts für Altertumskunde der Universität zu Köln. 3. Marc Aurel – Gallienus* (Opladen 1982).

Giuliano 1957: A. Giuliano, *Catalogo dei ritratti romani del Museo Profano Lateranense* (Vatican City 1957).

Göbl 1978: R. Göbl, *Antike Numismatik* (München 1978).

Goette 1990: H. R. Goette, *Studien zu römischen Togadarstellungen* (Mainz 1990).

Graindor 1937: P. Graindor, *Bustes et statues-portraits d'Égypte romaine* (Cairo 1937).

Grueber 1874: H. A. Grueber, *Roman medallions in the British Museum* (London 1874).

Haines 1919: Loeb Classical Library, C. R. Haines (ed. and trans.), *The correspondence of Marcus Cornelius Fronto I* (Cambridge, Mass. 1919).

Hallett 2005: C. H. Hallett, *The Roman nude. Heroic portrait statuary 200 BC–AD 300* (Oxford 2005).

Hallett 2007: C. H. Hallett, review of: J. M. Højte, 'Roman Imperial Statue Bases from Augustus to Commodus' (Aarhus 2005), in: *JRS* 97, 2007, 342–43.

Hausmann 1975: U. Hausmann, *Römerbildnisse* (Stuttgart 1975).

Heres et al. 1981: H. Heres – H. Hoffmann – K. Zimmermann, *Römische Porträts*, Exhibition Berlin (Berlin 1981).

- Hill 1922: G. F. Hill, 'Ancient Methods of Coining', *NC ser.* 5, 2, 1922, 1–42.
- Hinks 1935: R. P. Hinks, *Greek and Roman portrait sculpture* (London 1935).
- Hirschfeld 1905: O. Hirschfeld, *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian*. 2nd ed. (Berlin 1905).
- Hochuli-Gysel – Brodard 2006: A. Hochuli-Gysel – V. Brodard, *Marc Aurèle. L'incroyable découverte du buste en or à Avenches* (Avenches 2006).
- Højte 2005: J. M. Højte, *Roman Imperial Statue Bases from Augustus to Commodus* (Aarhus 2005).
- Inan – Rosenbaum 1966: J. Inan – E. Rosenbaum, *Roman and early Byzantine portrait sculpture in Asia Minor* (London 1966).
- Inan – Alföldi-Rosenbaum 1979: J. Inan – E. Alföldi-Rosenbaum, *Römische und frühbyzantinische Porträtplastik aus der Türkei. Neue Funde* (Mainz 1979).
- Johansen 1995: F. Johansen, *Catalogue. Roman Portraits 2. Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek* (Copenhagen 1995).
- Jucker 1961: H. Jucker, *Das Bildnis im Blätterkelch. Geschichte und Bedeutung einer römischen Porträtform* (Olten 1961).
- Jucker 1981: H. Jucker, 'Marc Aurel bleibt Marc Aurel', *Bulletin de l'Association Pro Aventico* 26, 1981, 5–33.
- Jucker 1995: I. Jucker, *Skulpturen der Antiken-Sammlung Ennetwies* (Mainz 1995).
- Jucker – Willers 1983: H. Jucker – D. Willers (eds), *Gesichter. Griechische und römische Bildnisse aus Schweizer Besitz*, Exhibition Bern. 2nd ed. (Bern 1983).
- Kampmann – Ganschow 2008: U. Kampmann – T. Ganschow, *Die Münzen der römischen Münzstätte Alexandria* (Regenstauf 2008).

Kapossy 1971/1972: B. Kapossy, 'Römische Medaillone und Kontorniaten', *JBernHistMus* 51/52, 1971/1972, 127–50.

Karageorghis 1975: V. Karageorghis, 'Chronique des fouilles et découvertes archéologiques a Chypre en 1974', *BCH* 99, 1975, 801–51.

Kent et al. 1973: J. P. C. Kent – B. Overbeck – A. U. Stylow, *Die römische Münze* (München 1973).

Kienast 1996: D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle. Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*. 2nd ed. (Darmstadt 1996).

Knoll – Vorster 2013: K. Knoll – C. Vorster (eds), *Skulpturensammlung. Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden. Katalog der antiken Bildwerke 3. Die Porträts* (München 2013).

Korkuti 1971: M. Korkuti, *Shqiperia Arkeologjike* (Tirane 1971).

Kovács 1984: V. Kovács, 'Mark Aurel Porträt aus Lugio', *Alba Regia* 21, 1984, 89–91.

