

ROMAN MALE PORTRAIT SCULPTURE OF THE
MIDDLE AND LATE REPUBLICAN PERIOD

FRANCESCO P.A. MOTTA

VOLUME I

The University of Sydney

Copyright in relation to this thesis*

Under the Copyright Act 1968 (several provision of which are referred to below), this thesis must be used only under the normal conditions of scholarly fair dealing for the purposes of research, criticism or review. In particular no results or conclusions should be extracted from it, nor should it be copied or closely paraphrased in whole or in part without the written consent of the author. Proper written acknowledgement should be made for any assistance obtained from this thesis.

Under Section 35(2) of the Copyright Act 1968 'the author of a literary, dramatic, musical or artistic work is the owner of any copyright subsisting in the work'. By virtue of Section 32(1) copyright 'subsists in an original literary, dramatic, musical or artistic work that is unpublished' and of which the author was an Australian citizen, an Australian protected person or a person resident in Australia.

The Act, by Section 36(1) provides: 'Subject to this Act, the copyright in a literary, dramatic, musical or artistic work is infringed by a person who, not being the owner of the copyright and without the licence of the owner of the copyright, does in Australia, or authorises the doing in Australia of, any act comprised in the copyright'.

Section 31(1)(a)(i) provides that copyright includes the exclusive right to 'reproduce the work in a material form'. Thus, copyright is infringed by a person who, not being the owner of the copyright, reproduces or authorises the reproduction of a work, or of more than a reasonable part of the work, in a material form, unless the reproduction is a 'fair dealing' with the work 'for the purpose of research or study' as further defined in Sections 40 and 41 of the Act.

Section 51(2) provides that "Where a manuscript, or a copy, of a thesis or other similar literary work that has not been published is kept in a library of a university or other similar institution or in an archives, the copyright in the thesis or other work is not infringed by the making of a copy of the thesis or other work by or on behalf of the officer in charge of the library or archives if the copy is supplied to a person who satisfies an authorized officer of the library or archives that he requires the copy for the purpose of research or study'.

*'Thesis' includes 'treatise', dissertation' and other similar productions.

ROMAN MALE PORTRAIT SCULPTURE OF THE
MIDDLE AND LATE REPUBLICAN PERIOD

Ω

*ITS MEANING, ORIGINS AND COURSE OF
DEVELOPMENT*

BY

FRANCESCO P. A. MOTTA
8605208

**This Thesis is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Doctor of
Philosophy at the University of Sydney**

Abstract

In this thesis, I explore certain issues relating to whether a 'Roman' style for male portrait sculpture can be defined and identified for the middle and late Republican periods. To do so, I concentrate on the communicational intent of Roman Republican portraiture and the meaning imparted by it to the ancient Roman viewer. I also consider what the information obtained may tell us concerning the origins and course of development of the genre.

The methodology of this study is both hermeneutic and empirical - relying on the textual evidence provided by Latin literature and inscriptions to define the existence, meaning and appearance of Roman portrait sculpture in the Republican period, as well as other surviving portraits in diverse media. Primarily, I shall utilise Roman Physiognomic beliefs - i.e., whether the Romans believed that specific cultural, moral, ethical, emotional or social messages were communicated via the physical features, gesture, gait, or facial expression - and whether these beliefs can be utilised in an effective way for identifying surviving Roman portraits, in adducing their meaning and in better understanding their function.

The literary evidence shows that the Romans had precise understandings of gesture, gait and facial expression in communicating certain ethical, moral or emotional states of an individual, known in Latin as the *motus animi*. Particularly, the Romans believed that the values of *severitas/gravitas* were communicated by a precise form of facial expression which consisted of contracted eyebrows and forehead, and down-turned mouth. It also shows that the values of *severitas/gravitas* were considered among the most important of the ruling élite at Rome, and that these values were thought to be evoked through the appearance of portraits of leading individuals, including those images of deceased notable Romans - referred to as *imagines maiorum*. The literary evidence also suggests that portraits were made from diverse material and were displayed and utilised for various social and political functions. The evidence supports the conclusion that the predominant class to utilise and to benefit from portraiture at Rome in the Republican period were male members of the ruling élite, known as the *nobiles*. However, despite the close association with the form, context and utilisation of portraiture with male members of the élite class, the rules governing the creation and display of portraiture were generally customary, defined by the practice of the ancestors or the *mos maiorum* - it appears that any individual could erect a portrait provided he had the requisite social (and economic standing), particularly in private or semi private contexts and particularly outside of Rome.

When these findings are applied to the archaeological material it is evident that the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression can be found on portrait after portrait, irrespective of the overall stylistic repertoire utilised to construct it. Where this facial expression is applied to a portrait, it signifies a conscious attempt to convey very precise Roman values to the viewer. It is thus the facial expression by which I define Roman male portraiture during the Republican period, which I term the "Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* style".

When the dating of the surviving portraits, the context of the display, mode of manufacture and relationship between the patron and artist are examined, the conclusion is that the Roman Republican portraits were very much a phenomenon of Roman culture and society. These findings have important ramifications for understanding the origins and course of development of portraiture at Rome and impacts on the existence of a separate and distinct Roman artistic culture, despite the profound influence of Greek art.

Dedication

In memoria dei miei genitori gentilissimi

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my thanks to various people who have assisted me with both ideas and suggestions in the drafting and layout of this thesis. Among those is my first supervisor, Prof. J.-P. Descoeudres, and my subsequent supervisors, Prof. J.R. Green and Dr. Ted Robinson. I would like also to thank Prof. R. R. R. Smith for reading an earlier preliminary draft and for providing some very useful comments in relation to it. I would also like to thank my friends and family for supporting me through the long process of research and redrafting. My biggest debt of gratitude is owed to my current supervisor, Dr. Lesley Beaumont, who has had the patience to wade through considerable material and various redrafts that I have given to her over the past three years and for her comments and suggestions.

Any errors contained in the text are wholly my own.

Table of Contents

VOLUME I

ABBREVIATIONS OF JOURNALS -----	i
ABBREVIATIONS OF LATIN/GREEK AUTHORS -----	v
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS -----	x
CHAPTER ONE -----	1
1.1 INTRODUCTION-----	1
1.2 A SURVEY OF ACADEMIC STUDIES ON ROMAN PORTRAITURE-----	3
1.3 METHODOLOGY-----	22
1.4 SOURCES AND EVIDENCE-----	30
1.5 DEFINITION OF 'PORTRAITURE'-----	31
PART: 1 ROMAN PHYSIOGNOMICS -----	32
CHAPTER TWO: ROMANI IPSI LOQVVNTUR -----	33
2.1 LATIN TERMS FOR STATUARY AND PORTRAITURE-----	33
2.1.1 <i>simulacrum</i> (n.n.), <i>simulacri</i> (gen.s.)-----	33
2.1.2 <i>statua</i> (f.n.), <i>statae</i> (gen. s.)-----	35
2.1.3 <i>effigies</i> (f.n.), <i>effigiei</i> (gen. s.)-----	36
2.1.4 <i>signum</i> (n.n.), <i>signi</i> (gen. s.)-----	37
2.1.5 <i>imago</i> (f.n.), <i>imaginis</i> (gen. s.)-----	38
2.1.6 <i>Summary</i> -----	45
2.2 VALUE TERMS-----	46
2.2.1 <i>virtus</i> (f.n.), <i>-utis</i> (gen. s.)-----	47
2.2.2 <i>Other values</i> -----	48
2.2.3 <i>dignitas</i> (f.n.), <i>-atis</i> (gen. s.)-----	49
2.2.4 <i>auctoritas</i> (f.n.), <i>-atis</i> (gen. S.)-----	50
2.2.5 <i>gloria</i> (f.n.), <i>-ae</i> (gen. S.)/ <i>fama</i> (f.n.), <i>-ae</i> (gen. s.)-----	52
2.3 SEVERITAS (FEM.N.), -ATIS (GEN. S.) AND GRAVITAS (F.N.), -ATIS (GEN. S.)-----	53
2.4 SUMMARY-----	57
CHAPTER THREE: ROMAN PHYSIOGNOMIC PRINCIPLES -----	60
3.1 INTRODUCTION TO ROMAN PHYSIOGNOMIC BELIEFS-----	60
3.2 ROMAN ORATORY AND PHYSIOGNOMICS-----	61
3.2.1 <i>Oratorical training and pronuntiatio</i> -----	66
3.2.2 <i>Textual use of physiognomics in speech making</i> -----	70
3.3 PHYSIOGNOMICS IN ROMAN HISTORIOGRAPHY, BIOGRAPHY AND TOMB INSCRIPTIONS-----	72
3.4 PHYSIOGNOMICS AND ROMAN THEATRE-----	78
3.5 PHYSIOGNOMICS AND ROMAN THEATRICAL MASKS-----	91
3.6 THE FACE AS A TOOL OF COMMUNICATION-----	94
3.6.1 <i>Caput - the head</i> -----	94
3.6.2 <i>Vultus/facies/os - the face</i> -----	94
3.6.3 <i>Supercilia - the eyebrows/frons - the forehead/os - the mouth/oculi - eyes</i> -----	97
3.6.4 <i>Other parts of the body: lips, nostrils, neck, shoulders and hands</i> -----	99
3.7 SUMMARY-----	99
CHAPTER FOUR: PHYSIOGNOMIC EXPRESSION OF THE MOTUS ANIMI -----	101
4.1 EMOTIONS, CHARACTER TRAITS, AND STATES OF MIND (<i>MOTUS ANIMI</i>) COMMUNICATED PHYSIOGNOMICALLY-----	101
4.1.1 <i>Good character</i> -----	101

4.1.2	Happiness, Joy, Love, Devotion – ‘Amicitia’	102
4.1.3	Anger, threat, sadness, ferocity etc.	103
4.1.4	Superbia	106
4.1.5	Shock, surprise, disapproval	108
4.1.6	Reproach	109
4.1.7	Guilt or Innocence	110
4.1.8	Politics/propaganda	111
4.2	HAND GESTURES	112
4.2.1	Giving credibility to a statement of facts, reproaching an adversary	112
4.2.2	Interrogation/approval/reinforce statement of facts	113
4.2.3	Modesty	113
4.2.4	Timidity	114
4.2.5	Exhortation	114
4.2.6	Wonder	114
4.2.7	Surprise/indignation	114
4.2.8	Aversion to something	115
4.2.9	Denunciation and indication/ affirmation	115
4.2.10	Regret/anger	115
4.2.11	Apology or supplication	116
4.2.12	Effeminacy/ homosexuality	116
4.2.13	Mimicry	116
4.3	‘FRAUS’ AND FACIAL EXPRESSION	117
4.4	SUMMARY	121

CHAPTER FIVE: SEVERITAS AND GRAVITAS ----- 122

5.1	IMPORTANCE OF SEVERITAS/GRAVITAS	122
5.2	PHYSIOGNOMIC INDICATORS OF SEVERITAS AND GRAVITAS	122
5.3	CONTRACTED FOREHEAD AND DRAWN TOGETHER EYEBROWS = SEVERITAS/GRAVITAS	126
5.4	THE SEVERITAS/GRAVITAS EXPRESSION	132
5.5	FACIAL EXPRESSION AND IMAGINES	132
5.6	SUMMARY	134

CHAPTER SIX: SEVERITAS/GRAVITAS AND SURVIVING PORTRAITS ----- 135

6.1	INTRODUCTION	135
6.2	PORTRAITS OF JULIUS CAESAR	135
6.3	PORTRAITS OF UNKNOWN MEN	138
6.4	CAPITOLINE “BRUTUS”	143
6.5	L’ARRINGATORE	145
6.6	SCIPIO AFRICANUS	146
6.7	TERRACOTTA HEAD OF MAN FROM NEAR CUMAE	147
6.8	TERRACOTTA HEAD – ROME	148
6.9	COIN PORTRAITS	149
6.9.1	Marcus Claudius Marcellus	149
6.9.2	Publius Cornelius Scipio	151
6.9.3	Aulus Postumius Albinus	154
6.9.4	Caius Coelius Caldus	154
6.9.5	Lucius Cornelius Sulla	155
6.9.6	Caius Antius Restio	156
6.10	PORTRAITS OF OTHER ‘IDENTIFIED’ INDIVIDUALS	156
6.10.1	Cicero	156
6.10.2	Pompey	157
6.11	THE PORTRAITS FROM DELOS	159
6.12	NUDE ATHLETES WITH ROMAN PORTRAIT HEADS	166
6.13	PORTRAITS OF THE NON-ÉLITES: PLEBEIAN CLASSES: ‘INGENUI’ AND ‘LIBERTI’	168
6.14	FACIAL EXPRESSION, SEVERITAS/GRAVITAS AND ROMAN PORTRAITS	171

