

RelBib

Bibliography of the Study of Religion

<https://relbib.de>

Dear reader,

This is a self-archived version of the following article:

Author: Rüpke, Jörg
Title: "Triumphator and Ancestor Rituals between Symbolic Anthropology and Magic"

Published in: Numen
Leiden: Brill

Volume: 53 (3)
Year: 2006
Pages: 251 - 289
ISSN: 0029-5973

The article is used with permission of [Brill](#).

Thank you for supporting Green Open Access.

Your RelBib team

EBERHARD KARLS
UNIVERSITÄT
TÜBINGEN



UNIVERSITÄTSBIBLIOTHEK

TRIUMPHATOR AND ANCESTOR RITUALS BETWEEN SYMBOLIC ANTHROPOLOGY AND MAGIC¹

JÖRG RÜPKE

Summary

This article argues that the Roman triumph with the figure of the triumphator and the burial of Roman nobles with the *pompa imaginum* should be interpreted within the framework of the prestige and practices related to honorific statues. Using the red colour of the triumphator's skin as the main argument, the figure of the triumphator is interpreted as a temporary statue, and the triumph as an attempt on part of the senate to regulate the prestige of honorific statues by tying it to a public ritual. Likewise, the bearers of *imagines* are interpreted as representing the ensemble of all legitimate — i.e. as based on public positions — statues used to construct a family. Both rituals, as known from late republican sources, developed from the fourth century BC onwards.

1. *Symbolic Communication*

Two rituals of the Roman republic have recently become the subject of intense research: the triumph; and the public funeral granted to Roman magistrates, with its mask-wearing actors, its impersonated ancestors, and its speeches of praise and commemoration.

¹ For discussions of the ideas in this paper, which have much furthered their development, I should like to thank in particular Ingo Gildenhard (London), Karl-Joachim Hölkeskamp (Köln), Martin Jehne (Dresden), Susan Stephens, Alessandro Barchiesi and Walter Scheidel (Stanford), Frances Hickson Hahn (Santa Barbara), Cecilia Ames (Córdoba), Tanja Itgenshorst (Bielefeld), Franz-Peter Mittag (Freiburg), Christoph Uehlinger (Zürich), Adrian Stäheli (Basel) and colleagues in Giessen and Erfurt. Hendrik Versnel's repeated criticism improved my argument and my English; I am grateful to Einar Thomassen for the documentation of the dissent remaining and his editorial care. I am grateful to the Max-Weber-Kolleg, Erfurt, for granting me a fellowship to start working on processes of rationalization in the Roman republic.

Thus the genesis and history of the triumph have been studied in detail by Versnel and Bonfante Warren.² Pietilä-Castrén and Orlin discuss the ritual in connection with the dedication and building of temples.³ Hölkeskamp and Rüpke, the former in his work on the formation of the Roman nobility, the latter in studies devoted to the religious construction of war in ancient Rome, explore the triumph as one of the means by which a highly competitive aristocracy managed to focus its internal rivalries on strictly controlled fields of public activity.⁴ And lately, Tanja Itgenshorst has stressed the conflictual dimension of the republican triumph, the discrepancy of credibility and power from contemporaries of Plautus down to Augustus.⁵

As goes without saying, Rome's imperial success during the period of the "enlightened Republic" depended much on how efficiently potentially disruptive internal rivalries could be channelled into military expansion. In this context, the triumph constituted one of the media through which the Roman nobility could display military victories and their rewards to the Roman populace, thereby helping to ensure its future participation in aristocratically directed warfare.⁶ Hence the importance of the display of booty and military feats.⁷ It is one of the most interesting aspects of this system of communication that it furnished hardly any institutionalized outlet for the communication, and public recognition, of military *defeats*. The Romans did not even have a parallel to the Greek cult of those who died during a victorious campaign.⁸ The significance of the triumph

² Versnel 1970; Bonfante Warren 1970, 1973.

³ Pietilä-Castrén 1987; Orlin 1997. Cf. Ziolkowski 1992 for a survey of the archaeological data relating to mid-republican temples.

⁴ Hölkeskamp 1987, reiterated in Hölkeskamp 1993; Rüpke 1990, and, more specifically, 1995. Cf. the discussion following Rosenstein's *Imperatores victi*: Rosenstein 1990a, 1990b; North 1990; Harris 1990. Cf. also Hölkeskamp 1994.

⁵ Itgenshorst 2005.

can further be gauged from the fact that, among the various alternatives of presenting and investing booty — such as temples, buildings or games⁹ — it offered a prestige that from the second century BC onwards some tried to exploit far beyond the temporal framework of the ritual proper.¹⁰

Even after the triumphator's death, the deceased received conspicuous recognition for his achievement. In the funeral of a Roman noble, those of his ancestors who themselves had reached magistracies took part in the form of actors who, in addition to a wax-mask, wore the insignia and clothing of the highest office that the person they were impersonating had reached in life. Each magistrate was accompanied by the appropriate number of lictors, and counting them was the only means by which one could differentiate between former consuls, praetors, and aediles. All of them were dressed up in the *toga praetexta*, the white toga with a stripe of purple worn by Roman magistrates. For *triumphatores*, on the other hand, such arithmetic was unnecessary: their all-purple garment set them apart from the crowd of ordinary office-holders.

But what are the semantics of the triumphator and the masks behind the political communication? Do we have to postulate a change from a dominantly religious meaning, i.e. that the triumphator was meant to be, or at least represent, Jupiter, and that dead ancestors rumbled through the city during the *pompa funebris*,¹¹ to a dominantly political one? For the triumph one could imagine that such a change occurred at the end of the fourth century BC, that is, during the formative phase of the new nobility. In this case, the change in signification seems to have left the basic elements of the ritual unaltered. For the *pompa imaginum*, Harriet Flower argued for the transformation, at about the same period, of some unknown previous ritual into the known, primarily political event.¹² Yet in

⁹ See Orlin 1997:66–73 for possible criteria and strategies.

¹⁰ Beard, North, Price 1998:143.

order to save the hypothesis of a more religious earlier version of the aristocratic funeral and the cult of the ancestors (completely unknown to us), she has to argue that the entire complex of the funeral speech and the commemorative use of masks, with the storage of the latter in the *atrium*, is a non-religious addition of that period.¹³ The only evidence for the postulated earlier stage is statuary representations of (what are supposedly) ancestors. Fully convincing parallels for that type of ancestor cult are lacking.¹⁴

This article offers a new hypothesis to understand the form and the significance of both rituals, by relating them to the practice of erecting honorific statues. The hypothesis is not supported by direct ancient evidence. Yet it better explains and historically contextualizes more of the odd features of the rituals (in particular the triumph) than previous attempts to understand them. The basic thesis is that by the fourth century BC the display of private statues in public space — not so much in view of the sheer quantity but because of the associations such statues evoked — was seen as a threat to the capacity of the nobility to regulate its internal competition.

2. Jupiter or *rex*?

What we know about the Roman triumph mostly stems from literary sources, from Livy onwards. The written sources on which these historians, antiquarians, or poets relied could not have gone further back than the end of the third century BC; usually they are later. The astonishingly few iconographic representations all come from the Principate.¹⁵ For this reason, any attempt at reconstruction of the ritual for earlier periods is necessarily antiquarian, that is, involves selecting individual elements, or combinations of elements, and interpreting them as dysfunctional survivals from a time

¹³ Flower 1996:341–43. See already Hölscher 1990:76.

¹⁴ Likewise, there are no convincing parallels to help account for the innovation (Flower 1996:343–51).

when they must have had greater pragmatic meaning and value. This heuristic procedure is operative in every study of the Republican triumph, including my own.

How are we to envisage this ritual? On the most basic level, we are dealing with a procession of soldiers and booty that had its notional centre in the victorious general. The triumph was staged at the end of a campaign, after the return of the army, and was subject to the senate's approval. In legal terms, it involved the entry of a holder of *imperium* and of armed soldiers into the city proper. The crossing of the boundary line was therefore emphasized.¹⁶ Booty and captives were presented to the populace; some of the prisoners might be put to death once the procession had reached the Capitoline hill. The ceremony was concluded with sacrifices to Iuppiter Optimus Maximus, probably corresponding to the vows made upon departure, which were addressed to the same deity.¹⁷ The whole procedure was supposed to honour the triumphing general. Riding in the centre of the procession, he wore a costume that the satirist Juvenal (later quoted by Servius) designated as *tunica Iovis*, "the tunic of Jupiter." Other paraphernalia, too, may have been designed to associate him with Jupiter: he wore a golden crown,¹⁸ held a sceptre topped by an eagle, and rode in a quadriga that imitated the one which was displayed on the roof of the Capitoline temple. Modern scholars tend to view the satirical verses sung by the participants as apotropaic.¹⁹ Antiquarians in antiquity, however, referred some of the symbols used in the triumph to Etruria and the period of the kings. Together with the apparent connection to Jupiter, this antiquarian claim has set the agenda for two centuries of modern

¹⁶ Versnel 1970:132–63; Rüpke 1990:226–30.

¹⁷ Rüpke 1990:225.

¹⁸ Emphasized by Versnel 1970:74–77.