Kreikenbom 1992: D. Kreikenbom, *Griechische und römische Kolossalporträts bis zum späten ersten Jahrhundert nach Christus* (Berlin 1992).

Kunisch 1979: N. Kunisch, 'Vier antike Porträts in den RUB-Kunstsammlungen', offprint from the *Jahrbuch der Ruhr-Universität Bochum 1979*.

Kuzsinszky 1934: V. Kuzsinszky, *Aquincum. Ausgrabungen und Funde. Führer mit einer topographischen und geschichtlichen Einleitung* (Budapest 1934).

Lagogianni-Georgakarakos 2002: M. Lagogianni-Georgakarakos, *Die römischen Porträts Kretas I. Bezirk Heraklion. Griechenland VI, Faszikel 1* (Athens 2002).

Lahusen – Formigli 2001: G. Lahusen – E. Formigli, *Römische Bildnisse aus Bronze. Kunst und Technik* (Munich 2001).

Landwehr 1985: Ch. Landwehr, *Die Antiken Gipsabgüsse aus Baiae. Griechische Bronzestatuen in Abgüssen römischer Zeit* (Berlin 1985).

La Rocca 1986: E. La Rocca, *Rilievi storici Capitolini* (Rome 1986).

La Rocca – Parisi Presicce 2011: E. La Rocca – C. Parisi Presicce (eds), *I giorni di Roma. Ritratti. Le tante facce del potere* (Rome, 2011).

La Rocca – Parisi Presicce 2012: E. La Rocca – C. Parisi Presicce (eds), *I giorni di Roma. L'età dell'equilibrio. 98–180 d.C. Traiano, Adriano, Antonino Pio, Marco Aurelio* (Rome 2012).

Lippold 1923: G. Lippold, *Kopien und Umbildungen griechischer Statuen* (Munich 1923).

Liverani 1996/97: P. Liverani, 'Il monumento antonino di Efeso', *Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale d'Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte* 19-20, 1996/97, 153-174.

Manson 1976: M. Manson, 'Le temps à Rome d'après les monnaies. Ce qu'apportent les monnaies sur la chronologie des naissances des enfants de Marc-Aurèle et de Faustine', *Le temps chez les Romains, Caesarodunum* 10 bis, 1976, 183–96.

Mansuelli 1961: G. A. Mansuelli, *Galleria degli Uffizi. Le sculture. II* (Rome 1961).

Martin 1915: J. Martin, Musée Lavignerie de Saint Louis de Cartage. Supplément II. Musées et collections archéologiques de l'Algérie et de la Tunisie (Paris 1915).

Mathews – Muller 2016: T. F. Mathews – N. E. Muller, *The dawn of Christian art in panel paintings and icons* (Los Angeles 2016).

Mayer 2012: E. Mayer, *The ancient middle classes. Urban life and aesthetics in the Roman empire, 100 BCE–250 CE* (Cambridge, Mass. 2012).

McCann 1968: A. M. McCann, *The portraits of Septimius Severus (A.D. 193–211)*, *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 30 (Rome 1968).

Megow 1987: W.-R. Megow, *Kameen von Augustus bis Alexander Severus* (Berlin 1987).

Mittag 2010: P. F. Mittag, *Römische Medaillons. Caesar bis Hadrian* (Stuttgart 2010).

Mlasowsky 2006: A. Mlasowsky, *Imagines Imperii. Griechische und römische Bildnisse einer norddeutschen Sammlung* (Mainz 2006).

Moesta – Franke 1995: H. Moesta – P. R. Franke, *Antike Metallurgie und Münzprägung. Ein Beitrag zur Technikgeschichte* (Basel 1995).

Murer 2017: C. Murer, *Stadtraum und Bürgerin. Aufstellungsorte kaiserzeitlicher Ehrenstatuen in Italien und Nordafrika* (Berlin 2017).

Neudecker 1988: R. Neudecker, *Die Skulpturenausstattung römischer Villen in Italien* (Mainz 1988).

Niemeyer 1968: H. G. Niemeyer, *Studien zur statuarischen Darstellung römischer Kaiser* (Berlin 1968).

Oberleitner 2009: W. Oberleitner, *Das Partherdenkmal von Ephesos. Ein Siegesmonument für Lucius Verus und Marcus Aurelius* (Wien 2009).

Østergaard 2009–2013: J. S. Østergaard (ed.), *Tracking colour. The polychromy of Greek and Roman sculpture in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek*. Preliminary report 1–5, 2009–2013 (Copenhagen 2009–2013).