PART 2: THE ORIGINS OF ROMAN REPUBLICAN PORTRAITURE	176
CHAPTER SEVEN: THE DATING OF ROMAN PORTRAITS IN THE REPUBLICAN PERIOD	177
7.1 INTRODUCTION	177
7.2 OBSERVATIONS ON PROBLEMS OF DATING OF ROMAN REPUBLICAN PORTRAITS	177
7.3 THE EVIDENCE REGARDING DATING OF ROMAN REPUBLICAN PORTRAITS	185
A) <i>Portraits from the island of Delos</i>	185
B) <i>Portraits of identified individuals</i>	198
C) <i>Portraits on coins</i>	202
D) <i>Portraits found in Pompeii and Herculaneum</i>	206
E) <i>Portraits dated by typology or stylistic criteria</i>	207
F) <i>The Gallic sack of Rome in 390 B.C. (or 386 B.C) as a terminus post quem</i>	214
7.4 CONCLUSIONS ON DATING OF ROMAN REPUBLICAN SEVERITAS/GRAVITAS PORTRAITURE	215
CHAPTER EIGHT: IMAGINES ET STATUAE AT ROME	217
8.1 INTRODUCTION	217
8.2 THE DISPLAY AND USE OF ROMAN PORTRAITS IN THE REPUBLIC	217
8.2.1 <i>Public statuary, votive statuary and semi-public images</i>	217
8.2.2 <i>The "semi-private" context of portraiture</i>	223
a) <i>Funeral procession - pompa funebris</i>	224
b) <i>Display in the Atrium, Family Custom and the Salutatio</i>	225
c) <i>Tomb display</i>	229
8.3 <i>IMAGINES IN THE FUNERAL AND HOME: MATERIALS AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE</i>	234
8.4 SUMMARY	247
CHAPTER NINE: THE IMPORTANCE OF THE IMAGINES AT ROME: WHO COMMISSIONED IMAGINES ?	249
9.1 INTRODUCTION	249
9.2 <i>IMAGINES AND NOBILES IDENTITY</i>	249
9.3 <i>MANIPULATION, FALSIFICATION AND FABRICATION OF IMAGINES</i>	262
9.4 <i>WHO COMMISSIONED PORTRAITS?</i>	264
9.5 SUMMARY	276
CHAPTER TEN: THEORIES CONCERNING GREEK ORIGINS FOR ROMAN PORTRAITURE	278
10.1 INTRODUCTION	278
10.2 GREEK SCULPTURAL TRADITIONS AND ROMAN PORTRAITURE	278
10.3 ROMANS AS BARBARIANS: ROMAN REPUBLICAN PORTRAITURE AND GREEK PHYSIOGNOMIC ATTITUDES	293
10.4 HELLENISTIC ROYAL PORTRAITS	297
10.4.1 <i>Hellenistic kingship and physiognomic communication</i>	300
10.5 THE CONTEXTS OF DISPLAY OF HELLENISTIC ROYAL IMAGES	305
10.5.1 <i>Statues</i>	305
10.5.2 <i>Coin portraits</i>	309
10.6 PORTRAITS OF OTHER HELLENISTIC MONARCHS	311
10.7 PORTRAITS OF HELLENISTIC KINGS IN THE 'REPUBLICAN STYLE'	314
10.8 ROMAN ATTITUDES TO GREEKS	320
CHAPTER ELEVEN: OBSERVATIONS ON THE ORIGINS OF ROMAN REPUBLICAN PORTRAIT STYLE	324
11.1 INTRODUCTION	324
11.2 THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONTEXTS OF DISPLAY AND UTILISATION OF PORTRAITURE AT ROME	328

11.3	THE SOCIAL ORGANISATION OF ROME IN THE REGAL AND EARLY REPUBLICAN PERIODS AND THE EMERGENCE OF THE <i>NOBILES</i> CLASS	347
CHAPTER TWELVE: CONCLUSIONS		363
12.1	INTRODUCTION	363
12.2	CONCLUSION	371
<u>VOLUME II</u>		
PART 3: APPENDICES, BIBLIOGRAPHY, ILLUSTRATIONS		373
APPENDIX 1: SYNOPSIS OF M. PAPINI <i>ANTICHI VOLTI DELLA REPUBBLICA: LA RITRATTISTICA IN ITALIA CENTRALE TRA IV E II SECOLO A.C.</i> (ROMA: 2004)		374
APPENDIX 1A: THE MEANING OF ‘PORTRAITURE’		384
APPENDIX 2: LATIN/GREEK SOURCES AND TRANSLATIONS		393
CHAPTER 2		393
CHAPTER 3		428
CHAPTER 4		443
CHAPTER 5		466
CHAPTER 6		476
CHAPTER 8		477
CHAPTER 9		483
APPENDIX 3: PHYSIOGNOMICS AND THE GREEKS		512
1.	INTRODUCTION	512
2.	GREEK THEORY RELATING TO PHYSIOGNOMICS	512
3.	<i>PHYSIOGNOMONICA</i>	518
4.	<i>POST ARISTOTLE</i>	521
5.1	<i>Drama and Theatre</i>	523
5.2	<i>Masks in Greek Theatre</i>	524
5.3	<i>Fables, History and Natural History</i>	535
5.4	<i>Rhetoric</i>	538
6.	CLASSICAL GREEK PHYSIOGNOMICS	538
APPENDIX 4 : CATALOGUE OF PORTRAITS		540
JULIUS CAESAR		540
UNKNOWN PORTRAITS		542
COIN PORTRAITS		550
PORTRAITS OF OTHER ‘IDENTIFIED’ INDIVIDUALS		553
<i>Cicero</i>		553
<i>Pompey</i>		554
DELOS HEADS		555
PORTRAITS OF HELLENISTIC KINGS IN THE ‘REPUBLICAN STYLE’		563
NUDE ATHLETES WITH ROMAN PORTRAIT HEADS		564
PORTRAITS OF THE NON-ÉLITES: PLEBEIAN CLASSES: ‘ <i>INGENUI</i> ’ AND ‘ <i>LIBERTI</i> ’		565
APPENDIX 5: CONCERNING AN EGYPTIAN ORIGIN FOR ROMAN PORTRAITURE		568
1.	STATUARY OF THE OLD, MIDDLE AND NEW KINGDOMS	568
2.	LATE PERIOD PORTRAITS	572
3.	HELLENISTIC EGYPTIAN (PTOLEMAIC) PORTRAITURE	573
APPENDIX 6: ROME’S CAPABLE ART INDUSTRY		576
APPENDIX 7: HELLENISTIC STATUARY AND PORTRAITURE ON DELOS		584
BIBLIOGRAPHY		587

Abbreviations of Journals

AA	Archäologischer Anzeiger				for Archaeology and the History of Art, Oxford University
AArch	Acta archaeologica [Copenhagen]				
AbhBerl	Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin	ArchCI			Archeologia classica: rivista della Scuola naz. di Archeologia, pubbl. a cura degli Ist. di Archeologia e Storia dell'arte greca e romana e di Etruscologia e antichità italiane dell'Univ. di Roma
ABull	The Art Bulletin: a quarterly published by the College Art Association of America				
ActHyp	Acta Hyperborea	ArtSc			Arti e scienze
ACStR	Atti del Congresso nazionale di studi romani	AZ			Archäologische Zeitung
Agora	Athenian Agora (Princeton 1953-)				
AIR	Acta Instituti Romana	BAH			Beyrouth Bibliothèque archéologique et historique, Institut français d'archéologie de Beyrouth
AIRend	Atti della R. Accademia d'Italia. Rendiconti della classe di scienze morali				
AJA	American Journal of Archaeology. The Journal of the Archaeological Institute of America	BCH			Bulletin de correspondance hellénique
AJPh	American Journal of Philology	BCIJ			Brown Classical Journal
AktBerl	Akten Berlin	BClevMus			The Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art
AAanth	American Anthropologist	BCAR			Bollettino della Commissione archeologia comunale di Roma
AMSt	Alma Mater Studiorum				
AnRom	Analecta Romana	BdA			Bollettino d'arte
ANRW	H. Temporini, ed., Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (Berlin 1972-)	BÉFAR			Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome
Ant	Die Antike	BICS			Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London
AntK	Antike Kunst				
AntPl	Antike Plastik	BMC			Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum (London 1873-)
AnzWien	Anzeiger. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien, Philologisch-historische Klasse	BMCR			Bryn Mawr Classical Review [online]
APAA	Atti della Pontificia Accademia romana di Archeologia	BMF			Bulletin des Musées de France
Archaeology	Archaeology. An Official Publication of the Archaeological Institute of America	BMFA			Bulletin of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston
		BMM			Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York
Archaeom	Archaeometry. Bulletin of the Research Laboratory	BMMP			Bollettino dei monumenti, musei e gallerie Pontificie

BMQ	Brooklyn Museum Quarterly			Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Bedeutung
BMY	The British Museum Yearbook	DOAWW		Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien, Philosophisch- historische Klasse. Denkschriften
BolIMC	Bolletino dei Musei comunali di Roma			Atti della Pontificia Accademia romana di archeologia. Dissertazioni
BPI	Bollettino Paletnologia Italiana	DPAA		
BRL	Bulletin of the John Rylands Library. University of Manchester	EtrStud		Etruscan Studies. Journal of the Etruscan Foundation.
BSAF	Bulletin de la Société nationale des antiquaires de France			
BSER	Bulletin de la Société d'études épigraphiques sur Rome et le monde romain	FdD		Fouilles de Delphes, École française d'Athènes
BUSA	Bollettino della Unione Storia ed Arte	Fitts-Zank		K. Fittschen and P. Zanker, Katalog der römischen Porträts in den Capitolinischen Museen und den anderen kommunalen sammlungen der Stadt Rom (Mainz 1985)
CAH	Cambridge Ancient History			
CArch	Cahiers archéologiques			
CCG	Cahiers du Centre G. Glotz	Glotta		Glotta: Organo de Difusión Lingüística
CIE	Corpus inscriptionum etruscarum I-III, Berlin 1893-1987	GMusJ		The J. Paul Getty Museum Journal
CIG	Corpus inscriptionum graecarum, Böckh, A. 1828-1877, Berlin	Gnomon		Gnomon. Kritische Zeitschrift für die gesamte klassische Altertumswissenschaft
CIL	Corpus inscriptionum latinarum, Berlin 1862-	Gymnasium		Gymnasium. Zeitschrift für Kultur der Antike und Bildung
CIAnt	Classical Antiquity			
CI Med	Classica et mediaevalia. Revue danoise de philologie et d'histoire	Helbig(F)		W. Helbig, <i>Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom</i> , 4th ed. supervised by H. Speier (Tübingen 1963-1972)
CollLat	Collection Latomus	Historia		Historia. Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte
CPh	Classical Philology	HSPH		Harvard Studies in Classical Philology
CR	Classical Review			
CritSoc	La Critica Sociologica			
CSStR	Cambridge Sociological Studies in Roman History			
CUE	Corpus delle urne etrusche di eta ellenistics			
CW	Classical World			
DArch	Dialoghi di archeologia	IG		Inscriptiones graecae
Délos	Exploration archéologique de Délos faite par l'École française d'Athènes	IGCH		C. Kraay, O. Mørkholm, and M. Thompson, <i>An Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards</i> (New York 1973)
D(K)Wien	Denkschrift der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien,			

ILLRP	H.Degrassi, <i>Inscriptiones latinae liberae rei publicae</i> (Rome 1957-)	MDAI-R-E	Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung.
ILS	H. Dessau, ed., <i>Inscriptiones latinae selectae</i> (1892-1916)		Ergänzungsheft
JDAI	Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts	MedArch	Mediterranean Archaeology. Australian and New Zealand Journal for the Archaeology of the Mediterranean World
JDAI-E	Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Ergänzungsheft		Meddelelser fra Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek [Copenhagen]
JD[K]AI	Jahrbuch des Kaiserlich Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts	MedKøb	Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'École française de Rome
JHS	Journal of Hellenic Studies		Münchener Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst
JMFA	Journal of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston	MJbK	Monumenti antichi, pubblicati dell'Accademia dei Lincei
JÖAI	Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts in Wien	MonAI	Memorie. Atti della Pontificia Accademia romana di archeologia
JRA	Journal of Roman Archaeology	MPAA	Marburger Winkelmann-Programm
JRS	Journal of Roman Studies	MWP	
JWAG	Journal of the Walters Art Gallery	ORom	Opuscula Romana
KJhr	Kölner Jahrbuch für Vor- und Frühgeschichte / hrsg. von Römisch-Germanischen Museum	PAAR	American Academy in Rome. Papers and Monographs
Ktema	Ktema. Civilisations de l'Orient, de la Grèce et de Rome Antiques	PBSR	Papers of the British School at Rome
Latomus	Latomus. Revue d'études latines	PP	La parola del passato
L'Urbe	L'Urbe. Rivista romana	PrCPS	Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society
MAAR	Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome	Prospet.	Prospettiva. Rivista d'arte antica e moderna
MAL	Memorie della Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche	QCAEtr	Quaderni del Centro di studio per l'archeologia etrusco-italica
MDAI	Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts	QITA	Quaderni dell'Istituto di topografia antica della Università di Roma
MDAI-R	Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung	RAL	Rendiconti della Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche dell'Accademia dei Lincei

RhM	Rheinisches Museum für Philologie	SocTh	Sociological Theory
RPAA	Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia di Archeologia	StMisc	Studi miscellanei.
ScAnt	Scienze dell'Antichità		Seminario di archeologia e storia dell'arte greca e Romana dell'Università di Roma
SE	Studi etruschi. Romá, Giorgio Bretschneider	StudRom	Studi romani: rivista bimestrale dell'Istituto di Studi Romani
S-Jones, Cap.	H. Stuart Jones, A Catalogue of the Ancient Sculptures Preserved in the Municipal Collections of Rome: The Sculptures of the Museo Capitolino (Oxford 1926)	TAPhA	Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association
S-Jones, Cons.	H. Stuart Jones, A Catalogue of the Ancient Sculptures Preserved in the Municipal Collections of Rome: The Sculptures of the Palazzo dei Conservatori (Oxford 1912)	TAPhS	Transactions of the American Philosophical Society
SO	Symbolae Osloenses, auspiciis Societatis Graeco-Latine	YCIS	Yale Classical Studies
		ZDA	Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum
		ZfA	Zeitschrift für Archäologie
		ZPE	Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik

Abbreviations of Latin/Greek

Authors*

Afran. L. Afranius (ap Nonius *Doctrinae*)
Vop. Vopiscus

Anth. Pal. Anthologia Palatina

Amm. Marc. Ammianus Marcellinus

App. Appian

B. Civ. De Bello Civile
Bel. Pun. Bellum Punicum
Hisp.(Iberica) Hispania
Mith. Mithridates
Rom. Hist. Romana Historia

Ar. Aristophanes

Ach. Acharnians
Eq. Equites
Thesm. Thesmophoriazusae
Vesp. Vespae

Arist. Aristotle

An. pr. Analytica priora
Gen. an. De generatione animalium
Hist. an. Historia animalium
Part. an. De partibus animalium
Phgn. Physiognomica
Pr. Problematica
Rh. Rhetorica