¹⁹ Rüpke 1990:230–33. The interpretation is elaborated in detail by Köves-Zulauf 1972:122–49 in his analysis of the words which a slave, standing behind

discussion, of whether the triumphator impersonated the god who was the embodiment of the entire *res publica*, namely Iuppiter Optimus Maximus, or rather revived the figure of the king.

I need not repeat the arguments. It was H.S. Versnel who demonstrated that the ostensible alternatives are not mutually exclusive, but two related facets of a religious ceremony known from the ancient Mediterranean world. According to Versnel, the triumph should be viewed as the modified form of a New Year's ritual during which the king confronted the highest god of the state and, in turn, became his embodiment or representative. The direct descendant of this festival is to be found on the Roman Ides of September, the *epulum Iovis* and the *ludi Romani*, opened by the *pompa circensis* that is so similar to the triumph, especially in the role played by the leading magistrate. One of Versnel's most important arguments involves the element of the triumph from which the ceremony, which had no fixed date in the calendar, derives its name: the soldiers' cry (*io*) *triumpe*. This formulation is used in the archaic *carmen Arvale*, a song that explicitly asked Mars and other deities for an epiphany and must stem from a cultic address to a deity from Asia minor, Dionysos, who was invited to appear with the cry *thráambe*.²⁰

If Versnel's interpretation were entirely correct, I could stop here. There is, however, a serious problem with his solution: The historical Romans did not associate the appearance and acclamation of the triumphant general with his ascent to divine status, to say nothing of his transformation into *Iuppiter ipse*.²¹ As is well known, the Roman nobility frowned upon peers who laid claim to royal power or identified themselves with the highest god of the *res publica*. Some even got killed for doing so. In a nutshell: why did

²⁰ See Varro, *Ling.* 6.68, who also already draws the connection with the triumph. For the New Year festival, see Versnel 1970:11ff.; 201ff. His basic argument is accepted by Coarelli 1988:414ff., in his analysis of the archaic triumph.

most of the triumphators survive their triumph for longer than, say, Julius Caesar did?

To concentrate on this problem is fair neither to Versnel nor to the complexities of the triumph, but it is crucial for any general interpretation of the ritual. In order to prepare the way for a new hypothesis, I want to invoke Victor Turner's principle of contextual meaning and start by addressing the relation between the triumph and the *pompa circensis*. The obvious parallels between the dress of the triumphator and of the magistrate who led the *pompa circensis* have led to several studies suggesting that there must have been a historical relationship between the two ceremonies.²² Whereas Versnel argued, by analogy with the triumphator, for the god-like status of the magistrate, and sought to establish an original meaning by analyzing the rituals of the Ides of September, I shall reverse the approach and concentrate on differences rather than similarities.

First of all, Versnel's most convincing arguments in favour of the hypothesis that the triumphator impersonated Jupiter are based on elements of the costume that he shared with the leading magistrate of the *pompa circensis*. Leaving aside the dream of Augustus' father,²³ two of the sources that refer to the *ornatus Iovis* (or similarly) concern the triumphator, the other two refer to the magistrate.²⁴ The same holds true of the golden crown (*corona aurea* or *Etrusca*),

²² Extensively discussed by Versnel 1970:101–15; 284–303. The treatment by Bernstein 1998:31–51 is unsatisfactory.

²³ Suet. *Aug.* 94.

²⁴ Triumphator: Liv. 10.7.10 (*ornatus Iovis*, no specific reference to the dress is detectable); Serv. *Ecl.* 10.27 (quoting Iuvenalis in referring to the *tunica palmata*); *pompa circensis*: Juv. 10.36–43 (*vestis*); Tert. *Cor.* 13.1 (*ab Iove insignes* syntactically separated from *palmatis togis*). No text explicitly states that the leader of the *pompa* in the *ludi Romani* wore the *ornatus* or *uestis triumphalis*. But everyone rightly infers from other games (such as the *ludi Apollinares*) that this was

which is attested for both, triumphator and magistrate.²⁵ But is there any reason to identify the magistrates in charge of the *pompa* with Jupiter?²⁶ They were neither victorious nor were they permanently honoured, either in their lifetime or after death, for having performed in this ritual role. They were — and this needs to be stressed — never acclaimed with *io triumphe*. There is one further argument that makes such an identification highly unlikely. The most important task of the magistrate was to round out a procession of gods to the circus. But Jupiter himself had already appeared in the *pompa*, in the form of a statue which was paraded along together with those of the other gods. So why should he appear twice?

All this has important consequences for our interpretation of the triumphator. I submit that we can no longer regard the accoutrements the triumphator shared with the magistrates leading other processions as evidence of his assimilation to Jupiter. The fact that the costume worn by the protagonists in these rituals recalled the (occasional?) dress of the Capitoline statue of Jupiter,²⁷ does not imply that the Romans must have understood wearing the *tunica palmata*, the purple toga, or the gold crown (which was too heavy to be worn on the head and hence — in both cases — had to be held by a slave),²⁸ to mean that Jupiter was being impersonated.²⁹

²⁵ Triumphator: Plin. *Nat.* 33.11; *pompa circensis*: Juv. 10.39–40; Tert. *Cor.* 13.1.

²⁶ I accept Versnel's refutation of Mommsen's theory (accepted e.g. by Wissowa 1912:452) that originally the *ludi* were simply the latter part of a triumph.

²⁷ I am convinced by Versnel's arguments (1970:73–74) for a strong interpretation of the relationship of the *uestis* with the statue of Jupiter.

²⁸ Even if associating the *processus consularis*, too, Juvenal (n. 24) is concentrating on the game-leading praetor.

²⁹ It should be noted that Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in his detailed account of the *pompa circensis* (7.70–72), does not even mention the leading magistrate, whom he was obviously unable to fit into his Greek interpretation of the ritual. If the magistrate had been considered to represent Jupiter/Jupiter, on the other hand,

The same is true of the sceptre surmounted by an eagle, which again was perhaps common to both ritual roles:³⁰ it is too general a symbol of sovereignty to support the claim that the reference must be specifically to Jupiter.³¹ In view of the fact that this combination of symbols could be used in different *ludi*, their meaning was most likely a generic one, and thus only loosely related to the specific contents of these rituals. The easiest way to interpret the costume is to see it as temporarily distinguishing an outstanding, extraordinary magistrate by means of regal symbols that, in other ritual contexts, were also used to honour Jupiter.³²

There remain two differences between the triumphator and the magistrate. First, the triumphator rode in a *quadriga*, a chariot drawn by four horses, whereas the magistrate was granted only a *biga*, drawn by two horses.³³ The *quadriga*, being the more prestigious vehicle, elevated the triumphator above the normal magistrate. This might be taken to imply a reference to Jupiter, as well as to royal status, that is to say, to the highest degree of political power.³⁴ Second, apart from the *io triumphe*, the triumphator was also coloured in red, which is not attested for the magistrate. Does this mean that the Romans saw Jupiter at the heart of the triumphal procession, as Versnel maintains?³⁵ Or did they see something else?

³⁰ See the previous note.

³¹ Thus Versnel 1970:77–78; cf. Waldner 2000:74–75. In the case of the triumphator an additional association or rather contrast with the departure of the general and his use of a spear to open hostilities might be implied. See Rüpke 1990:105–8.

³² Cf. Bonfante Warren 1970:59.

³³ Plin. *Nat.* 34.20; for the archaeological evidence see Bernstein 1998:53–57.

³⁴ Hence Versnel 1970:78 lays no stress on the *quadriga*. Given that his main interest is in the similarities of the two rituals which he takes to have developed from a common Etruscan prototype, it is perhaps unsurprising that he does not systematically explore the equally obvious differences between them.

³⁵ Versnel 1970:78, 82.

3. *Parading a Living Statue*

The earliest and principal source for the colouring of the triumphator with red paint is Pliny the Elder:

... Iovis ipsius simulacri faciem diebus festis minio inlini solitam triumphantiumque corpora; sic Camillum triumphasse; hac religione etiam num addi in unguenta cenae triumphalis et a censoribus in primis Iovem minian-dam locari.

... on feast-days, it was customary for the face of the statue of Jupiter himself to be painted with red-lead, likewise the body of triumphators. Camillus is said to have held a triumph thus painted. It was the same religious impulse that caused red-lead to be included among the substances employed at the triumphal meal, and one of the censors' first duties is to let out the contract for painting Jupiter with red-lead.³⁶

Now, why should the face of the statue of Jupiter be painted red? The answer has nothing to do with some proto-historic use of red colour, as Versnel suggests,³⁷ but with material conditions. The statue would have been made of terracotta, like the Hercules *fictilis* of the Ara Maxima.³⁸ This meant that, instead of the oil used in caring for statues of marble, the freshening up of the natural colour (as opposed to the parts that were specially painted) was done by using red paint.³⁹ If this is correct, we need look no further for an explanation of why a Roman triumphator celebrated the ritual

³⁶ Plin. *Nat.* 33.111f.; Serv. (auct.) *Ecl.* 6.22; 10.27; Isid. *Orig.* 18,2,6; Ioan. Tzetzes, *Epist.* 97 (= Dio 6), *Chil.* 13.35–48 Leone. For the statue, see Plut. *q. R.* 98.

³⁷ See Versnel 1970:78–81; tentatively Bonfante Warren 1970:54.

³⁸ Plin. *Nat.* 35.157. For the site see Coarelli 1988:81.