Padgett 2001: J. M. Padgett (ed.), *Sculpture in the Art Museum Princeton University* (Princeton 2001).

Papadimitriou 1937: I. Papadimitriou, 'Eikonistika', *ArchEph* 1937, 694–704.

Pekáry 1985: T. Pekáry, *Das römische Kaiserbildnis in Staat, Kult und Gesellschaft, dargestellt anhand der Schriftquellen* (Berlin 1985).

Petrakos 1976: V. C. Petrakos, 'Ανασκαφή Ραμνούντος', *Prakt* 1976, 5–60.

Pfanner 1988: M. Pfanner, 'Vom laufenden Bohrer bis zum bohrlosen Stil. Überlegungen zur Bohrtechnik in der Antike', *AA* 1988, 667–76.

Pfanner 1989: M. Pfanner, 'Über das Herstellen von Porträts. Ein Beitrag zu Rationalisierungsmaßnahmen und Produktionsmechanismen von Massenware im späten Hellenismus und in der römischen Kaiserzeit', *Jdl* 104, 1989, 157–257.

Poulsen 1923: F. Poulsen, *Greek and Roman portraits in English country houses* (Oxford 1923).

Poulsen 1932: F. Poulsen, 'Zwei Neuerwerbungen der antiken Porträt-Galerie der NY Carlsberg Glyptothek', *Jdl* 47, 1932, 82–89.

Poulsen 1974: V. Poulsen, *Les Portraits Romains 2. De Vespasien à la Basse-Antiquité* (Copenhagen 1974).

Raeder 1983: J. Raeder, *Die statuarische Ausstattung der Villa Hadriana bei Tivoli* (Frankfurt 1983).

Raeder 1992: J. Raeder, 'Herrscherbildnis und Münzpropaganda. Zur Deutung des Serapistypus des Septimius Severus', *Jdl* 107, 1992, 175–96.

Regling 1924: K. Regling, *Die antike Münze als Kunstwerk* (Berlin 1924).

Riccardi 2000: L. A. Riccardi, 'Uncanonical imperial portraits in the eastern Roman provinces. The case of the Kanellopoulos emperor', *Hesperia* 69, 2000, 105–32.

Rockwell 1990: P. Rockwell, 'Stone-carving tools: a stone-carver's view', *JRA* 3, 1990, 351–57.

Rockwell 1991: P. Rockwell, 'Unfinished statuary associated with a sculptor's studio', in: R. R. R. Smith – K. T. Erim (eds), *Aphrodisias Papers 2: the theatre, a sculptor's workshop, philosophers, and coin-types* (Ann Arbor 1991) 127–43.

Rockwell 1993: P. Rockwell, *The art of stoneworking: a reference guide* (Cambridge 1993).

Rockwell 2008: P. Rockwell, 'The sculptor's studio at Aphrodisias: the working methods and varieties of sculpture produced', in: Y. Z. Eliav – E. A. Friedland – S. Herbert (eds), *The sculptural environment of the Roman Near East. Reflections on culture, ideology, and power* (Leuven 2008) 91–115.

Rosenbaum 1960: E. Rosenbaum, *A catalogue of Cyrenaican portrait sculpture* (London 1960).

Sadurska 1972: A. Sadurska, *Les portraits romains dans les collections polonaises I* (Warsaw 1972).

Saladino 1998: V. Saladino (ed.), *Le antichità di Palazzo Medici Riccardi II. Le sculture* (Florence 1998).

Saletti 1974: C. Saletti, *I ritratti antoniniani di Palazzo Pitti* (Florence 1974).

Schazmann 1940: P. Schazmann, 'Buste en or représentant l'empereur Marc-Aurèle trouvé à Avenches en 1939', *ZSchwArch* 2, 1940, 69–93.

Scheid – Huet 2000: J. Scheid – V. Huet (eds), *Autour de la colonne Aurélienne. Geste et image sur la colonne de Marc Aurèle à Rome* (Turnhout 2000).

Schröder 1993: S. F. Schröder, *Katalog der antiken Skulpturen des Museo del Prado in Madrid I. Die Porträts* (Mainz 1993).

Schwarzmaier et al. 2012: A. Schwarzmaier – A. Scholl – M. Maischberger (eds), *Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Die Antikensammlung* (Darmstadt 2012).

Smith 1904: A. H. Smith, *A Catalogue of Sculpture in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum Vol. 3* (London 1904).