Asc. Asconius

Mil. Commentary on Cicero,
Pro Milone
Pis. Commentary on Cicero, In
Pisonem

Ath. Athenaeus

August. Augustine

De Civ. D. De civitate Dei

Caes. Caesar

B Civ. Bellum Civile
B Gall. Bellum Gallicum

Cass. Dio Cassius Dio

Cassiod. Cassiodorus

Var. Variae

Cato Cato

Frag. Fragmenta

Catull. Catullus

Cic. Cicero (Marcus Tullius)

Acad. Academicae quaestiones
(= Plasberg, Bk. 4)

Ad Brut. Epistulae ad Brutum

Amic. De amicitia

Arch. Pro Archia

Att. Epistulae ad Atticum

Balb. Pro Balbo

Brut. Brutus

Caecin. Pro Caecina

Cael. Pro Caelio

Cat. In Catilinam

Clu. Pro Cluentio

Corn. Pro Cornelio de maiestate

De or. De oratore

Deiot. Pro rege Deiotaro

Div. De divinatione

Div. Caec. Divinatio in Caecilium

Dom. De domo sua

Fam. Epistulae ad familiares

Fat. De fato

Fin. De finibus

Flac. Pro Flacco

Font. Pro Fonteio

Har. resp. De haruspicum responso

Inv. rhet. De inventione rhetorica

Leg. De legibus

Leg. agr. De lege agraria

Leg. Man. Pro lege Manilia or De
imperio Cn. Pompeii

Lig. Pro Ligario

Luc. Lucullus or Academica
posteriora

Marcell. Pro Marcello

Mil. Pro Milone

Mur. Pro Murena

Nat. D. De natura deorum

Off. De officiis

Orat. Orator ad M. Brutum

Part. or. Partitiones oratoriae

Phil. Orationes Philippicae

Pis. In Pisonem

Planc. Pro Plancio

Prov. cons. De provinciis consularibus

* Abbreviations for Latin and Greek authors are those listed on the *Interactive Ancient Mediterranean Project* website of the Ancient World Mapping Center at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. A full list of abbreviations are available at:
<http://iam.classics.unc.edu/main/help/A.html>

Q. Fr. Epistulae ad Quintum fratrem
Q. Rosc. Pro Roscio Postumo
Quinct. Pro Quinctio
Rab. Perd. Pro C. Rabirio Perduellionis Reo
Rab. Post. Pro Rabirio Postumo
Red. pop. Post reditum ad populum
Red. sen. Post reditum in senatu
Rep. De republica
Rosc. Am. Pro Sexto Roscio Amerino
Scaur. Pro Scauro
Sen. De senectute
Sest. Pro Sestio
Somn. Somnium Scipionis
Sull. Pro Sulla
Tog. cand. Oratio in senatu in toga candida
Top. Topica
Tusc. Tusculanae disputationes
Vat. In Vatinius
Verr. In Verrem

Q. Cic. Quintus Cicero
Comment. pet. Commentariolum petitionis
Claud. Princ. Claudius, Emperor

Dig. Digest of Roman Law

Dio Chrys. Dio Chrysostomus
Or. Orationes (Discourses)

Diod. Sic. Diodorus Siculus

Diog. Laert. Diogenes Laertius

Diom. Diomedes Grammaticus

Dion. Hal. Dionysius Halicarnassensis
Ant. Rom. Antiquitates Romanae

Eur. Euripides
Med. Medea

Fest. Festus
Gloss. Lat. Glossaria Latina

Flor. Florus
Epit. Epitomae de Tito Livio

Gai. Gaius
Inst. Institutiones

Gal. Galen
Anim. Mor. Corp. Temp
Nat. Fac.

Gell. Aulus Gellius
NA Noctes Atticae

Hdt. Herodotus

Hippoc. Hippocrates
Aer. De aera, aquis, locis
Nat. Hom. De natura hominis

Hom. Homer
Il. Iliad

Hor. Horace
Carm. Carmina or Odes
Epist. Epistulae
Ep. Epodi
Sat. Satirae or Sermones

Is. Isocrates
Ev. Evagoras

Just. Justinus
Epit. Epitome (of Trogus)

Justin Justin Martyr
Apol. Apologia

Juv. Juvenal
Sat. Saturae

Lactant. Lactantius
ID De Ira Dei

Laus. Pis. Laus Pisonis

Livy Livy
Epit. Epitomae
AUC Ab urbe condita libri
Per. Periochae

Luc. Lucan
Phars. Pharsalia

Lucian Lucian
Salt. De saltatione

Lucil. Lucilius
Sat. Saturae

Lucret. Lucretius
De Re Nat. De Rerum Natura

Macro. Macrobius
In Somn. Commentarius ex
Cicerone in Somnium Scipionis
Sat. Saturnalia

Mart. Martial
Ep. Eprigammata

Naevius Cnaeus Naevius

Nep. Nepos (Cornelius)
Pelop. Pelopidas
Han. Hannibal

Ov. Ovid
Am. Amores
Ars am. Ars amatoria
Ep. Epistulae
Fast. Fasti Fasti
Her. Heroides
Met. Metamorphoses
Pont. Epistulae ex Ponto
Rem. am. Remedia amoris
Tr. Tristia

Pan. Mess. Panegyricus Messallae

Paus. Pausanias

Petron. Petronius
Sat. Satyrica

Phaedr. Phaedrus

Philostr. Philostratus
VA Vita Apollonii

Pl. Plato
Leg. Leges
Phdr. Phaedrus
Resp. Respublica
Symp. Symposium
Ti. Timaeus

Plaut. Plautus
Amph. Amphitruo
Asin. Asinaria
Aul. Aulularia
Capt. Captivi
Cas. Casina
Cist. Cistellaria
Curc. Curculio
Epid. Epidicus
Men. Menaechmi
Merc. Mercator

Mil. Miles gloriosus
Mostell. Mostellaria
Pers. Persa
Poen. Poenulus
Pseud. Pseudolus
Rud. Rudens
Stich. Stichus
Trin. Trinummus
Truc. Truculentus

Plin. (E) Pliny (the Elder)
HN Naturalis Historia

Plin. (Y) Pliny (the Younger)
Ep. Epistulae

Plut. Plutarch
Ad Princ. Iner. Ad Principem Ineruditum
Aem. Aemilius Paulus
Alc. Alcibiades
Caes. Caesar
Cat. Mai. Cato Maior
Cic. Cicero
Cim. Cimon
Comp. Dem. et Cic. Comp. Demosthenis
et Ciceroni
De Alex. fort. De fortuna Alexandri
De fort. Rom. De fortuna Romanorum
De Is. et Os. De Iside et Osiride
Mar. Marius
Marc. Marcellus
Mor. Moralia
Nic. Nicias
Num. Numa
Pomp. Pompeius
Popl. Poplicola
Sull. Sulla

Poll. Julius Pollux
Onom. Onomasticon

Polyb. Polybius

Pomp. Porph. Pomponius Porphyrio
Com. Commentarii

Prop. Propertius
El. Elegiae

Prudent. Prudentius
C. Symm. Contra Symmachum

Quint. Quintillian
Inst. Institutio Oratoria
(?) Decl. Min. Declamationes Minores

Rhet. ad Her. Rhetorica ad Herennium

S.H.A. Scriptores Historiae Augustae

Alex. Sev. Alexander Severus

Tac. Tacitus

Sall. Sallust

Cat. Bellum Catilinae or De
Catilinae coniuratione

Hist. Historiae

Iug. Bellum Iugurthinum

S.C. de Cn. Pis. Sen. Cons. de Gn. Pisone

Sen. (E) Seneca (the Elder)

Controv. Controversiae

Suas. Suasoriae

Sen. (Y) Seneca (the Younger)

Ben. De Beneficiis

Clem. De Clementia

Brev. Vit. De Brevitate vitae

Constant. De Constantia Sapientis

De Ira De Ira

Ep. Epistulae

Helv. De Consolatione ad Helv.

Her. Fur. Hercules Furens

Her. Oet. Hercules Oetaeus

Liv. De Consolatione ad Liv.

Med. Medea

Phaedr. Phaedra

Tranq. De tranquillitate animi

Troad. Troades

Serv. Maurus Servius Honoratus.

Comm. Commentarii in Vergilii
Aeneidos

Buc. et Gerog. Commentarii in Vergilii
Bucolica et Georgica

Sil. Silius Italicus

Pun. Punica

Soph. Sophocles

OT Oedipus Tyrannus

Stob. Stobaeus

Anth. Anthologium

Strab. Strabo

Geog. Geographica

Suet. Suetonius

Aug. Divus Augustus

Cal. Gaius Caligula

Claud. Divus Claudius

Dom. Domitianus

Galb. Galba

Gram. De grammaticis

Iul. Divus Iulius

Ner. Nero

Rel. Reliquiae

Rhet. De rhetoribus

Tit. Titus

Tib. Tiberius

Vesp. Divus Vespasianus

Tac. Tacitus

Agr. Agricola

Ann. Annales

Dial. Dialogus de oratoribus

Hist. Historiae

Ter. Terence

Ad. Adelphoe

An. Andria

Eun. Eunuchus

Hec. Hecyra

Phorm. Phormio

Tert. Tertullian

Apol. Apologeticus

Theophr. Theophrastus

Caus. pl. De causis plantarum

Char. Characteres

Sens. De Sensibus

Thuc. Thucydides

Val. Max. Valerius Maximus

Mem. Factorum ac dictorum
memorabilium libri IX

Varro Varro

L.L. De lingua Latina

Rust. De re rustica

Vell. Pat. Velleius Paterculus

Verg. Virgil

Aen. Aeneid

Ecl. Eclogues

G. Georgics

Vitr. Vitruvius

De Arch. De Architectura

Xen. Xenophon

Mem. Memorabilia

List of Illustrations

1

Sarcophagus of L. Cornelius Scipio Barbatus.
Tufa. Museo Pio Clementino, Musei Vaticani
Photo:
<http://ist-socrates.berkeley.edu/~nemeaueb/175b/week03/image175b-53.jpg>

2.1

South Italian red figure bell amphora, scene from comedy 4th cent. B.C. Classics Museum, Wellington University
Photo: Wellington University
http://www.vuw.ac.nz/classics/moreabout/about/image_pgs/image_1.html

2.2

Phylax vase. Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Taranto.
Photo: Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Taranto (author)

3

Wall fresco: 'Phersu' from 'Tomb of the Augurs' (Tomba degli Àuguri). 530 B.C. Tarquinia.
Photo:
<http://www.mysteriousetruscans.com/taraugurs.html>

4

Wall fresco: Penelope and Odysseus: VI.10.2 (*House of the Skeletons*) Pompeii. N9107, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Napoli.
Photo: <http://www.uark.edu/campus-resources/achilles/odyssey/odyssey.html>

5

Wall fresco: Penelope and Odysseus: *macellum*, north wall: VII.9.7 Pompeii.
Photo: <http://www.uark.edu/campus-resources/achilles/odyssey/odyssey.html>

6.1-3

(*Cat. XXIII*)
L'Arringatore. Bronze. Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Firenze
Photo: Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Firenze
<http://www.firenzemusei.it/archeologico>

7

Wall fresco: Hercules strangles the snakes: north wall, *triclinium* n, VI.15.1 (House of the Vettii) Pompeii.
Photo: <http://www.art-and-archaeology.com/roman/pom32.html>

8.1-2

Wall fresco, Woman recoils in horror. *oecus* 5, Villa of the Mysteries, Boscoreale.
Photo:
http://www.coco.cc.az.us/apetersen/_ART201/_images/wall12.gif

9

Wall fresco: 'Sacrifice of Iphigenia', VI.8.3 (House of the Tragic Poet) Pompeii. N9112, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Napoli
Photo: Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Napoli (Skidmore College, Lucy Scribner Library)
<http://libsrv.skidmore.edu/REDSKID/full/85304.jpg>

10

(*Cat. I*)
Portrait of Julius Caesar. Marble. 713, Sala dei Busti 3, Braccio Nuovo, Musei Vaticani.
Photo:
[http://www.beloit.edu/~classics/main/courses/history222/julius/JuliusCaesar\(Grant-106\)_m.jpg](http://www.beloit.edu/~classics/main/courses/history222/julius/JuliusCaesar(Grant-106)_m.jpg)

11

(*Cat. II*)
Portrait of Julius Caesar. Marble, from Tusculum. Castello di Aglie, Museo di Antichità, Turin.
Photo:
http://www.beloit.edu/~classics/main/courses/history222/julius/JuliusCaesar50-44BCE_m.jpg

12

(*Cat. III*)
Julius Caesar. January-February 44 B.C. AR denarius. Minted by M. Mettius.
Photo:
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/imp/julius_caesar/i.html

13

(*Cat. IV*)
Portrait of Julius Caesar. Marble. Campo Santo, Pisa
Photo:
http://www.beloit.edu/~classics/main/courses/history222/julius/JuliusCaesarpisa_m.jpg

14

(*Cat. V*)
Portrait of Julius Caesar. Diabase. 342, Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen, Berlin
Photo: DAIR
http://www.dainst.org/index_3455_en.html

15

(Cat. VI)

Portrait of unknown man. Marble. Otricoli.
Museo Torlonia, Rome
Photo: Richard G. Tansey and Fred S. Kleiner,
Gardner's Art Through the Ages. (Fort Worth:
Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1996; 10th
edition)

16

(Cat. VII)

Portrait of unknown man. Marble. Museo
Archeologico Nazionale, Cagliari.
Photo: P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the
Age of Augustus*. Translated by A. Shapiro.
Rep. ed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan
Press, 1998, p. 11.