³⁹ Thus already Wissowa 1912:127 and Wunderlich 1925:63, drawing on Plin. *Nat.* 35.157 and 33.111–12. Despite the fact that the original inspiration for Wunderlich's thesis came from Ludwig Deubner, her book tends to reject "primitive" interpretation and to put emphasis on contemporary sources rather than ethnographic parallels, thus acknowledging the influence of her examiners Otto

painted red. He was covered in paint in imitation, not so much of Jupiter, as of a statue in terracotta.⁴⁰ Being carried in a frozen pose in a chariot,⁴¹ with red colour applied to his body (i.e. the visible parts of his skin), he was meant to recall a terracotta statue. The ancient Romans watching a triumph saw a procession in which a “stand-in” terracotta statue was carried into the city. They saw neither the (temporary) return of the monarchy, nor Jupiter returning home or being carried in state. For Jupiter, as I have pointed out above, was a familiar figure on Roman streets. Everyone knew what he looked like: he was paraded around town on a litter, in the form of a statue or bust, or represented simply by his *insignia*, especially the thunder-bolt, which were conveyed in a *tensa*, a special car that in olden times was drawn by children. No one would have confused him with a triumphator.

4. Statues for the Nobility

Here, then, is the long form of my hypothesis: In the sole form known to the Romans of the late Republic and the Empire, the triumph was an invention of the second half of the fourth century BC. It was a ritual that followed upon the (often difficult) decision of the senate to publicly acknowledge the martial achievements of a returning general. In the context of a growing fashion for displaying private statuary on public ground (described by Demosthenes as a contemporary Greek development),⁴² the Roman nobility as a whole tried to channel their desire for public prestige into a ritual that involved the publicly financed impersonation of a consciously archaic form of terracotta statues. And who could better act the part

⁴⁰ Klearchos, tyrant of Herakleia in the middle of the fourth century BC, deliberately dressed himself as a statue of a god — and painted his face red. See Versnel 1970:80, without the explanation that Klearchus wished to imitate a statue.

of the temporary statue than the one who was honoured by it? The ritual would not compel the honorand to reject later real statuary. Forming part of the creation of, and the attempt to control, a monumentalized commemorative culture,⁴³ such a ritual would even increase the symbolic value of such statues and legitimize their public display.

Sehlmeyer has recently observed that the earliest known honorific statues, that is, statues put up for a living person, represented triumphators. He went on to postulate a regular connection between triumphs and honorific statues, *Ehrenstatuen*.⁴⁴ The first recorded instance of this connection (for the year 338 BC) coincides with the first award of an honorific statue after the famous Camillus. After the successful completion of the war against Pedum, the final phase of the Latin wars 340–338 BC, the consuls L. Furius Camillus and C. Maenius “returned to Rome for the triumph decreed by the consensus of all. To the triumph the honour was added that they receive equestrian statues in the Forum, a rare event at that period” (*Romam ad destinatum omnium consensu triumphum decessere. additus triumpho honos, ut statuæ equestres eis, rara illa ætate res, in foro ponerentur*).⁴⁵

Livy stresses that the statues were *equestrian*, which implies a conceptual link between the simple award of a statue and the tri-

⁴³ See Hölscher 2001:187–88, who interprets the erection of a statue as the moment in time when current, functional knowledge was transformed into an element of historical memory and thereby afforded new forms of recognition and prestige. See also Hölkeskamp 2000; Sehlmeyer 2000.

⁴⁴ Sehlmeyer 1999:134. The connection had already been formulated less precisely by Lahusen 1983:67, who identified a statue given to M. Furius Camillus as a triumphator (over the Volsci and Aequi) after 389 BC. A discussion of these theses is lacking in Hölscher 2001:194–98, who dealt with honorific statues only as regards their placing along the route of the triumph. Already Wallace-Hadrill 1990:173 strongly argued against the assumption that statues were regularly

umph. Did Livy's Augustan construct reflect the situation at the end of the fourth century? Anthropomorphic divine images had been frequent,⁴⁶ but the same did not hold true for honorific statues of living people.⁴⁷ There is no evidence that the practice became common in Greek states before the late fourth century. There are isolated stories of statues being put up in Rome before then. Whether these stories are trustworthy is controversial.⁴⁸ Hölscher and Sehlmeier are in agreement that, at Rome, the practice of displaying statues in public began during the latter part of the fourth century, and led to a variety that greatly surpassed any known Greek models.⁴⁹ There are other indications that new commemorative practices emerged at the same time, such as the reorganization of the Forum initiated after 318 BC during the censorship of Maenius, who had previously, as noted already, been honoured by an equestrian statue and put up the so-called *Maenianum*, a building that featured a gallery for spectators.⁵⁰

We should not assume, however, that this development was directed by the senate. It is more plausible to assume that private initiative was responsible for the pursuit of the attractive possibility to represent, multiply, and immortalize one's likeness in a form and size previously reserved for gods. The warrior of Capistrano might be seen as evidence of such experiments. The granting of triumphs by the end of the fourth century may be seen as a reaction to this development, an attempt to regulate, and bring under senatorial control, an increasingly common private practice which had only recently become fashionable. Attempts to circumscribe the

⁴⁶ See Scheer 2000.

⁴⁷ Plin. *Nat.* 34.17; Hölscher 1978:328; Sehlmeier 1999:22.

⁴⁸ See the criticism of Hölscher 2001: *passim*, of Sehlmeier's rejection of every early statue that might threaten his account. Wallace-Hadrill 1990 too is sceptical.

⁴⁹ Cf. Hölscher 2001:202.

⁵⁰ Fest. 120 L; Varro, *De vita p. R.* fr. 72 Riposati; for the following course of

award of statues displayed in public continued throughout the rest of Roman (and, indeed, European) history.⁵¹ The public ritual and the (mostly) private erection of a statue complemented one another. Booty may have been displayed both during the triumph and at the site of the statue. Maenius built the famous tribunal for the speakers, the *rostra*, as location for this purpose, and some of the earliest attested statues represented the donator beside votive images of gods. The statue on the Capitol of the triumphator Spurius Carvilius, for example, stood close to a colossal image of Jupiter.⁵² In the triumph various media interacted in the representation of both the triumphator and booty, and this interaction is crucial to a proper understanding of the ritual.

If a late fourth-century date for the invention of the triumph can be maintained,⁵³ the decision to represent the victor by means of a (fictitious) terracotta image of a type that was also in use in other

⁵¹ See below, and Tanner 2000:25ff. for the late Republic.

⁵² Hölscher 1978:322–24: “Beuteanathem”; Sehlmeier 1999:113–16; more generally 128–29, 280.

⁵³ Some comparatively reliable notices in our literary sources about the display of triumphal statues suggest the late fourth century as the *terminus ante quem* for the emergence of the triumph in its classical form. Other aspects that impinge upon the question involve the rather dimly known spread of honorific statues in the wider Mediterranean world of the fifth and fourth centuries and the largely simultaneous process of the formation of the new Roman nobility during the fourth century BC. Decisive steps seem to have been taken in the wake of the constitutional changes marked by the so-called Sextian-Licinian laws, which are traditionally dated to 367 BC. Another line of argument is to exploit the similarities between triumph and *pompa circensis*. In conjunction with the admission of plebeians to the consulship in 367 BC (or thereabouts), the magistracy of the *aediles curules* was created, whose task it was to oversee the public games (see Bernstein 1998:58). As a result, the *pompa* celebrated during the *ludi* was no longer led by the supreme officer of the republic, but by lesser magistrates, who, for the time of the ritual only, assumed, by means of their clothing, the role of the “king’s successor,” which had previously been performed by the consul. This change in rit-

ritual contexts, must have been deliberate. Its chief attraction was that it gave prominence to the ritual associations of the statue and thereby stressed the role of senatorial control, even if the later erection of a permanent statue, and the choice of material for it, left plenty of scope for further semantic distinctions and the adoption of current technical standards. Bronze became the minimum standard for honorific statues; gilding would represent an exceptional honour.⁵⁴ A chryselephantine statue, on the other hand, indicated a definite transgression of the borderline between man and god. Such a statue was employed in the final honours for the dictator Caesar.⁵⁵ Whereas pedestrian statues became regular for magistrates who died while serving on foreign embassies,⁵⁶ a statue on horseback or even in a *currus* would be awarded to victorious magistrates or persons who had otherwise distinguished themselves in the service of the *res publica*. It should, however, again be stressed that it was not the statue but the accompanying public ritual that was central. Statues might be erected by all sorts of individuals or groups, but it was the performance of the public ritual that generated their status, thus blurring the difference between public and private.⁵⁷

5. Changes in the Ritual

As Versnel was able to demonstrate, the *honos* of the triumph was never seen as an honour for the gods.⁵⁸ Honouring the gods was the function of *supplicationes*, festivals of thanksgiving that were decreed “in the name of the victor” (as the later formula

games seem to indicate. It is this semantic development that I claim as a *terminus post quem* for the creation of the ritual of the triumph in its classical form.

⁵⁴ See Cic. *Phil.* 5.41; Lahusen 1999.

⁵⁵ Dio 43.14.3–7. See Tanner 2000:28 and, for late antiquity, Niquet 2000: 77–78. For chryselephantine statuary in general: Lapatin 2001:120–33.