Smith 1983: R. R. R. Smith, review of: K. Fittschen, *Die Bildnistypen der Faustina minor und die Fecunditas Augustae* (Göttingen 1982), in: *JRS* 73, 1983, 228–29.

Smith 1985: R. R. R. Smith, 'Roman portraits: honours, empresses, and late emperors', *JRS* 75, 1985, 209–21.

Smith 1992: R. R. R. Smith, review of: R. Neudecker, *Die Skulpturenausstattung römischer Villen in Italien* (Mainz 1988), in: *JRS* 82, 1992, 270–73.

Smith 1996: R. R. R. Smith, 'Typology and diversity in the portraits of Augustus', *JRA* 9, 1996, 31–47.

Smith 1998: R. R. R. Smith, 'Cultural Choice and Political Identity in Honorific Portrait Statues in the Greek East in the Second Century A.D.', *JRS* 88, 1998, 56–93.

Smith 2011: R. R. R. Smith, 'Marble workshops at Aphrodisias', in: F. D'Andria – I. Romeo (eds), *Roman sculpture in Asia Minor* (Portsmouth 2011) 62–76.

Soechting 1972: D. Soechting, *Die Porträts des Septimius Severus* (Bonn 1972).

Spinola 1999: *Il Museo Pio-Clementino 2* (Vatican City 1999).

Srejić 1968: D. Srejić, 'Les nouvelles trouvailles de Doclea', *Starinar* 19, 1968, 89–100.

Stemmer 1978: K. Stemmer, *Untersuchungen zur Typologie, Chronologie und Ikonographie der Panzerstatuen* (Berlin 1978).

Stephens 2008: J. Stephens, 'Ancient Roman hairdressing: on (hair)pins and needles', *JRA* 21, 2008, 110–32.

Stoll 1992: O. Stoll, *Die Skulpturenausstattung römischer Militäranlagen an Rhein und Donau. Der Obergermanisch-Rätische Limes* (St. Katharinen 1992).

Strack 1931: P. L. Strack, *Untersuchungen zur römischen Reichsprägung des zweiten Jahrhunderts. I. Die Reichsprägung zur Zeit des Traian* (Stuttgart 1931).

Strack 1937: P. L. Strack, *Untersuchungen zur römischen Reichsprägung des zweiten Jahrhunderts. III. Die Reichsprägung zur Zeit des Antoninus Pius* (Stuttgart 1937).

Strong – Claridge 1976: D. Strong – A. Claridge, 'Marble Sculpture', in: D. Strong – D. Brown (eds), *Roman Crafts* (London 1976) 195–207.

Stuart 1939: M. Stuart, 'How were imperial portraits distributed throughout the Roman empire?', *AJA* 43, 1939, 601–17.

Swift 1923: E. H. Swift, 'Imagines in Imperial Portraiture', *AJA* 27, 1923, 286–301.

Szaivert 1986: W. Szaivert, *Die Münzprägung der Kaiser Marcus Aurelius, Lucius Verus und Commodus (161–192)*, *Moneta Imperii Romani* 18 (Wien 1986).

Szilágyi 1976: J. G. Szilágyi, *Római kori plasztika Pannóniában I.– III. század* (Székesfehérvár 1976).

Thue 1971: O. Thue, *Nasjonalgalleriet. Katalog over Skulptur. Tilvekst 1952–1971* (Oslo 1971).

Toynbee 1944: J. M. C. Toynbee, *Roman Medallions* (New York 1944).