17

(Cat. XXXVI)

Portrait of Pompeius Magnus. Marble. IN 733,
Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen
Photo: Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen
[http://www.glyptoteket.dk/13743415-E247-
499E-8E01-C1468A5FCFD4.W5Doc?](http://www.glyptoteket.dk/13743415-E247-499E-8E01-C1468A5FCFD4.W5Doc?)

18

(Cat. VIII)

Portrait of unknown man. Marble. No. 13180,
Musée d'Art et d'Histoire, Geneva
Photo: Musée d'Art et d'Histoire, Geneva
(P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of
Augustus*. Translated by A. Shapiro. Rep. ed.
Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press,
1998, p.11)

19

(Cat. IX)

Portrait of unknown man. Marble. Private
Collection, Germany
Photo: von Heintze, H., ed. *Römische Porträts*.
Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche
Buchgesellschaft, 1974, p.23

20

(Cat. X)

Portrait of unknown man. Marble. H329,
Skulpturensammlung, Dresden.
Photo: Dyabola
<http://www.dyabola.de/>

21

(Cat. XI)

Portrait of unknown man. Marble. S1182,
Agora Museum, Athens.
Photo: Harrison, E. B. *Ancient Portraits from
the Athenian Agora*. Vol. 5, *Excavations of the
Athenian Agora Picture Book*. Princeton, New
Jersey: American School of Classical Studies
at Athens, 1960.

22.1-3

(Cat. XII)

Statue of man holding busts of his ancestors
("Barberini togatus"). Marble. Inv. MC02392,
Museo Centrale Montemartini, Rome.
Photo: Author

23.1-2

(Cat. XIII)

Portrait of unknown man ('Marius'). Marble.
N319, Glyptothek, Munich.
Photo: Dyabola
<http://www.dyabola.de/>

24.1-2

(Cat. XIV)

Portrait of unknown man ('Sulla'). Marble.
N589, Glyptothek, Munich.
Photo: Dyabola
<http://www.dyabola.de/>

25

(Cat. XV)

Portrait of unknown man. Marble. IN 1575, Ny
Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen.
Photo: Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen
[http://www.glyptoteket.dk/13743415-E247-
499E-8E01-C1468A5FCFD4.W5Doc?](http://www.glyptoteket.dk/13743415-E247-499E-8E01-C1468A5FCFD4.W5Doc?)

26

Gold stater, portrait of Titus Quinctius
Flaminius, 196 B.C. Greece. Dept. of Coins
and Medals 1954-10-9-1 (PCR 76); Room 22,
The Hellenistic world, case 2, no. 29: British
Museum, London
Photo: British Museum
<http://www.thebritishmuseum.ac.uk/compass/>

27.1-2

(Cat. XVI)

Head of unknown man. Marble. Inv 2261,
Braccio Nuovo, Musei Vaticani
Photo:
[http://www.indiana.edu/~c494trov/additions-9-
17-99/bracchionuovo.jpg](http://www.indiana.edu/~c494trov/additions-9-17-99/bracchionuovo.jpg)

28.1-2

(Cat. XVII)

Head of unknown man ('Albinus'), marble:
MA919, Musée du Louvre
Photo: Musée du Louvre
[http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/pub/fr/image/3904_g00
06838.001.jpg](http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/pub/fr/image/3904_g0006838.001.jpg)
© R.M.N./Les frères Chazelle

29

(Cat. XVIII)

Portrait of unknown man: marble; Rogers
Fund, 1912 (12.233): Metropolitan Museum of
Art

Photo: Metropolitan Museum of Art, NY
http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/ropo/ho_12.233.htm

30

(Cat. XIX)

Portrait of unknown man. Marble. Holmes Fund 1991.534, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
Photo: MFA, Boston
<http://38.114.160.229/fif=fpx/E/E7189CR-d1.fpx&obj=iip.1.0&wid=800&cvt=jpeg>

31

(Cat. XX)

Portrait of unknown man ('Crassus'). Marble. IN749, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen.
Photo: Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen
<http://www.glyptoteket.dk/13743415-E247-499E-8E01-C1468A5FCFD4.W5Doc?>

32

(Cat. XXI)

Portrait of unknown man ('Crassus'). Marble. MR510 (no. usuel MA 1220), Musée du Louvre, Paris.
Photo: Musée du Louvre
http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/pub/fr/image/3958_gv006864.001.jpg

33.1-3

(Cat. XXII)

Portrait of unknown man ('Brutus Capitolinus'). Bronze. MC1183, Palazzo dei Conservatori, Musei Capitolini, Rome.
Photo: Musei Capitolini
<http://www.museicapitolini.org/scripts/scheda.asp?lingua=en&id=MC1183>

34

(Cat. XXIV)

Portrait ('Scipio'). Bronze. N883, Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli.
Photo: Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli

35

Portrait of unknown man ('Scipio'). MC0562, Palazzo Nuovo, Musei Capitolini.
Photo: Musei Capitolini
<http://www.museicapitolini.org/scripts/PaginaListaOpere.asp?lingua=en&ttq=sezione&sezione=Capitoline+Museum>

36.1-2

(Cat. XXV)

Portrait of unknown man. Terracotta. Cumae. 01.8008, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
Photo: Maria Daniels, courtesy of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, September 1997 - May 1998.

<http://38.114.160.229/fif=fpx/SC1/SC1905.fpx&obj=iip.1.0&wid=800&cvt=jpeg>

37

(Cat. XXVI)

Terracotta head., CP4789 (no. usuel S848)
Département des Antiquités grecques, étrusques et romaines, Musée du Louvre
Photo: Musée du Louvre
http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/pub/fr/image/32082_S848.001.jpg

38.1

Terracotta 'grotesque' head. S1692, Département des Antiquités grecques, étrusques et romaines, Musée du Louvre
Photo: Musée du Louvre
http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/pub/fr/image/9502_gv021566.001.jpg

38.2

Terracotta boxer. CA 1608, Département des Antiquités grecques, étrusques et romaines, Musée du Louvre
Photo: Musée du Louvre
http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/pub/fr/image/9453_gv014793.001.jpg

39

(Cat. XXVII)

Denarius, portrait of M. Marcellus Claudius, minted by Publius Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus: 50 B.C.
Photo:
<http://www.coinarchives.com/a/lotviewer.php?LotID=28146&AucID=30&Lot=360>

40

(Cat. XXVIII)

Coin from Cartago Nova, portrait of unknown man ('Scipio')
Photo:
http://www.usask.ca/antiquities/coins/republic_thirdcent.html

41

(Cat. XXIX)

Gold signet ring, portrait of unknown man signed by Herakleides. Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Napoli, Inv. 25085.
Photo: Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Napoli
http://www.usask.ca/antiquities/coins/republic_thirdcent.html

42.1-2

(Cat. XXX)

Denarius, portrait of Aulus Postumius Albinus (Cos. 180/151 B.C.; or Cos. 99 B.C.) minted by Decimus Postumius Albinus. 49 B.C.
Photo:

(1)
[http://www.coinarchives.com/a/lotviewer.php?
LotID=43337&AucID=46&Lot=764](http://www.coinarchives.com/a/lotviewer.php?LotID=43337&AucID=46&Lot=764)

(2)
[http://www.coinarchives.com/a/lotviewer.php?
LotID=51402&AucID=53&Lot=600](http://www.coinarchives.com/a/lotviewer.php?LotID=51402&AucID=53&Lot=600)

43

(*Cat. XXXI*)

Denarius, portrait of C. Coelius Calvus, minted by grandson, C. Coelius Calvus. 51 B.C.

Photo:

[http://www.coinarchives.com/a/lotviewer.php?
LotID=56493&AucID=59&Lot=704](http://www.coinarchives.com/a/lotviewer.php?LotID=56493&AucID=59&Lot=704)

44.1-4

(*Cat. XXXII*)

Denarii, portraits of Sulla and Q. Pompeius Rufus, minted by grandson of latter, Q. Pompeius Rufus. 54 B.C.

Photo:

(1) and (2)
[http://imagedb.coinarchives.com/img/lanz/117/
00470q00.jpg](http://imagedb.coinarchives.com/img/lanz/117/00470q00.jpg)

(3) and (4)
[http://imagedb.coinarchives.com/img/gorny/12
5/image00349.jpg](http://imagedb.coinarchives.com/img/gorny/125/image00349.jpg)

45

(*Cat. XXXIII*)

Denarius, portrait of C. Antius Restio, minted by C. Antius Restio. 47 B.C.

Photo:

[http://imagedb.coinarchives.com/img/cng/062/
enlarged/620768.jpg](http://imagedb.coinarchives.com/img/cng/062/enlarged/620768.jpg)

46

(*Cat. XXXIV*)

Portrait of Cicero. Marble. Inv. 194 N393, Uffizi, Firenze

Photo: [http://www.phil.uni-
erlangen.de/~plaltar/photo_html/portraet/roem
isch/republik/benannt/cicero/cicero6.JPG](http://www.phil.uni-erlangen.de/~plaltar/photo_html/portraet/roemisch/republik/benannt/cicero/cicero6.JPG)

47

Portrait of Cicero. Marble. MC589, Sala dei Filosofi, (Palazzo Nuovo) Musei Capitolini

Photo:

[http://www.museicapitolini.org/scripts/scheda.
asp?lingua=en&id=MC0589](http://www.museicapitolini.org/scripts/scheda.asp?lingua=en&id=MC0589)

48

(*Cat. XXXV*)

Portrait of Cicero. Marble. Museo Chiaramonti, Musei Vaticani.

Photo: author

49

Portrait of Alexander the Great. Marble. Pergamum. Copy of Lysippan original

probably executed during the reign of Eumenes II (197-159).

Photo:

[http://www.hackneys.com/alex_web/graphics/a
lexhed4.jpg](http://www.hackneys.com/alex_web/graphics/alexhed4.jpg)

50

Herm portrait of Alexander the Great, modelled from Lysippan bronze original. H. 68 cm. Pentelic marble (discovered at Tivoli).

MR 405 (usual number MA436),

Département des Antiquités grecques, Etrusques et romaines, Musée du Louvre.

Photo: Musée du Louvre

[http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/pub/fr/image/1014_gv0
05501.001.jpg](http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/pub/fr/image/1014_gv005501.001.jpg)

51.1-3

(*Cat. XXXVII*)

Coins, portraits of Gn. Pompeius Magnus, minted by his sons, Gnaeus and Sextus Pompeius Magnus. 43-38 B.C.

Photo:

(1)
[http://www.vroma.org/images/mcmanus_imag
es/pompeycoin44.jpg](http://www.vroma.org/images/mcmanus_images/pompeycoin44.jpg) (Copyright B. McManus)

(2)
[http://www.vroma.org/images/mcmanus_imag
es/pompeycoin.jpg](http://www.vroma.org/images/mcmanus_images/pompeycoin.jpg) (Copyright B. McManus)

(3)
[http://imagedb.coinarchives.com/img/kunker/1
00/00046q00.jpg](http://imagedb.coinarchives.com/img/kunker/100/00046q00.jpg)

52.1-3

(*Cat. XXXVIII*)

Portrait of unknown man. Marble. A2136, Delos Museum.

Photo: l'École française d'Athènes

53.1-3

(*Cat. XXXIX*)

Portrait of unknown man. Marble. A2912, Delos Museum.

Photo: l'École française d'Athènes

54

(*Cat. XL*)

Portrait of unknown man. Marble. A4142, Delos Museum.

Photo: l'École française d'Athènes

55.1-3

(*Cat. XLI*)

Portrait of unknown man. Marble. A4186, Delos Museum.

Photo: l'École française d'Athènes

56.1-3

(Cat. XLII)

Portrait of unknown man. Marble. A4187, Delos Museum.

Photo: l'École française d'Athènes

57.1-3

(Cat. XLIII)

Portrait of unknown man. Marble. A4188, Delos Museum.

Photo: l'École française d'Athènes

58.1-3

(Cat. XLIV)

Portrait of unknown man. Marble. A4189, Delos Museum.

Photo: l'École française d'Athènes

59.1-3

(Cat. XLV)

Portrait of unknown man. Marble. A4190, Delos Museum.

Photo: l'École française d'Athènes

60

(Cat. XLVI)

Portrait of unknown man. Marble. A4191, Delos Museum.

Photo: l'École française d'Athènes

61.1-3

(Cat. XLVII)

Portrait of unknown man. Marble. A4193, Delos Museum.

Photo: l'École française d'Athènes

62.1-3

(Cat. L)

Portrait of unknown man. Terracotta. A7258, Delos Museum.

Photo: l'École française d'Athènes

63.1-3

(Cat. XLIX)

Portrait of unknown man. Terracotta. A7259, Delos Museum.

Photo: l'École française d'Athènes

64.1-2

(Cat. XLVIII)

'Pseudo Athlete'. Marble. NM 1828, National Archaeological Museum, Athens.

Photo: l'École française d'Athènes

65

C. Ofellius Ferus. Marble. A4340, Delos Museum.

Photo: l'École française d'Athènes

66

(Cat. LIII)

'Tivoli General'. Marble. Museo Palazzo Massimo, Rome.

Photo: Author

67

(Cat. LIV)

Grave monument of a soldier. Via appia antica, Rome.

Photo: Author

68

(Cat. LV)

Nude soldier. Marble. Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Chieti.

Photo: Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Chieti
<http://www.soprintendenza-archeologica.ch.it>

69

Nude warrior/athlete (without cuirass). Marble. HN1657, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen.

Photo: Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen
<http://www.glyptoteket.dk/Images/Web500/Web500ItemImageMedium/4/000671.jpg>

70

(Cat. LVI)

Portrait of unknown man. Marble. Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Chieti.

Photo: Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Chieti
<http://www.soprintendenza-archeologica.ch.it/iconog1.gif>

71

Nude athlete. Bronze. Cat. 15055, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, Musei Vaticani.

Photo: http://mv.vatican.va/2_IT/pages/x-Schede/MGEs/MGEs_Sala14_01_079.html

72

(Cat. LVII)

Tomb monument from Via Statilia. White limestone. Inv. 2142, Museo del Palazzo dei Conservatori, Musei Capitolini (now, Museo centrale montemartini).