⁵⁶ Tanner 2000:26.

run),⁵⁹ once reports of the victory had been received. From a religious point of view, a strict separation of human and divine honours was necessary. While it was possible to deny a triumph to a general, the *res publica* could not dare to withhold what was due to the gods. Still, problems remain. After all, the ritual involved the deposition of the laurel wreath to Jupiter and the sacrifice of oxen on the Capitoline hill. In other words, we have to look for precedents for and influences on the “enlightened” triumph other than the Hellenistic *pompae* on which it was so clearly modelled in its ostentatious display of booty.⁶⁰

Rome’s aristocracy engaged in “gentilician warfare” before the formation of the nobility. Only gradually, these wars became a matter for the entire commonwealth. As demonstrated in the reconstruction of the history of the fetial rites, gentilician warfare was an enterprise carried out by individual families, perhaps for their personal enrichment, but it constituted at the same time a public problem.⁶¹ We may expect that earlier rites of return from military campaigns centred on the religious obligations of the leaders. They had to fulfil their vows and dedicate part of the booty to specific deities. The deities to which the dedication was made might have been chosen according to the individual preference of the general, family tradition, or more general rules that are perhaps still reflected in the so-called *leges regiae*, the royal laws that defined the dedication of *spolia opima*, the spoils taken from the opposing leader.⁶² It is crucial to note that the Romans understood these regulations to require the victorious general to walk on his feet while carrying himself the spoils to be dedicated. Of equal importance is the fact

⁵⁹ See Rüpke 1990:215–17; in general Halkin 1953; Freyburger 1988; Hickson Hahn 2000.

⁶⁰ For the latter point see Hölscher 1990:76.

⁶¹ Rüpke 1990:97–124.

⁶² For the *spolia opima* see Rüpke 1990:217–23; the (Varronian?) text of the

that the return to the city and its boundary was a highly sensitive occasion. Rome was completely walled during the early republic, and entering the city with an armed group must have been restricted or even banned.⁶³

Even if Augustan historiography associated with one another ritual performances like the *ovatio*, the entering on foot, the *triumphus in monte Albano* (a triumph at the federal sanctuary that was celebrated for the first time in 231 BC and did not require the senate's consent), and the special form of dedication performed on the spoils of the hostile general, the *spolia opima*,⁶⁴ the "real" triumph decreed by the senate differed from the Alban triumph as regards the location (the Roman Capitol instead of the federal sanctuary) and from the *ovatio* and the dedication of the *spolia opima* with respect to how the general moved during the ritual. He arrived standing on a chariot (rather than approaching on foot), and the red paint that, as I have suggested, assimilated the triumphator to a motionless statue, would have further highlighted the difference. Public accountability for the warfare and its gains was important since the successful conclusion of a campaign brought an enormous amount of material benefits to the victorious general and opened many options for prestigious ritual activities.⁶⁵ The wide range of available ritual alternatives mentioned above, the amount of public statuary in public space, and the granting of often dubious triumphs give an indication of the small degree of success achieved by this form of control.⁶⁶

The new processional ritual conformed with the growing importance of the publicity and visibility of Roman rituals. It should be

⁶³ This brief sketch basically agrees with the reconstruction of the pre-Etruscan form of the triumph in Bonfante Warren 1970:50–56.

⁶⁴ Versnel 1970:165–68; Rüpke 1990:217–28; for the Augustan interest in reintegrating his own military successes of the civil war see Itgenshorst 2005:221–23.

⁶⁵ For the concept of senatorial control see Rich 1976; for the later republic,

pointed out that another form of military procession may have been invented only shortly afterwards, supposedly in 304 BC, the so-called *transvectio equitum*.⁶⁷ The gods were honoured by the display of booty, too. Other rituals of thanksgiving, called *supplicationes*, took place before the celebration of the triumph. The general was also expected to discharge his personal obligations to the divinities afterwards, after the sacrifice to Jupiter that concluded the triumph and corresponded to the vow of departure. The name of the new ritual offers the best indicator of its focus: *triumphus* and *triumphator* derive from the exclamation *triumpe*, which, initially, must have been of mocking character, an outcry that accompanied the general standing still on his chariot, playing his own statue. We are dealing with a form of *iambízein*, which focused its satirizing thrust on the chief protagonist of the triumph, as it did in the *pompa funebris* with the important and rich deceased.⁶⁸ The mockery of the soldiers was not “apotropaic,” but rather formed a rite of reversal (and substantial public critique) in the presence of a superior who had enjoyed the right over the life and death of his inferiors and was now confined to immobility by the rite.

6. *The Media of Representation*

The triumph was a serious matter. Many members of Rome’s ruling elite vied for the honour. The temporary appearance as a statue gave symbolic value to the permanent, too. To be permanently represented by a statue in a public place, a distinction previously by and large restricted to divinities, was as close to immortality as a Roman aristocrat could get.⁶⁹ The prestige was immense, and the Romans developed considerable ingenuity to enhance the visual impact of individual statues even further. Some claimed attention by being

⁶⁷ See Weinstock 1937:17–18. Favro 1994 stresses the enduring impact of the monumentalized processional route.

put up next to monuments of colossal size, such as larger-than-life statues of Jupiter and Hercules.⁷⁰ Others stuck out by being elevated on columns or arches.⁷¹ The dress differed as well: some chose representation in armour, others preferred the *toga*.⁷² The statue built or given on the basis of a triumph soon became the pinnacle and centre of a much wider practice. If consuls leading a *pompa triumphalis* were honoured with *quadrigae*, why not give *chariots* to praetors and *aediles* leading a *pompa circensis*? It was, in any case, one's role in processional rites that functioned as the criterion of legitimacy for the public display of a statue.⁷³

Still, Roman culture was first and foremost theatrical.⁷⁴ Frequently backed by public money, Roman generals of the middle and late Republic often used part of their military booty for building temples, but, as Orlin points out, nineteen out of twenty preferred to spend their booty on games. In contrast to temples, which were owned by deities, the generals themselves could preside over games.⁷⁵ Likewise, it was the triumphal procession, rather than the statue, that made the largest impression upon the Roman populace. Even the emperors, at a time when most generals could no longer hope to celebrate their own triumph, did not object to a bronze statue at the centre of the *ornamenta triumphalia*.⁷⁶ By using the

⁷⁰ See Hölscher 1978:323–24 on monumentalization.

⁷¹ For republican arches see de Maria 1988:31–53. See *Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae* 4 (1999) 353–72 s.v. *statua* for the range of realizations. Plattus 1983 stresses the ritual framing of the arches of the centre of Rome.

⁷² Hölscher 1978:343.

⁷³ See Plin. *Nat.* 34.20: *Non uetus et bigarum celebratio in iis, qui praetura functi curru uecti essent per circum.*

⁷⁴ Dupont 1994:31; for the triumph see 25–26.

⁷⁵ Orlin 1997:68–70.

⁷⁶ See Tac. *Agr.* 40.1: *triumphalia ornamenta et inlustris statuae honorem et quidquid pro triumpho datur.* More precise is Dio, 55.10.3, who indicates that bronze statues were a regular feature already in the time of Augustus. The term

term *ovans triumphavi* in his *Res gestae*, Augustus employed another strategy to separate triumphal honours and the *pompa* proper.⁷⁷

The triumph further affords a new perspective on the history of art. The “temporary work of art” that consisted in the living statue of the triumphator was only one of a growing number of various improvised “temporary images,” such as soldiers or captives arranged into battle scenes.⁷⁸ It is here that we have to look for the Roman origins of triumphal painting.⁷⁹ Henner von Hesberg used the term “temporary images” (*temporäre Bilder*) to describe nearly contemporaneous practices at Hellenistic courts, such as are documented for us by Calixeinus’ lengthy description of a festival given by Ptolemy II.⁸⁰ It was this demonstrative element of the whole complex that drew most of the public interest and afforded a specific celebration the best chances to enter into the literary tradition, as is evinced by the lengthy descriptions that the extraordinary triumphs of Aemilius Paulus or Pompey received.⁸¹ The further development of the triumph may be described in terms of increased theatricalization: The ritual dress, which originally simply denoted unsurpassable authority,⁸² was elaborated into a *tunica palmata* and a *toga picta*⁸³ and was used on further occasions and in statutory representations. The triumph was only one of the occasions to

⁷⁷ August. *Gest.* 4. See also Nickbakht 2005.

⁷⁸ For the impression of the latter as living images see Brilliant 1999. See Fless 2004:43 for a catalogue of representations. Plutarch (*q. R.* 111) conceptualized the Flamen Dialis as “a living statue” (*émpsychon kai hieròn ágalma*), as pointed out by Scheid 2004.

⁷⁹ See Hölscher 1978:341; cf. Holliday 2002.

⁸⁰ Athen. 5,196a–203b quoting Calixeinus of Rhodes; Hesberg 1989:65ff. Only in his very last sentence does von Hesberg point to the Roman adoption of such practices. See Rice 1983 for a detailed analysis of the procession.