- Traversari 1968: G. Traversari, *Museo Archeologico di Venezia. I ritratti* (Rome 1968).
- Trillmich 1971: W. Trillmich, 'Zur Formgeschichte von Bildnis-Typen', *Jdl* 86, 1971, 179–213.
- Trillmich 1974: W. Trillmich, review of: D. Soechting, *Die Porträts des Septimius Severus* (Bonn 1972), in: *Gnomon* 46, 1974, 284–92.
- Trunk 1999: M. Trunk, 'Zum 1. Bildnistypus der Faustina Minor', *MM* 40, 1999, 218–27.
- Ugaglia 2011: E. Ugaglia (ed.), *L'image et le pouvoir. Le siècle des Antonins* (Toulouse 2011).
- van den Hout 1999: M. P. J. van den Hout, *A commentary on the letters of M. Cornelius Fronto* (Leiden 1999).
- Van Voorhis 2018: J. Van Voorhis, *Aphrodisias X. The Sculptor's Workshop* (Wiesbaden 2018).
- Vermeule 1959/60: C. C. Vermeule, 'Hellenistic and Roman cuirassed statues', *Berytus* 13, 1959/60, 1–82.
- Vetters 1983: H. Vetters, 'Ephesos. Vorläufiger Grabungsbericht 1982', *AnzWien* 120, 1983, 111–69.
- Vidman 1982: L. Vidman, *Fasti Ostienses*. 2nd ed. (Prague 1982).
- von Bothmer 1990: D. von Bothmer (ed.), *Glories of the past. Ancient art from the Shelby White and Leon Levy Collection* (New York 1990).
- von Hees-Landwehr 1982: Ch. von Hees-Landwehr, *Griechische Meisterwerke in römischen Abgüssen. Der Fund von Baia* (Frankfurt 1982).
- von Kaenel 1986: H.-M. von Kaenel, *Münzprägung und Münzbildnis des Claudius* (Berlin 1986).
- von Sacken 1873: E. von Sacken, *Die antiken Sculpturen des k. k. Münz- und Antiken-Cabinets in Wien* (Wien 1873).

von Sarwey et al. 1901: O. von Sarwey – E. Fabricius – F. Hettner (eds), *Der Obergermanisch-Raetische Limes des Römerreiches. Band VII, B, Nr. 73, Kastell Pfünz* (Heidelberg 1901).

Wallace-Hadrill 1982: A. Wallace-Hadrill, 'Civilis Princeps: Between citizen and king', *JRS* 72, 1982, 32–48.

Wallace-Hadrill 1996: A. Wallace-Hadrill, 'Chapter 7: The imperial court', *CAH* 10 (2nd ed.), 1996, 283–308.

Wallace-Hadrill 2011: A. Wallace-Hadrill, 'The Roman imperial court: seen and unseen in the performance of power', in: J. Duindam – T. Artan – M. Kunt (eds), *Royal courts in dynastic states and empires: a global perspective* (Leiden 2011) 91–102.

Walker 1988: D. R. Walker, 'Roman coins from the sacred spring at Bath. Part 6 (The Roman coins)', in: B. Cunliffe, *The temple of Sulis Minerva at Bath, 2. The finds from the sacred spring* (Oxford 1988) 281–358.

Wegner 1939: M. Wegner, *Die Herrscherbildnisse in antoninischer Zeit. Das römische Herrscherbild II* 4 (Berlin 1939).

Wegner 1979: M. Wegner, 'Verzeichnis der Kaiserbildnisse von Antoninus Pius bis Commodus', *Boreas* 2, 1979, 87–181.

Wegner 1980: M. Wegner, 'Verzeichnis der Kaiserbildnisse von Antoninus Pius bis Commodus, II. Teil', *Boreas* 3, 1980, 12–116.

Wegner 1981: M. Wegner, 'Bildniskunde römischer Herrscher', *ANRW* II 12, 2 (Berlin 1981) 646–66.

Wolters 1999: R. Wolters, *Nummi Signati. Untersuchungen zur römischen Münzprägung und Geldwirtschaft, Vestigia* 49 (München 1999).

Woytek 2010: B. Woytek, *Die Reichsprägung des Kaisers Traianus (98–117)* (Vienna 2010).

Woytek 2012: B. Woytek, 'System and Product in Roman Mints from the Late Republic to the High Principate: Some Current Problems', *RBN* 158, 2012, 85–121.

Yarrow 2012: L. M. Yarrow, 'Antonine Coinage', in: W. E. Metcalf (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of Greek and Roman coinage* (Oxford 2012) 423–52.

Zanker 1979: P. Zanker, 'Prinzipat und Herrscherbild', *Gymnasium* 86, 1979, 353–68.

Zanker 1982: P. Zanker, 'Herrscherbild und Zeitgesicht', *Römisches Porträt. Wege zur Erforschung eines gesellschaftlichen Phänomens. Wissenschaftliche Konferenz, Berlin 1981 = Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift Berlin* 31, 1982, 307–12.

Zanker 1983: P. Zanker, *Provinzielle Kaiserporträts. Zur Rezeption der Selbstdarstellung des Princeps* (München 1983).

Zanker 2016: P. Zanker, *Roman portraits: sculptures in stone and bronze in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (New York 2016).

Zwierlein-Diehl 2007, E. Zwierlein-Diehl, *Antike Gemmen und ihr Nachleben* (Berlin 2007).

## Illustrations

The images cannot be made freely available  
for copyright reasons