Photo: Musei Capitolini
http://www.centralemontemartini.org/it/museo/percorso_salacolonne_ritratti.htm

73

(Cat. LVIII)

Statues of Marcus Vergilius Eurysaces [and his wife Atistia]. Travertine. Museo del Palazzo dei Conservatori, Musei Capitolini (now lost).

Photo:
<http://libsrv.skidmore.edu/REDSKID/full/94828.jpg>

74

(Cat. LIX)

Tomb monument of L. Vibius and his wife, V. Hila. Marble. N1081, Museo Chiaramonti, Musei Vaticani.

Photo:

<http://libsrv.skidmore.edu/REDSKID/full/94855.jpg>

75

(Cat. LX)

Tomb monument of L. Ampudius Philomusus. Tufa. Dept. Greek and Roman Antiquities 1920.2-20.1, British Museum, London

Photo: British Museum

<http://www.thebritishmuseum.ac.uk/compass/>

76

(Cat. LXI)

Tomb monument of L. Antistius Sarculo and Antistia Plutia, Dept. of Greek and Roman Antiquities 1858.8-19.2 (Sculpture 2275) Room 70, British Museum, London

Photo: British Museum

<http://www.thebritishmuseum.ac.uk/compass/>

77.1

Portrait of unknown man. Marble. Rogers Fund, 1912 (12.233): Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Photo: Met. Mus. Art, NY

http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/ropo/ho_12.233.htm

77.2

Portrait of unknown man. Marble. Otricoli. Museo Torlonia, Rome (not on display).

Photo: Richard G. Tansey and Fred S. Kleiner, *Gardner's Art Through the Ages*. (Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1996; 10th edition)

77.3

Portrait of unknown man ('Brutus Capitolinus'). Bronze. MC1183. Palazzo dei Conservatori, Musei Capitolini, Rome.

Photo: Musei Capitolini

<http://www.museicapitolini.org/scripts/scheda.asp?lingua=en&id=MC1183>

77.4

Portrait of Julius Caesar. 713, Sala dei Busti 3, Braccio Nuovo, Musei Vaticani.

Photo:

[http://www.beloit.edu/~classics/main/courses/history222/julius/JuliusCaesar\(Grant-106\)_m.jpg](http://www.beloit.edu/~classics/main/courses/history222/julius/JuliusCaesar(Grant-106)_m.jpg)

78.1-7

Portraits from Delos when viewed as negative images.

Photo: l'École française d'Athènes

79

Monument of C. Billienus. Marble. Delos

Photo: Author

80.1-2

Two portraits of unknown men. Marble.

Museo Palazzo Massimo, Rome.

Photo: Author

81.1-2

Coins, portraits of Octavian.

Photo:

(1)

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/imp/octavian/RIC_0254b.1.jpg

(2)

BMC 597

<http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s1550.html>

81.3-4

Coins, portraits of Augustus.

Photo:

(3)

<http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/augustus/i.html>

(4)

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/augustus/RIC_0186aVar-o.jpg

81.5

Cameo portrait of Augustus. Strozzi and Blacas Collections, Dept. of Greek and Roman Antiquities 1867.5-7.484 (Gems 3577) Room 70, British Museum.

Photo: British Museum

<http://www.thebritishmuseum.ac.uk/compass/>

82

Procession of Imperial family and dignitaries.

Ara Pacis Augustae. Marble. Rome.

Photo: Author

83.1

Portrait of Octavian. Marble. MC0143 Stanza degli Imperatori, Palazzo Nuovo, Musei Capitolini.

Photo: Musei Capitolini

<http://www.museicapitolini.org/scripts/scheda.asp?lingua=en&id=MC0413>

83.2

Statue of Augustus. Marble. Museo Palazzo Massimo.

Photo: Author

83.3

'Augustus Prima porta'. Marble. Braccio Nuovo, Musei Vaticani.

Photo:

<http://www.ancientroute.com/people/PeoplePic/01984.gif>

84.1

Portrait of Emperor Vespasian (originally from Ostia). Marble. Museo Palazzo Massimo, Rome.

Photo:

http://www.indiana.edu/~c414rome/net_id/museiromani/vespasian2.jpg

84.2

Coins, portraits of Emperor Vespasian.

Photo:

<http://www.coinarchives.com/a/lotviewer.php?LotID=102303&AucID=110&Lot=489>

85

Portrait of M. Porcius Cato (Uticensis). Bronze. Musée d'Archeologie, Rabat.

Photo: <http://www.barca.fsnet.co.uk/cato.htm>

86

Portrait of unknown man ('Cato Uticensis') (from Castel Gandolfo). Marble. Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Firenze.

Photo: <http://www.barca.fsnet.co.uk/cato.htm>

87

Coin, portrait of M. Agrippa. Julio Claudian period.

Photo:

<http://imagedb.coinarchives.com/img/cng/068/enlarged/681089.jpg>

88.1-2

Portrait of 'Agrippa' from Gabii. Marble. Inv. MR402 (No. usual MA1208). Département des Antiquités grecques, Etrusques et romaines, Musée du Louvre.

Photo: Musée du Louvre

http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/pub/fr/image/3982_gv006846.001.jpg

89

Copy of Bronze portrait herm *in situ*, house of L. Cornelius Iucundus, Pompeii.

Photo: Author

90

The *atrium* of the house of L. Cecilius Iucundus, Pompeii

Photo:

<http://faculty.overlake.org/~jrothfels/afsrone/pages/Caecilius%20Iucundus'%20Villa.JPG.htm>

91

S333 'Priest of Isis'. Marble. H.29 cm. The Museum of the Athenian Agora.

Photo: Ill. 32, E. B. Harrison, *The Athenian Agora*, I, *Portrait Sculpture*, Princeton, 1953.

92.1-2

Coins, portraits of Brutus and Ahala, minted by L. Junius Brutus. 44 B.C.

Photo:

(1)

<http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s0398.html>

(2)

<http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s1439.html>

93

Coin, portrait of G. Vibius Varus minted by M. Antonius.

Photo:

<http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s1466.html>

94

Portrait of unknown man. Bronze. State Museum Fund 1928: State Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg.

Photo: State Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg
[http://www.hermitagemuseum.org/tmplobs/DSWSV932C\\$FVK91F3.jpg](http://www.hermitagemuseum.org/tmplobs/DSWSV932C$FVK91F3.jpg)

95

Portrait of unknown man. Bronze. No. 1928-860, Cleveland Museum of Art.

Photo: Museum of Art, Cleveland

<http://www.clevelandart.org/oci/magnify/1928/1928.860.jpg>

96.1-2

Etruscan cinerary urns. Terracotta. Caere. End of 6th century B.C. CP5188 and CP5189.

Département des Antiquités grecques, Etrusques et romaines, Musée du Louvre.

Photo: Musée du Louvre

(1)

http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/pub/fr/image/27522_gv024347.001.jpg

(2)

http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/pub/fr/image/25454_gv024346.002.jpg

97

Amiternum Relief. Museo Archaeologico Nazionale D'Abruzzo, L'Aquila.
Photo: Museo Archaeologico Nazionale D'Abruzzo, L'Aquila
<http://libsrv.skidmore.edu/REDSKID/full/87731.jpg>

98

Relief from 'Tomb of the Haterii'. Marble. Inv. 9998, Museo Gregoriano Profano, Musei Vaticani.
Photo:
<http://classics.furman.edu/~rprior/imgs/RP/RP-232.htm>

99

'First style' decoration, 'Samnite House'. Herculaneum, 2nd-early 1st century B.C.. Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Napoli.
Photo:
http://www.coco.cc.az.us/apetersen/_ART201/Wall_painting.htm

100

Tomb relief *imagines*.
Tomb of Paconius, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek
Photo: <http://www.glyptoteket.dk/>

101

Pyramid tomb of C. Cestius Epulo, Rome.
Photo:
http://www.livius.org/a/italy/rome/pyramid/pyramid_cestius01.jpg

102

Tomb of Caecilia Metella, Via Appia.
Photo:
<http://www.cgl.uwaterloo.ca/~smann/Rome05/Pics/Rome08-041.JPG>

103

Tomb of Eurysaces, Rome.
Photo: Author

104

Fasces in relief. Tomb of C. Cartilius Poplicola, outside the Porta Marina, Ostia.
Photo: Author

105

Nude athlete statue dedicated by C. Cartilius Poplicola. Temple of Hercules, Ostia.
Photo: Author

106

Wax head found in tomb near Cumae. Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Napoli.
Photo: Soprintendenza di Archeologia, Napoli

107

Portrait of Ptolemy I Soter. Marble. 3rd century B.C. From Greece or Asia Minor. H. 24 cm. MR 457
(n° usuel MA 849), Département des Antiquités grecques, étrusques et romaines, Musée du Louvre.
Photo: Musée du Louvre
http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/pub/fr/image/22129_gv005480.001.jpg

108

Sarcophagus lid. Woman with *imago* of husband. Marble. Flavian period.
British Museum
Photo: British Museum
<http://www.thebritishmuseum.ac.uk/compass/>

109

Sarcophagus of Seianti Tlesnana. Terracotta. Etruscan, about 150-140 B.C. Found at Poggio Cantarello, near Chiusi, Tuscany, Italy. L. 183cm. GR 1887.4-2.1 (Terracotta D 786), Room 71, Italy before the Roman Empire, case 1. British Museum
Photo: British Museum
<http://www.thebritishmuseum.ac.uk/compass/resources/image/large/k97005.jpg>

110.1

Drunken old woman. Marble. Marble.
Inv. MC0299, Palazzo Nuovo, Musei Capitolini
Photo: Musei Capitolini
<http://www.museicapitolini.org/scripts/scheda.asp?lingua=en&id=MC0299>

110.2

Old Market Woman. Marble. Rogers Fund 1909 (09-39). Metropolitan Museum of Art, NY.
Photo: Met. Mus. of Art, NY.
<http://media.metmuseum.org/mgen/metzoom/zoom.ms?>

111

Tomb of P. Licinius Demetrius. Marble. Dept. of Greek and Roman Antiquities, Sculpture 1954.12-14.1, British Museum, London.
Photo: British Museum
<http://www.thebritishmuseum.ac.uk/compass/>

112.1-2

Portrait of unidentified man ("Euthydemos I of Bactria"). Marble. Museo Torlonia, Rome.
Photo:
(1)
http://www.phil.uni-erlangen.de/~plaltar/photo_html/portraet/griechisch/staatsmaenner/euthydemos/euthy1.JPG

(2)
http://www.phil.uni-erlangen.de/~plaltar/photo_html/portraet/griechisch/staatsmaenner/euthydemos/euthy3.JPG

113

Portrait of unidentified man ('Antiochos III').
Marble. Département des Antiquités grecques, Etrusques et romaines, Musée du Louvre.
Photo: Musée du Louvre
http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/pub/fr/image/1079_gv005505.001.jpg

114

Terme Ruler, L'Aula Ottogana di Terme di Diocleziano, Rome, Inv. 1049.
Photo:
http://www.utexas.edu/courses/citylife/imagesr/terme_ruler_2views.jpg

115.1-7

Coins of Seleukos I, Antimachos I and III, Ptolemy I
Photo: internet
(1)
<http://members.verizon.net/vze3xycv/RulersCoins/seleucidPic.htm>
(2)
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/seleucia/seleukos_I/Houghton_MA_80.jpg
(3)
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/seleucia/antiochos_I/Newell_155.jpg
(4)
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/seleucia/antiochos_I/Newell_140.jpg
(5)
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/seleucia/antiochos_III/Newell_243.jpg
(6)
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/seleucia/seleukos_IV/Houghton_082.jpg
(7)
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/egypt/ptolemy_I/SNGCop_070.jpg

116.1-6

Coins, portraits of Euthydemos I of Bactria
Photo: internet
(1)
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/baktria/kings/euthydemos_I/Bop_05D.jpg
(2)
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/baktria/kings/euthydemos_I/Bop_09A.jpg
(3)
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/baktria/kings/euthydemos_I/Bop_10A.jpg

(4)
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/baktria/kings/euthydemos_I/Bop_11A.jpg
(5)
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/baktria/kings/euthydemos_I/Bop_12A.1.jpg
(6)
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/baktria/kings/euthydemos_I/Bop_12A.2.jpg

117

Coins, portraits of Bactrian Kings
Photo: internet
(1)
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/baktria/kings/diodotos_I/Holt_C1A.jpg
(2)
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/baktria/kings/diodotos_II/Bop_06F.jpg
(3)
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/baktria/kings/demetrios/Bop_1B.jpg
(4)
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/baktria/kings/euthydemos_II/Bop_1C.1.jpg
(5)
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/baktria/kings/agathokles/Bop_01D.3.jpg
(6)
<http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sg/sg7542.html>
(7)
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/baktria/kings/apolodotos_I/Bop_1A.jpg
(8)
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/baktria/kings/eukratides_I/Bop_01F.jpg
(9)
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/baktria/kings/eukratides_II/Bop_1B.jpg
(10)
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/baktria/kings/heliokles_I/Bop_1J.1.jpg

118

Coins, portraits of Pontic kings: Mithridates III IV, and VI.
Photo:
(1)
<http://imagedb.coinarchives.com/img/leu/081/image00236.jpg>
(2)
<http://imagedb.coinarchives.com/img/baldwin/nyc9/00084q00.jpg>
(3)
<http://imagedb.coinarchives.com/img/nac/p/01495q00.jpg>

119.1-5

Coin, portraits of Ariobarzanes I of Cappadocia.

Photo:

(1)

<http://imagedb.coinarchives.com/img/gorny/122/image01500.jpg>

(2)

<http://imagedb.coinarchives.com/img/gorny/118/thumb01502.jpg>

(3)

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/cappadocia/kings/ariobarzanes_I/SNGCop_160.jpg

(4)

<http://imagedb.coinarchives.com/img/cng/065/enlarged/650333.jpg>

(5)

<http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sg/sg7302.html>

120.1-2

Coins, portraits of Mithridates VI Eupater Pontus. (120-63 B.C.)