⁸¹ Aemilius: Diod. 31.7.9–12; Plut. *Aem. Paul.* 32–34; Cn. Pompeius: App. *Mithr.* 116–17; Plut. *Pomp.* 45.

present military success among the varied iconography of rituals, victory celebrations, and the public conclusion of treaties.⁸⁴

The honorific statue remains of crucial importance. There is a discourse about statues in our literary sources, and, at least in the time of Cicero, this discourse was very important. His *Orationes Verrianae* bear witness to this. Statues of Marius were put up and removed; Verres' intentions and his prestige with the Sicilians can be measured by the way they dealt with statues. To a large extent, the discourse on Caesar's desire for deification is a discourse about statues. Earlier, once honorific statues had started to fill public space, memorial statues of historically important people, of kings and liberators, were added.⁸⁵ Statues created complex mnemotopes.⁸⁶ *Damnationes memoriae* tried to make sure that the persons annihilated disappeared from these mnemotopes, too.⁸⁷ Statues were not just representations of individuals but conveyed messages relating to collective values, as is demonstrated by the generally stern mien of Roman portraits.⁸⁸ Finally, when Roman coinage started to

⁸⁴ See Hölscher 1978:349, who observes that the Roman concept of an historical event was focussed on ceremonial and representative fixations of political situations and ideals ("... die zeremoniellen und repräsentativen Besiegelungen politischer Zustände und Ideale zum Inhalt hat").

⁸⁵ Hölscher 1978:349; Sehmeyer 1999:67–103.

⁸⁶ Hölscher 2001.

⁸⁷ As regulated in the *Senatusconsultum de Gn. Pisone patre* ll. 74–82: *utiq(ue) statuae et imagines Cn. Pisoni patris, quae ubiq(ue) positae essent, tollerentur; recte et ordine facturos qui quandoq(ue) familiae Calpurniae essent, quiue eam familiam cognatione adfinitateue contingerent, si dedissent operam, si quis eius gentis aut quis eorum, qui cognatus adfiniue Calpurniae familiae fuisset, mortuos esset, lugendus esset, ne inter reliquas imagines, <quibus> exequias eorum funerum celebrare solent, imago Cn. Pisoni patris duceretur, neue imaginibus familiae Calpurniae imago eius interponeretur.* See Flower 1996:24–31; Arce 1999:329; for the Republic, see Varner 2004:16–20.

⁸⁸ Verism, which is much more dominant in Roman than in Hellenistic portraits, and is not a casual development of style, has been interpreted as an expression of

develop its individualism in the last third of the second century BC, statues were among the first personal, or rather family-oriented, motives represented.⁸⁹

There is a curious consequence of the conceptual relationship between the triumph and public honorific statues. Only one group of Romans is formally equivalent to triumphators, the *virgines Vestales*. Both share the right to be buried within the boundaries of the city,⁹⁰ together they are the earliest groups in Roman historical memory to receive public statues.⁹¹ When the honouring of Livia in 9 BC firmly turned the rare practice of giving statues to women into a prerogative of the imperial *domus*, regulations were made that not only associated her with the Vestals, but had direct connections with the triumph as well. She was credited with *omina* that predicted her giving birth to future *triumphatores* and even organized a banquet for the women of Rome, parallel to Tiberius' triumphal banquet following his *ovatio* (on behalf of Drusus).⁹² Just like a triumphator's, Livia's right to a public statue was beyond discussion.

7. Pompa imaginum

A further mode of representing honorific statues in republican Rome has to be considered. It is possible to conceive of the entourage of dead ancestors, represented by actors wearing masks, which made

Tanner 2000 has made a case for placing the development of the veristic style in the 2nd century BC within the institutional context of Roman patronage, especially as extended onto foreign citizens.

⁸⁹ *RRC* 242/1; 263/1 and later. See Sehlmeier 1999:181. For this process in general, see Meadows and Williams 2001:37–38.

⁹⁰ Plut. *q. R.* 79; Serv. *Aen.* 11.206.

⁹¹ See Plin. *Nat.* 34.25, with Flory 1993:288–89, and Val. Max. 1.8.11 for Claudia Quinta.

⁹² The sources are given by Flory 1993:295–97. Flory herself does not pay spe-

up the procession that led a recently deceased former magistrate of the Republic from his house to the place of burning or burial, as consisting of all those members of the family who had been awarded a legitimate honorific statue, or at least had the right to one. (We do not know whether every aedile of the late republic received the statue that was his due during his lifetime, but I suspect they did.)

Flower has argued that those aspects of the ritual that involved the wearing of masks and the laudatory speech cannot be older than the end of the fourth century. *Termini post quem* (or coequal processes) are the restructuring of the Forum (the place where the *laudatio funebris* was delivered) and the emergence of the individualistic statuary portraits.⁹³ Flower, however, had to leave open a crucial problem that also figures largely in all the older studies on the history of the masks. What are the ritual and artificial antecedents of those masks that — according to the classical description by Polybios — tried to portray the dead ancestors as realistically as possible?⁹⁴ The traditional explanation, which invoked magic rituals applied to the dead and posited a connection to a death mask (still maintained by Heinrich Drerup in 1980), has by now been soundly refuted on the grounds of archaeological and literary evidence.⁹⁵ But the problem disappears if one applies the concept of “temporary images” to the ritual.

If the masks were intended to copy existing honorific statues or fictive memorial ones (as the line of ancestors grew longer and

⁹³ Flower 1996:341–43. If my thesis is tenable, Hölscher’s claim (2001:205) that public gentilician representation in the form of statues did not start before the middle of the second century BC will have to be modified, though he stresses the importance of ritual “performances” of statues. Bianchi’s discussion (1994) remains without clear results.

⁹⁴ Polyb. 6.53 (likeness: 6.53.5).

⁹⁵ Drerup 1980 (for magic: 119, 127); contra Lahusen 1985:263–65. It would

longer due to late republican competition and historical fiction),⁹⁶ one need no longer worry about the origin of the masks. They were either historical copies of models used for the production of the statues themselves or easily copied from the actual statue. Hence the proliferation of masks of common ancestors that would be used in many agnate and cognate families at the same time was no technical problem. At the same time, the known statues would have set standards of individuality that had to be strived for: “likeness,” not fancy, was a necessity.

Recent research has shown the convergence of the range of masks and statues, as far as the recipients are concerned. This convergence can no longer be explained by a postulated *ius imaginum* that would regulate both cases in like manner.⁹⁷ The primary factor was the proliferation of statues, finally reaching down to *aediles*. Despite the attempts of Flower to play down all the other forms of portraits,⁹⁸ already Hölscher, who thought of “historical” masks and statues as parallel developments, demonstrated that ancient discourse was much more concerned with statues than with ancestor masks.⁹⁹ The *pompa imaginum* and the *laudatio funebris* must be seen as attempts to reactualize and extend the impression made by the honorific statues with a focus on a family. By such means as cheap masks, actors and oratory the family ensemble could be represented and displayed, and defined according to needs.¹⁰⁰ Here,

⁹⁶ See Dondin-Payre 1990:58–59, 66–72 for the creation of fictive genealogies. Such fictions did enhance the normative value of genealogy, as is rightly noticed by Hölkeskamp 1996:322.

⁹⁷ Flower 1996:53–56, against Lahusen 1983:113–27; Lahusen 1985.

⁹⁸ Flower 1996:70ff.

⁹⁹ Hölscher 1978:325. However, the argument should be built on sources like Ennius (e.g. *Scipio* = *var.* 1–2 Vahlen; cf. Liv. 38.56.22; Val. Max. 4.1.6) or Cicero, rather than on Pliny’s book dealing with metals (*naturalis historia* 34,15ff.); cf. Drerup 1980:127.

again, Greek temporary images might have been a source of inspiration, festival practices that delighted in the visualization of groups of people, perhaps even genealogies.¹⁰¹ In contrast to the Hellenistic festivals centred on courts that were locally fixed and would therefore stress the arrangement of real statuary, the Roman practice, as part of the competition within a polyfocal aristocracy, laid stress on rituals in public space and on actors performing statues, a feature also popular in the festivals of early Hellenism.¹⁰²

None of this excludes statuary programs in private villas, shown in the context of private festivals. The presentation of masks and *tituli* to clients and visitors in the *atrium* of the house of a Roman noble attests to the interest in demonstrating a complete lineage — and to the limits of this interest. More impressive arrangements than closed cupboards and depicted genealogical trees were possible!¹⁰³ Not masks and cupboards (even if they were better preserved) dominate the archaeological records from Roman villas, but fully fledged portrait busts and statuary.¹⁰⁴ It is only by being placed in a spectacular location that a mask could be endowed with

¹⁰¹ Hesberg 1989. A genealogical row of figures might have been part of the tomb of Nikokreon, king of Salamis, from the end of the fourth century BC (*ibid.*, 67–68).

¹⁰² Hesberg 1989:77. This is one of the elements that argue — against Sehmeyer 1999 — for a priority of the Greek form, and hence for a process of reception like those shown for a wide range of elements by Hölscher 1990. What is important is not the temporal priority of invention, but the different use to which these inventions (and even their producers, Greek artists, see Gruen 1992:140) are put. Drerup, too, thought he had identified pure Roman forms and institutions in the use of the wax mask (1980:120). For the Greek use of masks, see e.g. Carter 1987; Frontisi-Ducroux 1991; for other Roman practices, see Meuli 1955.