Photo:

<http://imagedb.coinarchives.com/img/nac/p/01495q00.jpg>

120.3

Portrait of Mithridates VI Eupater Pontus.

Marble. H. 36 cm. No. usuel Ma 2321, Département des Antiquités grecques, étrusques et romaines Musée du Louvre

Photo : Musée du Louvre

http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/pub/fr/image/1081_gv005506.001.jpg

121.1-2

Coins, portraits of Tarkondimotos I Cilicia.

Photo:

(1)

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/cilicia/kings/tarkondimotos/RPC_3871.1.jpg

(2)

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/cilicia/kings/tarkondimotos/RPC_3871.2.jpg

122.1-2

Coins, portraits of Lysanias, Tetrarch of Chalcis.

Photo:

(1)

<http://imagedb.coinarchives.com/img/cng/059/enlarged/590532.jpg>

(2)

<http://imagedb.coinarchives.com/img/lew/083/image00396.jpg>

123

Coin, portrait of Nikias of Cos.

Photo:

<http://imagedb.coinarchives.com/img/cng/059/enlarged/590492.jpg>

124

Coin, portrait of Theophanes of Mytilene.

Photo:

http://www.mun.ca/classics/mouseion/1998/cw/illiams/pl_1.html

125

Portrait of unknown man ('Theophanes of Mytilene'): N1109, Mytilene Museum, Lesbos

Photo:

http://www.mun.ca/classics/mouseion/1998/cw/illiams/pl_1.html

126.1

Portrait of Juba II of Mauretania. Marble. H. 28cm. 25 B.C.- A.D. 23. MNC 1576

(no. usuel MA 1886), Département des Antiquités grecques, étrusques et romaines, Musée du Louvre.

Photo: Musée du Louvre

http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/pub/fr/image/3962_gv006833.001.jpg

126.2

Portrait of Ptolemy of Mauretania. A.D. 30-40.

Marble. H. 37 cm. Cherchel, Algérie (ancienne Caesarea). LP 2528 (no. usuel MA 1887), Département des Antiquités grecques, étrusques et romaines, Musée du Louvre.

Photo: Musée du Louvre

http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/pub/fr/image/3966_gv006836.001.jpg

127

Portrait of unknown ('Diodorus Paspasos') from Pergamum. Marble. N3438, Bergama Museum, Turkey.

Photo: Bergama Museum

<http://viamus.uni-goettingen.de/pages/imageView?Object.Id:record:int=114>

128

Sesterce, image of 'Minucius column'.

Photo:

<http://www.hunterian.gla.ac.uk/Archives/OldSite2001/HuntMus/MoneyAndMedals/MoneyMonuments/slides/slide001.html>

129

'Cleobis and Biton': Archaeological Museum, Delphi.

Photo: Ephor of Antiquities: Delphi Museum

130

'Capestrano Warrior': Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Chieti.

Photo: Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Chieti
http://hl.ath.cx/muvi/musarc/imageno/foto/sale1_2/guerriero_e.jpg

131

Stone colossal head: Museo Archeologico, Ancona.

Photo: Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Ancona
<http://www.museionline.it/museimarche/piceni/province/ancona.htm>

132.1

Bronze *fascis*: Vetulonia

Photo:
http://www.livius.org/a/1/romanempire/etruscan_fascies.jpg

132.2

Bronze figurine holding a *lituus*, from votive deposit under *lapis niger*, *forum romanum*, Rome.

Photo:
<http://www.utexas.edu/courses/romanciv/romancivimages02/raugur.jpg>

133

Painted stone slab from Banditaccia necropolis, Cerveteri, mid 6th century B.C.: CP 6628, Département des Antiquités grecques, Etrusques et romaines, Musée du Louvre.

Photo: Musée du Louvre
http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/pub/fr/image/25589_gv024356.001.jpg

Fresco from Tomb of the Augurs, Tarquinia, depicting figures with curule chairs and *lituus*.

Photo:
<http://www.mysteriousetruscans.com/taraugurs.html>

134.1

Limestone cinerary urn in the form of a seated man. From a tomb at Chiusi. 540-530 B.C. H: 1.22 m (1.38 m with plinth). GR 1847.11-27.1 (Sculpture D 9) Room 71, Italy before the Roman Empire, case 21. British Museum.

Photo: The British Museum
<http://www.thebritishmuseum.ac.uk/compass/resources/image/large/ps225694.jpg>

134.2

Line drawing of statues found in the *Tombe delle statue*, Ceri.

Photo: internet:
<http://www.gatc.it/ritagli/tombadellestatue.htm>

135

Terracotta figure from 'la tomba delle cinque sedie'. Male figure.

Female figure: Dept. Of Greek and Roman Antiquities, GR 1873.8-20.638 (Terracotta D 219) Room 71, case 18: British Museum, London.

Photo: British Museum
<http://www.thebritishmuseum.ac.uk/compass/resources/image/large/k39117.jpg>

136

Terracotta frieze of assembly of seated figures, Murlo (Poggio Civitate): Museo Civico Archeologico, Murlo.

Photo:
http://spazioinwind.libero.it/popoli_antichi/Etruschi/Murlo.html

137

Painted terracotta frieze from Acquarossa depicting banquet scene. Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Viterbo, Rocca Alborno.

Photo: Internet

138.1-2

Terracotta *simā* and figurine from Murlo (Poggio Civitate): Museo Civico Archeologico, Murlo.

Photo:
http://spazioinwind.libero.it/popoli_antichi/Etruschi/Murlo.html

139

lapis satricanus. Museo Nazionale Romano alle Terme di Diocleziano. Rome.

Photo:
http://www.livius.org/a/1/romanempire/lapis_satricanus.JPG

140

Late Villanovan/Early Etruscan funerary urn with helmet lid, 7th century B.C. CA2591, Musée du Louvre

Photo:
http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/pub/fr/image/25467_gv022129.001.jpg

141

Cinerary urn: Museo Nazionale Etrusco, Chiusi.

Photo: Museo Nazionale Etrusco, Chiusi
<http://faculty.cva.edu/Stout/Etruscan/CineraryUrn.jpg>

142

Hammered bronze face covers for cinerary urns: Museo Nazionale Etrusco, Chiusi.

Photo: Museo Nazionale Etrusco, Chiusi
<http://faculty.cva.edu/Stout/Etruscan/>

143

Cinerary urn with 'peg holes' for attachment of mask. Terracotta. Etruscan, about 625-600 B.C. from Chiusi, Tuscany, Italy. 1853.6-4.1 (Vases H 245). Room 71, Italy before the Roman Empire, case 18, British Museum
 Photo:
<http://www.thebritishmuseum.ac.uk/compass/resources/image/large/k85123.jpg>

144

Cinerary urns. Terracotta and bronze. Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Sarteano.
 Photo: Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Sarteano
<http://www.ctnet.it/museo/sarteano/museo-uk.htm>

145

Cinerary urn. Bronze. Museo Nazionale Etrusco Chiusi.
 Photo: Museo Nazionale Etrusco, Chiusi
<http://www.ou.edu/class/ahi4163/files/urns1.html>

146

Cinerary urn from Cerveteri (Caere). Terracotta, 550-500 B.C. D162, Département des Antiquités grecques, étrusques et romaines, Musée du Louvre.
 Photo: Musée du Louvre
http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/pub/fr/image/30658_D162.001.jpg

147

Cinerary urn. Terracotta. Museo Nazionale Etrusco, Chiusi.
 Photo: Museo Nazionale Etrusco, Chiusi
<http://www.stedentipsvoortrips.nl/italie/chiusi.htm>

148

Sarcophagus of the Newly Weds. Terracotta. Cerveteri (Caere), last quarter of 6th century B.C. Museo Villa Giulia, Rome.
 Photo: Museo Villa Giulia, Rome
<http://www.ou.edu/class/ahi4163/files/terra06.html>

149

Sarcophagus of the Spouses (Sarcophage des Époux). Terracotta. From Cerveteri (Caere), last quarter of 6th century B.C. CP5194, Département des Antiquités grecques, étrusques et romaines, Musée du Louvre.
 Photo: Musée du Louvre
http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/pub/fr/image/25455_gv024351.001.jpg

150.1-6

Terracotta antefixes from Portonaccio Sanctuary, Veii. Second half of 6th century B.C. Museo Nazionale di Villa Giulia, Rome.
 Photo:
<http://www.ou.edu/class/ahi4163/files/terra03.html>

150.7-9

Terracotta statues from Portonaccio Sanctuary, Veii: Apollo, Woman with child, and Hermes. Second half of 6th century B.C. Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, Rome.
 Photo:
 Apollo
<http://www.apollodiveio.it/it/images/apollo2.jpg>
 Woman with child
<http://www.library.upenn.edu/finearts/slide/000/00025807.jpg>
 Hermes
<http://www.library.upenn.edu/finearts/slide/000/00025808.jpg>

151.1

Terracotta 'Hercules and Minerva'. Sant'Omobono Sanctuary, Rome. Inv. AntCom14914, Museo Centrale Montemartini, Photo: Museo Centrale Montemartini, Musei Capitolini
http://www.centralemontemartini.org/img_sk/AntCom14914.jpg

152

Cinerary urn depicting the deceased with 'vanth'. Terracotta. Early 4th century B.C. Museo Civico Archeologico delle Acque, Chianciano Terme, Inv. 94352.
 Photo: Museo Civico Archeologia delle Acque di Chianciano Terme/ Museo Nazionale Etrusco, Firenze.
<http://www.chiancianoterme.com/museo/etrusco/museo-it.htm>

153

Sarcophagus. Marble "of Circeo". From Necropolis of the Banditaccia, Cerveteri. Mid-4th cent. BC. Cat. 14949, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, Musei Vaticani.
 Photo: Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, Musei Vaticani
http://mv.vatican.va/1_CommonFiles/media/photographs/MGE/020_MGE_14949_BS_go.jpg

154

'Sarcophagus, of the magistrate'. Nenfro, from Tuscany. Early 3rd cent. BC.: cat. 14950, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, Musei Vaticani.
 Photo: Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, Musei Vaticani

http://mv.vatican.va/1_CommonFiles/media/photos/MGE/019_MGE_14950_BS_go.jpg

155

Sarcophagus of Velthur Partunus "the Magnate". Limestone. Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Tarquinia, Inv. 9873
Photo: Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Tarquinia
<http://www.ou.edu/class/ahi4163/slides/068.jpg>

156

Cinerary urn lid. Bronze. Early 4th century B.C. from Perugia. State Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg, Russia.
Photo: State Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg
http://www.hermitagemuseum.org/html/En/03/hm3_1_2a.html

157

Archaic funeral urn 647 from the necropolis della Badia, Volterra. Alabaster. Museo Etrusco Guarnacci, Volterra.
Photo: Museo Etrusco Guarnacci, Volterra
<http://www.comune.pisa.it/gr-archeologico/musvir/urne/uafr2.htm>

158.1-5

Various items held in the hands of figures from alabaster cinerary urns.
Photo: Museo Etrusco Guarnacci, Volterra
<http://www.comune.pisa.it/gr-archeologico/musvir/urne/museofr.htm>

159

Urn 613, 'Urna degli sposi'. Alabaster. Museo Etrusco Guarnacci, Volterra.
Photo: Museo Etrusco Guarnacci, Volterra
<http://www.comune.pisa.it/gr-archeologico/musvir/urne/urfr2.htm>

160

Urn 174. Gruppo Luvisu I. Alabaster. Museo Etrusco Guarnacci, Volterra.
Photo: Museo Etrusco Guarnacci, Volterra
<http://www.comune.pisa.it/gr-archeologico/musvir/urne/urfr7.htm>

161

Urn 346. Gruppo Luvisu I. Alabaster. Museo Etrusco Guarnacci, Volterra.
Photo: Museo Etrusco Guarnacci, Volterra
<http://www.comune.pisa.it/gr-archeologico/musvir/urne/urfr7.htm>

162

Urn 335. Gruppo Luvisu II. Alabaster. Museo Etrusco Guarnacci Volterra.
Photo: Museo Etrusco Guarnacci, Volterra

<http://www.comune.pisa.it/gr-archeologico/musvir/urne/urfr8.htm>

163

Urn 339. Gruppo Luvisu II. Museo Etrusco Guarnacci Volterra.
Photo: Museo Etrusco Guarnacci, Volterra
<http://www.comune.pisa.it/gr-archeologico/musvir/urne/urfr8.htm>

164

Urn 262. Museo Etrusco Guarnacci, Volterra.
Photo: Museo Etrusco Guarnacci, Volterra
<http://www.comune.pisa.it/gr-archeologico/musvir/urne/urfr3.htm>

165

Urn 136 'Urna del aruspice'. Museo Etrusco Guarnacci, Volterra.
Photo: Museo Etrusco Guarnacci, Volterra
<http://www.comune.pisa.it/gr-archeologico/musvir/urne/urfr5.htm>

166

Cinerary Urn of Larth Sentinates Caesa. Tomba della Pellegrina, Tarquinia. 2nd century B.C.
Photo:
<http://www.ou.edu/class/ahi4163/slides2/ston8-3.jpg>

167

Sarcophagus of Laris Pulena. Early 2nd century B.C. Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Tarquinia.
Photo:
<http://www.ou.edu/class/ahi4163/slides2/ston8-3.jpg>

168

Etruscan sarcophagus. Terracotta. No. 15709, Museo Etrusco di Villa Giulia, Rome.
Photo:
<http://www.giovannirinaldi.it/page/museum/vilagiulia/image98.htm>

169

Etruscan votive head from Cerveteri. Terracotta. Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, Inv. 13847
Photo:
<http://rubens.anu.edu.au/htdocs/surveys/charlotte/0012/001294.JPG>

170

Etruscan votive head from the votive deposit at Manganello, Cerveteri. Terracotta. Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, Rome, Inv. 56513.

Photo:
<http://www.ou.edu/class/ahi4163/slides/113.jpg>

171

Mural of procession, Tomba Bruschi, Tarquinia.
Photo: DAI Rome

172

Tomb of the Scipiones. Reconstruction of the facade. Mid-2nd century B.C.
Photo: Coarelli, F. *Il sepolcro degli Scipioni a Roma, Itinerari d'arte e di cultura. Via Appia*. Roma: F.lli Palombi, 1988, 13. Photo from Muzao Nazionale Romano.

173

Painted processional scene. *Tomb of the Scipiones*. Mid 2nd century B.C. Museo Nazionale Romano, Rome.
Photo: Holliday, P.J. *The Origins of Roman Historical Commemoration in the Visual Arts*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002) 35, ill. 6.

174.1

Scene of combat. *Tomba Arieti* (Tomb of the Magistrate). Mid-2nd century B.C. Museo dei Conservatori, Braccio Nuovo.
Photo: Holliday, P.J. *The Origins of Roman Historical Commemoration in the Visual Arts*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002) 38, ill. 7. Photo from Museo dei Conservatori.

174.2

Figure of a lictor. *Tomba Arieti* (Tomb of the Magistrate). Mid 2nd century B.C. Museo dei Conservatori, Braccio Nuovo.
Photo: Holliday, P.J. *The Origins of Roman Historical Commemoration in the Visual Arts*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002) 39, ill. 8. Photo from Museo dei Conservatori.

174.3

Three lictors in procession. *Tomba Arieti* (Tomb of the Magistrate). Mid 2nd century B.C. Museo dei Conservatori, Braccio Nuovo.
Photo: Holliday, P.J. *The Origins of Roman Historical Commemoration in the Visual Arts*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002) 39, ill. 10. Photo from Museo dei Conservatori.

175

Mural, Vel Satie in Triumphator's robes. François Tomb, Vulci.

Photo:

http://www.maravot.com/Etruscan_mural_francois6.gif

176

Ivory curule chair. Tomba dello Sgabello, Necropoli dei Giardini Margherita. End of 6th century B.C. No. 17274, Museo Archeologico, Bologna.
Photo: Museo Archeologico, Bologna
<http://www.comune.bologna.it/museoarcheologico/collezio/etrusca/img/17274ag.jpg>

177

Mural of procession. *Tomba dei Tifoni*, Tarquinia.
Photo:
http://www.maravot.com/Etruscan_mural_typhon1.gif

178

The sepulcretum, forum romanum during Boni's excavations..
Photo: Soprintendenza di Archeologia di Roma
<http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~nemeaueb/175b/week01/image175b-9.jpg>

179.1

Terracotta maenad and satyr – Satricum: Museo Nazionale di Villa Giulia
Photo:
http://imgdb.arts.ubc.ca/app/includes/image.php?catalogue_id=CNRS++Etruscan+Collection++

179.2

Reconstruction of the terracotta statues from Satricum: From: Lulof, P.S., *The Ridge-Pole Statues from the Late Archaic Temple at Satricum*. Thesis Publishers, Amsterdam, 1996. Fig. 33, at 169

180

Terracotta frieze from Velletri, second half of 6th century B.C.: Museo Civico di Velletri
Photo: Museo Civico di Velletri
<http://www.comune.velletri.rm.it/museocivico/collezione.htm>

181

Terracotta from Cerveteri (Caere). Museo Nazionale Etrusca id Villa Giulia, Rome.
Photo:
http://imgdb.arts.ubc.ca/app/includes/image.php?catalogue_id=CNRS++Etruscan+Collection++

182.1

Terracotta antefix of unknown provenance, late 6th century B.C.: J-P Getty Museum, Malibu

Photo: J-P Getty Museum, Malibu
<http://www.getty.edu/art/collections/images/1/03557501.jpg>

182.2

Terracotta antefix of 'Juno Sospita' type from Lavinium. Museo Nazionale di Villa Giulia
Photo:
<http://www.mysteriousetruscans.com/art/art.html>

182.3

Terracotta head from Faliscum. Museo di villa Giulia.
Photo:
<http://www.giovannirinaldi.it/page/museum/villagiulia/villagiulia036.jpg>

182.4

Terracotta statuette from Temple at Pyrgi, early 5th century B.C.: Museo Nazionale di Villa Giulia.
Photo:
<http://www.giovannirinaldi.it/page/museum/villagiulia/villagiulia049.jpg>

183

Terracotta head of bearded god from ridgepole: Temple I, Satricum: Museo Nazionale di Villa Giulia.
Photo:
<http://www.library.upenn.edu/finearts/slide/000/00025821.jpg>

184

lupa capitolina (Capitoline Wolf). Bronze. MC1181, Musei Capitolini, Rome.
Photo:
http://www.museicapitolini.org/img_sk/MC1181.jpg

185

Chimaera from Arrezzo. Bronze. Piano I, Sala XIV, Inv. No. 1, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Firenze.
Photo:
<http://www.unifi.it/unifi/surfchem/solid/bardi/chimera/chimarezzo.html>

186.1

Bronze warrior, early 5th century B.C.: Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte, Berlin
Photo: <http://www.smb.spk-berlin.de/mvf/vg/img/mvfb8g.jpg>

186.2

Bronze figurines from Brolio (Abruzzo), early 5th century B.C.: Museo di Villa Giulia, Rome and Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Firenze
Photo: Museo di Villa Giulia

<http://www.giovannirinaldi.it/page/museum/villagiulia/image8.htm>
and
Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Firenze.

187

'Warrior of Cagli'. Bronze.
Photo:
<http://www.mysteriousetruscans.com/art/7bronze.jpg>

188.1-4

The 'Mars' of Todi. 13886, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, Musei Vaticani.
Photo: Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, Musei Vaticani
http://mv.vatican.va/1_CommonFiles/media/photographs/MGE/048_MGE_13886_BS_go.jpg

189

Statue of youth. Bronze. Inv. 27816, Museo Civico Archeologico, Bologna
Photo: Museo Civico Archeologico, Bologna
<http://www.comune.bologna.it/museoarcheologico/collezio/etrusca/img/27816g1.jpg>

190

Head of youth. Bronze. Museo Archeologico delle Marche, Ancona.
Photo: Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Ancona
http://www.museionline.it/museimarche/piceni_ing/province/cagli.htm

191

Head of youth. Bronze. H. 27.5 cm. From Lake Bolsena. GR 1824.4-70.6 (Bronze 1692), Room 71, Italy before the Roman Empire, case 27, top shelf, British Museum.
Photo: British Museum
<http://www.thebritishmuseum.ac.uk/compass/resources/image/large/k86259.jpg>

192

Torso of wounded warrior. Terracotta. Found on Esquiline. 5th century B.C. Inv. AntCom03363, Museo centrale Montemartini, Rome.
Photo:
http://www.centralemontemartini.org/img_sk/AntCom03363.jpg

CHAPTER ONE

1.1 Introduction

In this thesis I shall explore certain issues relating to 'Roman Republican' portraiture of the third, second and first centuries B.C. Specifically, by utilising specific Roman understandings concerning physiognomic communication, I shall concentrate on one particularly important aspect of Roman Republican portraiture, that of the communicational intent of the portrait and the meaning imparted to the ancient Roman viewer. I shall examine whether a particular 'Roman' manner of depiction can be defined and/or identified for portraits during the Republican period, and then proceed to consider what this tells us concerning the origins and course of development of portraiture in Republican Rome. Central to the discussion will be the textual and archaeological evidence dating from the late third century B.C. until the end of the first century A.D.

More precisely, the questions I shall examine are:

1. Does the surviving ancient Latin literary and epigraphic evidence substantiate the conclusion that the Romans manufactured 'portraits' which depicted themselves; and if so, were there different types of portraiture evidenced by the language?
2. Does this same literary and epigraphic evidence reveal whether the Romans believed in culturally specific physiognomic principles, that linked defined facial expressions with emotions, states of mind, and culturally specific social/moral values (and if so, whether such beliefs differed in content to the physiognomic beliefs of the Greeks)?
3. Does the same literary and epigraphic evidence reveal whether there were precise facial expressions that directly communicated certain Roman ethical values or states of mind; and further, does it support the conclusion that such specific physiognomic beliefs might *determine the physical appearance* of Roman portraits in the Republican period and how these may have been received or understood by the viewer?
4. Whether it is possible to construct a "physiognomic" formula by which a 'Roman' portraiture can be defined for the Republican period and whether this physiognomic

formula is evident in the surviving portraits?

Following from this, questions arise as to how such a precise conjunction of physiognomic elements communicating specific Roman values may have developed and how it came to be applied to portraiture. To answer these, other aspects relevant to Roman portraiture in the Republican period need to be examined:

5. The chronology of the surviving portraits.
6. The physical contexts in which portraits were displayed at Rome and the uses which the Romans made of them, including the relationship (if any) between the different types of portraits attested to by the sources, their mode of manufacture and the contexts of their display.
7. Whether there were restrictions in the Republican period on who could commission portraits and the contexts in which these were displayed and the significance of portraiture to the political and social class which mostly benefited from it as a tool for reinforcing and maintaining complex social relationships.
8. The Greek influences generally attributed as being seminal in the origins of Roman portraiture and considered determinative of its evolution.
9. Evidence suggesting the origins and evolution of portraiture at Rome during the Republican period.

In conclusion, I consider what the findings mean for our understanding of a 'Roman' art and 'Roman' culture during the Republican period.

Central to this study is the premise that it is the Roman conceptualisation of physiognomic communication and the application of these principles to their own portrait images that provides the key to defining and understanding Roman portraiture during the middle and late Republican periods. These principles provide important information explaining how the genre originated and developed, including aspects of the contexts in which it was displayed, and the meaning imparted through it to all sectors of the Roman community. The most important

conclusion from this study is that Roman portraits were a dynamic expression of highly complex social relationships which, through their physical appearance, communicated specific messages regarding the character, status and ethics (the *motus animi*) of the person portrayed.

1.2 A survey of academic studies on Roman portraiture

The literature on Roman portraiture is extensive.¹

However, before embarking on a discussion of the previous academic literature on Roman portraiture, it is necessary to make an important observation. Since what we term 'portraiture' has as its subject the representation of an individual human being, we consciously and subconsciously read into a portrait something of the character, personality or attitudes of the portrayed. This is basic 'physiognomics'. Indeed, it is almost impossible for us to look at an image of an individual without these psychological and cultural elements coming into play. Such perceptions affect how a portrait is interpreted, and in respect of Roman Republican

¹ For example, E. Courboud, "Imago," in *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*, ed. C. Daremberg and E. Saglio (Paris: 1900); E. H. Swift, "Imagines in Imperial Portraiture," *AJA* 27 (1923); G. Kaschnitz von Weinberg, "Studien zur etruskischen und frühromischen Porträtkunst," *MDAI-R* 41 (1926); A. N. Zadoks-Josephus Jitta, *Ancestral Portraiture in Rome and the Art of the Last Century of the Republic*, *Archaeologisch-Historische Bijdragen I* (Amsterdam: Allard Pierson Stichting, 1932); O. Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik*, 2 vols. (Lund, Leipzig: C. W. K. Gleerup, O. Harrassowitz, 1941); A. Boethius, "On the Ancestral Masks of the Romans," *AArch* 13 (1942); R. Herbig, "Die italische Wurzel der römischen Bildniskunst," in *Das neue Bild der Antike*, ed. H. Berve (Leipzig: 1942); B. Schweitzer, *Die Bildniskunst der römischen Republik* (Leipzig-Weimar: Koehler & Ameland, 1948); G. M. A. Richter, "Origins of Verism in Roman Portraits," *JRS* 45 (1955): 39-46.; J. D. Breckenridge, *Likeness: a conceptual history of ancient portraiture* (Evanston [Ill.]: Northwestern University Press, 1968); R. Bianchi Bandinelli, *Archeologia e cultura* (Milano: R. Ricciardi, 1961); R. Bianchi Bandinelli, *Il Ritratto nell' antichità* (Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia italiana, 1965); P. Zanker, "Zur Rezeption des hellenistischen Individuellporträts in Rom und in den italischen Städten," in *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien - Colloquium 5-9 Juni 1974* (Göttingen: 1976); M. Felletti-Maj, *La tradizione italica nell'arte romana* (Rome: G. Bretschneider, 1977); D. E. E. Kleiner, *Roman Group Portraiture: The Funerary Reliefs of the Late Republic and Early Empire* (New York: 1977); R. R. R. Smith, "Greeks, Foreigners, and Roman Republican Portraits," *JRS* 71 (1981); R. R. R. Smith, "Philorhomaioi: Portraits of Roman client rulers in the Greek East in the 1st Century B.C.," in *Ufficiale e Ritratto Privato, Atti della II Conferenza Internazionale sul Ritratto Romano, Roma, 26-30 Settembre 1984*, ed. N. B. G. Rizza (Roma: Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Quaderni de "La Ricerca Scientifica", 1988); D. Jackson, "Verism and the Ancestral Portrait," *G & R* 34 (1987); E. S. Gruen, *Culture and national identity in Republican Rome* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1992); D. E. E. Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992); H. I. Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996); J. M. Højte, ed., *Images of Ancestors* (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2002); J. Tanner, "Portraits, Power, and Patronage in the Late Roman Republic," *JRS* 90 (2000); Papini, M. *Antichi volti della Repubblica: La ritrattistica in Italia centrale tra IV e II secolo a.C.* Supplementi 13, Bolletino della Commissione Archeologia Comune di Roma. Rome L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2004.

portraiture these have often provided an un-stated premise upon which much of the discussion and analysis has taken place.