¹⁰³ The “Kastengräber” of freedmen, showing reliefs of persons as if looking out of a window (“Fenstergucker”) are interpreted by Lahusen 1985:283–84 as an even more economic form of presentation.

permanent importance: The deposition of the mask of Scipio Africanus in the temple of Jupiter¹⁰⁵ was a spectacular act of this kind, making its impression not by virtue of the inherent quality of the mask but by the contrast between the public location and the intimate, domestic object.¹⁰⁶

My thesis has several further advantages. The ancient Romans were strikingly preoccupied with, and careful in, their dealings with spirits and shadows, as evinced by such festivals as the Parentalia, the Lemuria, or the *kalendae fabariae*.¹⁰⁷ This preoccupation would seem to make their nonchalance about the appearance of dead ancestors during the *pompa funebris* strikingly odd. But if the actors who represented these ancestors by wearing masks are seen as representing statues, rather than dead persons, the apparent oddity that the Romans did not seem to worry about dead people rumbling through their city disappears. A procession formed by living statues was much more comfortable to deal with. By the time of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, but probably much earlier, perhaps right from the start, the satirical figures of the *pompa circensis*, too, formed part of, or had entered into, the funeral *exsequiae*.¹⁰⁸ Only by the time of Principate, as is attested for the funeral of Vespasian (though qualified as *mos*), did the actors no longer just

¹⁰⁵ Val. Max. 8.15.1–2.; App. *Iber.* 89.

¹⁰⁶ Flower 1996:48–51.

¹⁰⁷ See Toynbee 1971:33–42 and, concentrating on the funerary rites, Deschamps 1995; cf. Bremmer 1994 and Sourvinou-Inwood 1995 for Greece, Briquel 1987 for Etruria. This problem, first articulated in a discussion of a paper given by Egon Flaig at the university of Tübingen, was in fact the beginning of my thinking about Roman masks and the red face of the triumphator. Kierdorf 1991:84–85 solves the problem by stressing the close relationship between the living and the dead in Rome, shown in particular by the *pompa imaginum*. Dupont 1987:171 had offered a solution by maintaining that the masks represented the living part of the dead, without any defilement; she was followed in principle by

imitate motionless statues carried in chariots (as in the time of Polybios),¹⁰⁹ but interacted with the spectators. Having heard that the *pompa* cost ten million sesterces, Favor, imitating Vespasian in words and deeds, exclaimed: “Give me just one hundred thousand and throw me into the Tiber!”¹¹⁰

Such sums were necessary not just to pay for the actors, but to attract the necessary public by the promise of a subsequent lavish banquet and *munera*, gladiatorial shows.¹¹¹ The temporary medium of the ritual had its prize, too. And yet, there is an important difference as regards the triumph. Whereas the triumph as a ritual was depicted and carved into reliefs, not a single instance of an ancient representation of the *pompa imaginum* is known.¹¹² This observation may have a chronological explanation: In the heyday of preserved relief, i.e. the Principate, the *pompa imaginum* had already fallen into disuse.¹¹³ But I would suggest that there is another reason as well. Whereas the triumph was an argument in itself, the funerary procession by and large displayed only existent statuary. Not the ritual but the number of statues was to be multiplied — again the aftermath of the *funus* is a typical instigation for the creation of public honorific statues for the defunct immediately afterwards.¹¹⁴ Finally, one further difference should be pointed out. The triumph normally presupposed a senatorial decision recognizing the legitimacy of the general’s claim to be honoured. Such formalized control is lacking for the *funus*. Descent from famous Roman families

¹⁰⁹ Polyb. 6.53.8.

¹¹⁰ Suet. *Vesp.* 19.2: *Se et in funere Fauor archimimus personam eius ferens imitansque, ut est mos, facta ac dicta uiui, interrogatis palam procuratoribus, quanti funus et pompa constaret, ut audit sestertium centiens, exclamauit, centum sibi sestertia darent ac se uel in Tiberim proicerent.*

¹¹¹ Stressed by Bodel 1999.

¹¹² Fless 2004:50.

¹¹³ See Bodel 1999:271, for the Augustan attempt of monopolization of this rit-

and even gods was claimed, but not always believed.¹¹⁵ But that was where the centre of interest lay. The documentation of such detailed constructions and claims was better left to historiography than reliefs.

8. *Statues and Immortality*

In the course of this paper, two important Roman rituals which supposedly featured magical or, rather, anachronistic religious elements, have emerged as historical creations that reflect forms of public honouring which were newly introduced at the end of the fourth century and involved the setting up of terracotta, and, soon afterwards, bronze statues in public space.¹¹⁶ Why, however, were statues so important as to attract such a degree of ritualization?

We do not know anything about Roman attitudes in the fourth century BC to images of deities. As the Romans shared the combination of temple and cult image, the combination of sacrifices at an altar outside and presentation of food inside a temple, in front of a cult statue, and as they shared the cultivation of sanctuaries, altars and sacred groves with many Mediterranean cultures, we could presuppose that their attitude towards images did not differ *in principle* from what we know about Greek attitudes. Those were far ranging and varying according to situation. The identification of image and deity in the address of a statue probably coexisted with a clear conception of statues as human artefacts.¹¹⁷ An analogous ambivalence applied to statuary representations of humans. In his discourse about statues in his speeches against Verres, Cicero credited contemporary Greeks with the sentiment that statues of humans had a divine dimension.¹¹⁸ Unlike Cicero, we have no rea-

¹¹⁵ See Hölkeskamp 1996:322 for examples, such as Cic. *Brut.* 62; Liv. 4.16.4.

¹¹⁶ See in general Hölscher 1990 and Bonfante 1978 for the crucial role of the fourth century in developing local sepulchral practices.

son not to extend this notion to the Romans as well, of the first no less than of the fourth century, even if they attempted to maintain the differences.¹¹⁹ As I said above, having a bronze statue set up in a public space was as close to immortality as a mortal could get during lifetime.¹²⁰ Peter Stewart has recently shown that images on tombstones frequently depict statues or busts of the deceased, not the persons proper.¹²¹ Statues embodied social eternity. Thus, the preoccupation, even obsession with a statue is understandable.

Honorific statues were more than “Symbole nobilitären Standesbewußtseins,” symbols of self-esteem of the nobility.¹²² The mechanisms involved continued into and throughout the Principate, they were part of a history that led to (and survived) Byzantine iconoclasm. The development of the triumph under Augustus offers a splendid illustration. The first *princeps* monopolized the triumph for the emperor and members of the imperial family.¹²³ A similar development can be detected as regards the *pompae funebres*, which acquired a new orientation directed towards the imperial household.¹²⁴ In both cases, the emperor put his stamp on large theatrical rituals.¹²⁵

uidissem, propterea quod apud omnis Graecos hic mos est, ut honorem hominibus habitum in monumentis eius modi non nulla religione deorum consecrari arbitrentur.

¹¹⁹ See Gregory 1994:98–99; Stewart 2003:31–33. Orlin’s characterization (1997:71–72) of statues as a non-religious alternative to victory rituals is misleading.

¹²⁰ See Tanner 2000 and Niquet 2000:77 for many literary and epigraphic instances connecting the honour of a statue with notions of eternity. Texts would offer even more possibilities (see Feldherr 2000), but they would not be as accessible to the general public as poets usually supposed.

¹²¹ Stewart 2003:92, 102.

¹²² Thus Sehlmeier 1999:278–84.

¹²³ Barini 1952; Rüpke 1990:208, 234.

¹²⁴ Lahusen 1985:267 with an argument *e silentio* that has to be modified on the basis of the *Senatusconsultum de Cn. Pisone patre*; Bodel 1999:271.

¹²⁵ For the many dramatic elements of the complex funeral ritual see Arce 1999:331,

Augustus, however, did not triumph after establishing his monopoly. The permanence of the victorious power, its felicity, could no longer be adequately expressed by setting up new statues among the mass of existing ones. For the use of an inflationary medium, the context was decisive: At least for Rome, small statuettes of Augustus between *genii* or *lares* were more important than another life-size statue in the Forum.¹²⁶ Triumphal practices were concentrated on the new temple of Mars Ultor, where triumphal imagery abounded.¹²⁷ In the long run, the triumph lost its processional character and was concentrated in the circus.¹²⁸ Coins and the inscriptional copies of the *Res gestae* demonstrate the importance of representation in other media from Augustus onwards.

The meaning of the triumph changed. In his *Res gestae*, Augustus described himself as having triumphed *ovans*, thus defining an important alternative to the triumph, the *ovatio*, as a mere variant.¹²⁹ The triumph had become an urban form of control of the appropriation of victory, rivalling the monumental *tropaia* built in the provinces.¹³⁰ The monopoly on victory implied a monopoly on triumphs. Even the most prestigious statues had to be set up without preceding processions. The collegial conception of rulership was reflected in the erection of groups of statues, irrespective of actual participation in a military campaign.¹³¹ For their statues, the emperors could be displayed in a seated position used in the procession (on a four-wheeled vehicle, a *carpentum*).¹³² This, however, points to remaining associations. Trajan, for instance, even cele-

¹²⁶ For the reform of the compital cult see Frascetti 1990, esp. 331–60; Rüpke 1998.

¹²⁷ Hickson 1991:133–34; for details see Siebler 1988; Ganzert 1988.

¹²⁸ McCormick 1987:99–100.

¹²⁹ August. *Gest.* 4. See Itgenshorst 2004:458 for the Augustan canonization of the past.

¹³⁰ See Rüpke 1990:201; for the “theology of victory” see Heim 1992.

brated his triumph posthumously, as a statue — without obvious theological difficulties.¹³³ Constantius II entered Rome in 357 in a processional manner, immobile as a statue according to the description by Ammianus Marcellinus.¹³⁴ Yet it was an event that took place a generation earlier that produced the account of a ritual that shows us the combination of a procession and the erection of a real statue: the erection of a statue of Constantine on the day of consecration of Constantinople, 11 May 330:

The statue in the Forum received many solemn hymns. The governor Olbianus, the *spatharii*, the *cubicularii*, and also the *silentarii*, forming an escort with white candles, all dressed in white garments, brought it raised on a carriage . . . it was revered as the Tyche of the city by all, including the army. And finally it was raised on a pillar in the presence of the priest and the procession, and everyone cried out the *Kyrie eleison* a hundred times.¹³⁵

In a Christian city, *io triumpe* had to be dropped.

University of Erfurt
Comparative Religion
P.O. Box 900 221
99105 Erfurt, Germany
joerg.ruepke@uni-erfurt.de

JÖRG RÜPKE

REFERENCES

Arce, Javier

- 1999 “Los funerales romanos: problemas y perspectivas.” In Corinne Bonnet and Andre Motte, *Les Syncretismes Religieux dans le monde mediterraneen Antique*, Brussels: Brepols, 323–336.

Barini, Concetta

- 1952 *Triumphalia: Imprese ed onori militari durante l'impero romano* (Studi superiori [5]), Turin: Società editrice internazionale.

¹³³ *Historia Augusta*, *Hadr.* 6.3.

¹³⁴ *Amm. Marc.* 16.10.9–10; cf. Stewart 2003:112 and 152 with a direct refer-

Bauer, Franz Alto

- 2001 "Urban Space and Ritual: Constantinople in Late Antiquity." *Acta ad Archaeologiam et artium historiam pertinentia* 15 (ns 1):27–61.

Beard, Mary, John North, and Simon Price

- 1998 *Religions of Rome. 1: A History. 2: A Sourcebook*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- 2003 "The Triumph of the Absurd: Roman Street Theatre." In Catherine Edwards and Greg Woolf (eds.), *Rome the Cosmopolis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 21–43.

- 2004 "Writing ritual: The triumph of Ovid." In Alessandro Barchiesi, Jörg Rüpke, and Susan Stephens (eds.), *Rituals in Ink* (Potsdamer Altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 10), Stuttgart: Steiner, 115–126.

Belayche, Nicole

- 1995 "La neuvaune funéraire a Rome ou 'la mort impossible.'" In François Hinard (ed.), *La mort au quotidien dans le monde romain*, Paris: Boccard, 155–169.

Bernstein, Frank

- 1998 *Ludi publici: Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Entwicklung der öffentlichen Spiele im republikanischen Rom* (Historia Einzelschriften 119), Stuttgart: Steiner.

Bianchi, Luca

- 1994 "YPO THN OPSIN: Polibio e le 'vere immagini' del funerale romano." *Aevum Antiquum* 7:137–153.

Bodel, John

- 1999 "Death on Display: Looking at Roman Funerals." In Bettina Bergmann and Christine Kondoleon (eds.), *The Art of Ancient Spectacle* (Studies in the History of Art 56), Washington and New Haven: National Gallery of Art/Yale University Press, 259–281.

Bonfante, Larissa

- 1978 "Historical Art: Etruscan and Early Roman." *American Journal of Ancient History* 3:136–162.

Bonfante Warren, Larissa

- 1970 "Roman Triumphs and Etruscan Kings: The Changing Face of the Triumph." *Journal of Roman Studies* 60:49–66.

- 1973 "Roman Costumes: A Glossary and Some Etruscan Derivation." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* 1.4:584–614.

Bremmer, Jan

- 1994 "The Soul, Death and the Afterlife in Early and Classical Greece." In J.M. Bremer et al. (eds.), *Hidden Futures: Death and Immortality in Ancient*

Brilliant, Richard

- 1999 "Let the Trumpets Roar! The Roman Triumph." In Bettina Bergmann and Christine Kondoleon (eds.), *The Art of Ancient Spectacle* (Studies in the History of Art 56), Washington and New Haven: National Gallery of Art/Yale University Press, 221–229.

Briquel, Dominique

- 1987 "Regards étrusques sur l'au-delà." In François Hinard (ed.), *La mort, les morts et l'au-delà dans le monde romain*, Caen: Presses universitaires de Caen, 263–277.

Carter, Jane Burr

- 1987 "The Masks of Ortheia." *American Journal of Archaeology* 91:355–383.

Coarelli, Filippo

- 1985 *Il Foro Romano 2: Periodo repubblicano e augusteo*. Rome: Quasar.
 1988 *Il Foro Boario: Dalle origine alla fine della repubblica*. Rome: Quasar.

Corbier, Mireille

- 1990 "Les comportements familiaux de l'aristocratie romaine (II^e siècle av. J.-C.–III^e siècle ap. J.-C.)." In Jean Andreau and Hinnerk Bruhns (eds.), *Parenté et stratégies familiales dans l'antiquité romaines* (Collection de l'École française de Rome 129), Rome: École française, 225–249.

Deschamps, Lucienne

- 1995 "Rites funéraires de la Rome républicaine." In François Hinard (ed.), *La mort au quotidien dans le monde romain*, Paris: Boccard, 171–180.

Dondin-Payre, Monique

- 1990 "La stratégie symbolique de la parenté sous la république et l'empire romains." In Jean Andreau and Hinnerk Bruhns (eds.), *Parenté et stratégies familiales dans l'antiquité romaines* (Collection de l'École française de Rome 129), Rome: École française, 53–76.

Drerup, Heinrich

- 1980 "Totenmaske und Ahnenbild bei den Römern." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abt.* 87:81–129.

Dupont, Florence

- 1987 "Les morts et la mémoire: la masque funèbre." In François Hinard (ed.), *La mort, les morts et l'au-delà dans le monde romain*, Caen: Presses universitaires de Caen, 167–172.
 1994 *L'invention de la littérature: De l'ivresse grecque au livre latin*. Paris: La Découverte.

Favro, Diane

- 1994 "The Street Triumphant: The Urban Impact of Roman Triumphal Parades." In Zeynep Çelik, Diane Favro, and Richard Ingersoll (eds.),

- Feldherr, Andrew
 2000 "Non inter nota sepulcra: Catullus 101 and Roman Funerary Ritual." *Classical Antiquity* 19:209–231.
- Fless, Friederike
 2004 "Römische Prozessionen." *Thesaurus cultus et rituum antiquorum*, Los Angeles: Paul Getty Museum, 1:33–58.
- Flory, Marleen B.
 1993 "Livia and the History of Public Honorific Statues for Women in Rome." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 123:287–308.
- Flower, Harriet I.
 1996 *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Fraschetti, Augusto
 1990 *Roma e il principe: Ricerche di storia urbana nell'età di Augusto e di Tiberio*. Bari: Laterza.
- Freyburger, Gérard
 1988 "Supplication grecques et supplication romaine." *Latomus* 47:501–525.
- Frontisi-Ducroux, Françoise
 1991 *Le Dieu-Masque: Une figure du Dionysos d'Athènes* (Images a l'appui 4), Paris: La Découverte, 213–232.
- Ganzert, Joachim
 1988 "Der Mars-Ulter-Tempel auf dem Augustusforum in Rom: Ein Bericht über die laufenden Bauforschungsarbeiten und Beitrag zur Sakralbau-Entwicklung." *Antike Welt* 19:36–59.
- Gordon, Richard L.
 1979 "The Real and the Imaginary: Production and Religion in the Graeco-Roman World." *Art History* 2:5–34.
- Gregory, Andrew P.
 1994 "'Powerful images': Responses to Portraits and the Political Uses of Images in Rome." *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 7:80–99.
- Grimes, Ronald
 1995 "Masking." In id. *Beginnings in Ritual Studies*, Columbia: Columbia University Press, 78–89.
- Gruen, Erich S.
 1992 *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 52), Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
 1996 "The Roman Oligarchy: Image and Perception." In Jerzy Linderski (ed.), *Imperium sine fine: T. Robert S. Broughton and the Roman Republic* (Historia Einzelschriften 105), Stuttgart: Steiner, 215–234.

Hackl, Ursula

- 1982 *Senat und Magistratur in Rom von der Mitte des 2. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. bis zur Diktatur Sullas* (Regensburger historische Forschungen 9), Kallmünz: Laßleben.

Halkin, Léon

- 1953 *La supplication d'action de grâces chez les Romains* (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège 128), Paris: Belles Lettres.

Harris, W[illiam] V.

- 1990 "On Defining the Political Culture of the Roman Republic: Some Comments on Rosenstein, Williamson, and North." *Classical Philology* 85:288–293 (responses: 294–298).

Heim, François

- 1992 *La théologie de la victoire de Constantin à Théodose* (Théologie historique 89), Paris: Beauchesne.

Hesberg, Henner von

- 1989 "Temporäre Bilder oder die Grenzen der Kunst." *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 104:61–82.

Hickson, Frances V.

- 1991 "Augustus Triumphator: Manipulation of the Triumphal Theme in the Political Program of Augustus." *Latomus* 50:124–138.

Hickson-Hahn, Frances

- 2000 "Pompey's Supplicatio Duplicata: A Novel Form of Thanksgiving." *Phoenix* 54:244–254.

Hölkeskamp, Karl Joachim

- 1987 *Die Entstehung der Nobilität: Studien zur sozialen und politischen Geschichte der Römischen Republik im 4. Jhd. v. Chr.* Stuttgart: Steiner.
- 1993 "Conquest, Competition and Consensus: Roman Expansion in Italy and the Rise of the Nobilitas." *Historia* 42:12–39.
- 1994 "[Rev.] N.S. Rosenstein, Imperatores Victi. . . ." *Gnomon* 66:332–341.
- 1996 "Exempla und mos maiorum: Überlegungen zum kollektiven Gedächtnis der Nobilität." In Hans-Joachim Gehrke and Astrid Möller (eds.), *Vergangenheit und Lebenswelt: Soziale Kommunikation, Traditionsbildung und historisches Bewußtsein* (ScriptOralia 90), Tübingen: Günter Narr Verlag, 301–338.
- 2000 "Fides — deditio in fidem — dextra data et accepta: Recht, Religion und Ritual in Rom." In Christer Bruun (ed.), *The Roman Middle Republic: Politics, Religion, and Historiography c. 400–133 B.C.* (Acta Instituti Finlandiae 23), Rome: Institutum Romanum, 223–250.

Hölscher, Tonio

- 1978 "Die Anfänge römischer Repräsentationskunst." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Rom* 85:315–357.
- 1990 "Römische Nobiles und hellenistische Herrscher." In *Akten des XIII. Internationalen Kongresses für Klassische Archäologie*, Mainz: Zabern, 73–84.
- 2001 "Die Alten vor Augen: Politische Denkmäler und öffentliches Gedächtnis im republikanischen Rom." In Gert Melville (ed.), *Institutionalität und Symbolisierung: Verstetigungen kultureller Ordnungsmuster in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart*, Cologne: Böhlau, 183–211.

Holliday, Peter J.

- 2002 *The Origins of Roman Historical Commemoration in the Visual Arts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Itgenshorst, Tanja

- 2004 "Augustus und der republikanische Triumph: Triumphalfasten und summi viri-Galerie als Instrumente der imperialen Machtsicherung." *Hermes* 132:436–458.
- 2005 *Tota illa pompa: Der Triumph in der römischen Republik* (Hypomnemata 161), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Kierdorf, Wilhelm

- 1991 "Totenehrung im republikanischen Rom." In Gerhard Binder and Bernd Effe (eds.), *Tod und Jenseits im Altertum* (Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium 6), Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 71–87.

Köves-Zulauf, Thomas

- 1972 *Reden und Schweigen: Römische Religion bei Plinius Maior* (Studia et Testimonia antiqua 12), Munich: Fink.

Künzl, Ernst

- 1988 *Der römische Triumph: Siegesfeiern im antiken Rom*. Munich: Beck.

Lahusen, Goetz

- 1983 *Untersuchungen zur Ehrenstatue in Rom: Literarische und epigraphische Zeugnisse* (Archaeologica 35), Rome: Bretschneider.
- 1985 "Zur Funktion und Rezeption des römischen Ahnenbildes." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abt.* 92:261–289.
- 1999 "Zu römischen Statuen und Bildnissen aus Gold und Silber." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 128:251–266.

Lapatin, Kenneth D.

- 2001 *Chryselephantine Statuary in the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maria, Sandro de

- McCormick, Michael
 1987 *Eternal Victory: Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium, and the Early Medieval West*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meadows, Andrew, and Jonathan Williams
 2001 "Moneta and the Monuments: Coinage and Politics in Republican Rome." *Journal of Roman Studies* 91:27–49.
- Meuli, Karl
 1955 "Altrömischer Maskenbrauch." *Museum Helveticum* 12:206–235.
- Nickbakht, Mehran A.
 2005 "Zur ovatio des jüngeren Drusus in den Fasti Ostienses und Fasti Amiterni." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 153:264–66.
- Niquet, Heike
 2000 *Monumenta virtutum titulique: Senatorische Selbstdarstellung im spätantiken Rom im Spiegel der epigraphischen Denkmäler* (Heidelberger althistorische Beiträge und epigraphische Studien 34), Stuttgart: Steiner.
- North, John [A.]
 1990 "Politics and Aristocracy in the Roman Republic." *Classical Philology* 85:277–287.
- Östenberg, Ida
 2003 *Staging the World: Rome and the Other in the Triumphal Procession*. Diss. Lund.
- Orlin, Eric M.
 1997 *Temples, Religion and Politics in the Roman Republic* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 164), Leiden: Brill.
- Pietilä-Castrén, Leena
 1987 *Magnificentia publica: The Victory Monuments of the Roman Generals in the Era of the Punic Wars* (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 84), Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.
- Plattus, Alan
 1983 "Passages into the City: The Interpretive Function of the Roman Triumph." *Princeton Journal* 1:91–115.
- Rice, E.E.
 1983 *The Grand Procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rich, J.W.
 1976 *Declaring War in the Roman Republic in the Period of Transmarine Expansion* (Collection Latomus 149), Brussels: Latomus.
- Rosenstein, Nathan
 1990a *Imperatores victi: Military Defeat and Aristocratic Competition in the*

- 1990b "War, Failure, and Aristocratic Competition." *Classical Philology* 85:255–265.
- RRC
Michael Crawford. *Roman Republican Coinage*. Cambridge 1974.
- Rüpke, Jörg
1990 *Domi militiae: Die religiöse Konstruktion des Krieges in Rom*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
1994 "Die religiöse Konstruktion des Krieges in Rom." In Hans Wißmann (ed.), *Krieg und Religion*, Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 55–78.
1995 "Wege zum Töten, Wege zum Ruhm: Krieg in der römischen Republik." In Heinrich von Stietencron and Jörg Rüpke (eds.), *Töten im Krieg* (Schriften des Instituts für Historische Anthropologie 6), Freiburg: Alber, 213–240.
1998 "Les archives des petits collèges: Le cas des vicomagistri." In *La mémoire perdue: Recherches sur l'administration romaine* (Collection de l'École française de Rome 243), Rome: École française de Rome, 27–44.
2004 *La religione dei Romani*. Trans. Umberto Gandini. Torino: Einaudi. [German Munich 2001.]
- Scheer, Tanja S[usanne]
2000 *Die Gottheit und ihr Bild: Untersuchungen zur Funktion griechischer Kultbilder in Religion und Politik* (Zetemata 105), Munich: Beck.
- Scheid, John
1984 "'Contraria facere': Renversements et déplacements dans les rites funéraires." *Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale, Archeologia e storia antica* 6:117–139.
2004 *Quand faire est croire*. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Sehlmeyer, Markus
1999 *Stadtrömische Ehrenstatuen der republikanischen Zeit: Historizität und Kontext von Symbolen nobilitären Standesbewusstseins* (Historia Einzelschriften 130), Stuttgart: Steiner.
2000 "Die kommunikative Leistung römischer Ehrenstatuen." In M. Braun, H. Haltenhoff, and F.H. Mutschler (eds.), *Moribus antiquis res stat Romana: Römische Werte und römische Literatur im 3. und 2. Jh. v. Chr.* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 134), Munich/Leipzig: Saur, 271–284.
- Siebler, Michael
1988 *Studien zum augusteischen Mars Ultor* (Münchener Arbeiten zur Kunstgeschichte und Archäologie 1), Munich: Editio Maris.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, Christiane
1995 "Reading" *Greek Death: To the End of the Classical Period*. Oxford:

- Stewart, Peter
 2003 *Statues in Roman Society: Representation and Response*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tanner, Jeremy
 2000 "Portraits, Power, and Patronage in the Late Roman Republic." *Journal of Roman Studies* 90:18–50.
- Toynbee, J[ocelyn] M[ary] C[atherine]
 1971 *Death and Burial in the Roman World*. [London]: Thames & Hudson. [Repr. 1996.]
- Varner, Eric R.
 2004 *Mutilation and Transformation: Damnatio Memoriae and Roman Imperial Portraiture*. Leiden: Brill.
- Versnel, H[enrik] S[imon]
 1970 *Triumphus: An Inquiry into the Origin, Development and Meaning of the Roman Triumph*. Leiden: Brill.
- Waldner, Katharina
 2000 *Geburt und Hochzeit des Kriegers: Geschlechterdifferenz und Initiation in Mythos und Ritual der griechischen Polis* (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 46), Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew
 1990 "Roman Arches and Greek Honours: The Language of Power at Rome." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 36:143–181.
- Weinstock, Stefan
 1937 "Römische Reiterparade." *Studie e materiali di storia delle religioni* 13: 10–24.
- Wissowa, Georg
 1912 *Religion und Kultus der Römer*. 2nd ed. (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 5.4), Munich: Beck.
- Wunderlich, Eva
 1925 *Die Bedeutung der roten Farbe im Kultus der Griechen und Römer: Erläutert mit Berücksichtigung entsprechender Bräuche bei anderen Völkern* (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 20.1), Giessen: Töpelmann.
- Ziolkowski, Adam
 1992 *The Temples of Mid-Republican Rome and their Historical and Topographical Context* (Saggi di Storia antica 4), Rome: Bretschneider.