Previous studies on the subject have followed various main approaches.² The most enduring involve the formalist or “art-historical/critical” approach as established by Winckelmann.³ This relies heavily on traditional tools of analysis, such as stylistics and typology, mostly with the intention of establishing a satisfactory chronology for specific genres of artworks within a specific period or cycle of time (‘Ages’ or ‘Periods’).⁴ Each ‘Age’ or ‘Period’ is believed to operate according to a biological life cycle: meaning it has its birth, period of maturity and decline. The mechanism by which styles in art spread is based on an amorphous concept of ‘diffusion’.

While this method permits an empirical (or ‘empiricised’) systematisation and classification of artefacts, to be successful it relies on several assumptions. First and foremost is that such empirical observation, quantification and qualification are actually possible. Secondly, it assumes the ability to qualify and quantify ‘style’ (the determination of which may be highly subjective), and then to identify such elements of style in a particular artwork (which likewise may be highly subjective). Finally, it is usually premised on the artificial notion that style in

2 For surveys of the previous academic studies on Roman art generally, see J. Bažant, *Roman Portraiture. A History of Its History* (Prague: 1995); and N. Boymel-Kampen, “On Writing Histories of Roman Art,” *ABull* 85, no. 2 (2003). For a study of the academic studies on Etruscan, Italic and pre-Roman sculpture, see M. Papini, *Antichi volti della Repubblica: La ritrattistica in Italia centrale tra IV e II secolo a.C.* Bolletino della Commissione Archeologica comunale di Roma. Supplementi: 13 (Roma: L’Erma di Bretschneider, 2004), 11-57.

3 J. J. Winckelmann, *History of Ancient Art*, trans. G. H. Lodge (Boston: 1880). According to Winckelmann’s model, art changes in a cyclical process. ‘Antiquity’, for instance, was a particular phase of civilisation which developed its own inherent artistic principles which passed through a set process of change from its inception (Archaic), to full maturity (Classical), to its decline and fall (Hellenistic/Roman). The medieval period was nothing but corruption and decay, until contact with the Byzantine Empire reinfused European Civilisation with the Classical values of Antiquity. A new Civilisation then appeared at the beginning of the Renaissance, building on what had gone before, but infused with new elements. According to Winckelmann’s theory, Modern Civilisation must pass through the same cycle.

4 *Ibid.*, 107: “The History of Art which I have undertaken to write is not a mere chronicle of epochs, and of the changes which occurred within them. ...[I]t is my intention to present a system... [T]he principle object is the essential of art...”

art develops *pari passu* for explaining the development style over a period of time.⁵

A further criticism of this formalist art historical/critical approach lay in the fact that it tends to dehumanise the object of study, yet simultaneously raising it to the level of an *objet d'Art* which largely involves judgements based on connoisseurship. This translates the artefact into a contemporary object, viewed as though it were a product of abstract mechanics, rather than as a manifestation of the desire of a patron, manufactured by an artisan, and viewed within a certain cultural context at a specific time and place. The purely stylistic approach often results in an analysis within a contemporary, highly academic (or aesthetic) framework without reference to, or an attempt to understand, its significance and meaning.

Unfortunately, stemming from Winckelmann's belief that all art was striving towards 'perfection' or 'true beauty' as attained in Classical Greek art which was unmatched until the Renaissance,⁶ the aesthetic opinion of Hellenistic and Roman art has generally remained low. As a result of Winckelmann's influence, Hellenistic and Roman art have often been viewed by scholars (whether consciously or otherwise) through the lens of assumed superiority of Greek Classical art – thus creating a partial, and at times biased, view of Roman art: at best characterising it as degenerate or derivative of Greek art, and at worst denying its existence.⁷

There was also a racial element underlying Winckelmann's theory which was adopted in the nineteenth century by Hegelian aesthetics and provided with a 'scientific' basis by the emerging sciences of physiognomics, psychology and psychiatry. Winckelmann was predominantly concerned with what he perceived to be 'European Civilisation' and its superiority as expressed by its art, which was due primarily to the congenial mix of race,

5 Problematic is the fact that traditional art theory and history creates artificial categorisations or classifications of certain artworks according to form, not function. For instance, statuary from ancient Greece and Rome is often categorised as cult, honorary, devotional, funerary, private, etc. which may blur unitary aspects of such statuary and the context in which it was viewed. The other aspect is that the invention of the Arts and of Art during the Renaissance, has led to the analysis of Greek and Roman statuary in terms of connoisseurship and aesthetic considerations, not in terms of how such statuary may have been considered within its original contexts.

6 Winckelmann, *History of Ancient Art*, 300-19. The belief that Greek art represented true beauty while Roman art was symptomatic of decay was earlier propounded by Giorgio Vasari in his famous work first published in 1555 which was revised and republished in 1568: G. Vasari, *Lives of the Sculptors, Painters and Architects*, trans. G. D. C. d. Vere (London: Everyman, 1996), 46 and 135.

7 Winckelmann, *History of Ancient Art*, 305-06. Also J. J. Winckelmann and D. G. Irwin, *Winckelmann: Writings on art* (London: Phaidon, 1972), 19.

climate, religion etc. He believed that it was contact with non-Greek barbarians during the Hellenistic and Roman periods which caused the degeneracy of Art and led to its near total demise during the Middle Ages.⁸ To Winckelmann, nothing evidenced this decline more than the Roman Republican portraits, which he himself barely mentions, and then only with disdain.⁹

Winckelmann's influence has been tremendous in terms of art criticism and art analysis – and his theories underpin much of the subsequent scholarly discourse on Roman art. His influence can be seen in studies that date from his time, throughout the nineteenth century (e.g., Q. Visconti and J.J. Bernoulli¹⁰), the mid-twentieth century (O. Vessberg¹¹ and B. Schweitzer¹²) and even into the 1970s (G. M. A. Richter¹³). These later writers shed much of the precise theorising evidenced in Winckelmann's writings, being more purely typological and stylistic in their approach. However, much of the teleology and theoretical understandings which underpinned Winckelmann's theory are still evident.

Winckelmann's theory, based on his premise that there was a 'pervasive spirit' or *Zeitgeist* that characterised the manifestation of art and civilisation within each period, was formulated into a philosophy of aesthetics by Hegel in the early nineteenth century.¹⁴ Hegelianism viewed art as manifested in local forms, usually attributed as a product to a specific racial or national group,¹⁵ which was referred to as the *Volkskunst*. The *Volkskunst* itself was explained as expressing principles or attitudes to art inherent to the particular national or racial group which produced it – referred to as the *Volksgeist*. Hegelianism further grouped together

8 Winckelmann accepted physiognomic theory, based primarily on the effect of climate on conformation of the races which expressed itself in the countenance and physical attributes of diverse peoples and which was reflected in their level of civilisation and their Art. These physiognomic beliefs formed the basis to his own theory on the development of Art: Winckelmann, *History of Ancient Art*, 159-60.

9 Ibid., 305-06. Winckelmann and Irwin, *Winckelmann: Writings on art*, 19.

10 J. J. Bernoulli, *Römische Ikonographie, die Bildnisse berühmter Römer*, vol. 1 (Hildesheim: 1969).

11 Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik*.

12 Schweitzer, *Die Bildniskunst der römischen Republik*.

13 G. M. A. Richter, *Roman portraits* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1948); G. M. A. Richter, 3 *Critical Periods in Greek Sculpture* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951); Richter, "Origins of Verism in Roman Portraits."; G. M. A. Richter, "Late Hellenistic Portraiture," *Archaeology* 16 (1963); G. M. A. Richter, *Portraits of the Greeks*, vol. 2 (London: Phaidon, 1965).

14 Winckelmann, *History of Ancient Art*, 176: "The history of Art I dedicate to Art and the Age..."; see also Winckelmann and Irwin, *Winckelmann: Writings on art*, 53.

15 M. Podro, *The critical historians of art* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1982), 19 and 26.

various *Völker* which were believed to have certain underlying principles in common to form a 'Civilisation'. Significantly different from Winckelmann, Hegelian theory viewed 'Civilisation' as evolving and developing, but never in decline;¹⁶ each stage of Civilisation passing into the next according to the notion of 'Progress' towards what would be an eventual state of 'perfection'.¹⁷ The motivating principles inherent in a particular civilisation, which were manifest in art, religion, politics, economics and technology, etc., were simply expressions of the dominating *Zeitgeist* ('Spirit of the Age').

Hegelian theory is highly teleological, tending to the view that contemporary nineteenth century *European* civilisation was the most advanced (or most 'perfect') state of civilisation yet attained by man.¹⁸ The result for contemporary art theory and art criticism was that all previous history, art and culture were seen as necessarily paving the way for an ever more perfect state of development at the present.¹⁹ This Eurocentricity also meant that art history and criticism and the emerging science of Archaeology often became imbued with racist or nationalist prejudices which necessarily tainted how ancient and other cultures (i.e., non-'European' cultures) were perceived.²⁰ Hegelian Aesthetics was given a scientific *imprimatur* by the application of a distorted understanding of Darwin's *Theory of Evolution* and Psychology/Psychiatry to the human sciences in the later half of the Nineteenth century. It is no coincidence that the Hegelian approach to art criticism and art history developed in tandem with the rise of the secular nation states in Europe and the advent of large-scale European colonialism.

16 R. Wicks, "Hegel's Aesthetics: An Overview," in *The Cambridge companion to Hegel*, ed. F. C. Beiser, Cambridge companions to philosophy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 352.

17 Podro, *The critical historians of art*, 26; D. Preziosi, *The Art of Art history: a Critical Anthology*, Oxford history of art (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 67; Wicks, "Hegel's Aesthetics: An Overview," 348.

18 Podro, *The critical historians of art*, 18; Preziosi, *The Art of Art history: a Critical Anthology*, 67.

19 Podro, *The critical historians of art*, 33.

20 Sumer and Egypt, recognised for their sophistication, were believed to contain the roots of European civilisation (since Europe itself offered nothing of note which was contemporaneous). Civilisation then passed through the then newly discovered Minoan civilisation, Greece, Rome, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance to culminate in the Enlightenment of the nineteenth century: see Podro citing K. Schnaase, *Niederländische Briefe* (1834), 397: „Ich beginne schon in jeder Vergangenheit neben ihrer Gegenwart ihre Zukunft mitzuempfinden. So führt die genaue und klare historische Betrachtung auch zu der höheren aesthetischen,... welche in der Schönheit jeder einzelnen Zeit den Zusammenhang mit den übrigen empfindet.“ This was the theory applied by Riegl in his reassessment of Roman art: A. Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, trans. R. Winkes (Rome: G. Bretschneider, 1985), 2. A. Riegl et al., *Problems of Style: Foundations for a History of Ornament* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 26.

The effect of Hegelianism was not all negative. A positive result was that art historians and archaeologists were freed from Winckelmann's prism through which non-Classical art was necessarily seen as 'degenerate'.²¹ Scholars were thus able to re-examine local and regional variations that deviated from the Classical ideal for their own aesthetic principles of style which were indicators of specific, and even non-classical, cultures. These cultures were then either set within the stream of Western or European civilisation, or of non-European 'civilisations', without thereby threatening the overall universality of the Hegelian model. This was to have great impact on re-legitimising the study of Roman art, reinforced by the discovery and influence of a vast quantity of 'Roman' art at Pompeii and Herculaneum and the art of pre-, or non-, Roman cultures, such as the Etruscan.²²

Examples of this liberated approach are found in the writings of Riegl,²³ who explained the development of certain patterns or motifs as expressive of a common *Kunstwollen* ('urge to make art') which progressed through various civilisations from Egypt through to the Middle Ages.²⁴ Similarly, Wickhoff²⁵ saw Roman art as expressive of a particular *Italian Kunstwollen* which adopted Classical art, but imbued it with principles inherent to the diverse (non-Greek) peoples of the Italian peninsular that would later evolve into the art of the Middle Ages. The writings of Riegl and Wickhoff represented a profound reassessment of the aesthetic value of

21 Since Germany was understood to have been largely outside the sphere of Classical civilisation, it was therefore felt necessary by certain German scholars to legitimise German culture and its Gothic antecedents as a reaction against Winckelmann and his Greek Classical aesthetic. This was evident from the writings of Goethe onwards and became a fundamental premise to the German Romantic movement in the nineteenth century, expressed in the architecture of King Ludwig II of Bavaria, in particular his castle *Neuschwanstein*, the music of Wagner, or the archaeology of G. Kossina.

22 Studies on the Etruscans particularly had been published for some time. *De Etruria Regali* [1723-1726 by Thomas Dempster] was followed by the volumes of the *Museum Etruscum*, 1737-1743 by Gori, who provided very detailed account of all aspects of Etruscan sculpture, tombs, pottery, mirrors and other works which were amply illustrated in many plates. Calus, in his important *Recueil D'Antiquites* from 1752 onwards, was concerned with Etruscan art. But Winckelmann gave Etruscan art scant and unfavourable attention: this art did not conform to his ideal. The only exception was the so-called 'Etruscan vases' which are now known to be Greek. Despite this, interest in pre-Roman archaeology was further stimulated in the 18th century with the discovery of the mural paintings of Corneto in 1827 and the discovery of the Regolini-Galassi tomb at Caere in 1836. A notable book was published in English on the Etruscans in 1848, *Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria* by George Dennis: See G. Daniel, *A Short History of Archaeology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 88. The greater interest in pre- and non-Roman archaeology gained a fresh impetus following the unification of Italy in 1862, the results of which would be proposed to challenge the theory of Greek and Roman cultural unity and to cite a line of development for Roman art within the Italian peninsular itself.

23 Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*.

24 *Ibid.*, 19.

25 F. Wickhoff, *Roman Art: Some of its Principles and their Application to Early Christian Painting*, trans. E. Strong (London: Duckworth, 1900).

Roman and Medieval art that led to closer re-examination by subsequent scholars of Roman art in general, including portraiture, unfettered by the bias in taste that Winckelmann's writings had largely condemned the subject.

Unfortunately the Hegelian insistence on art as *Volkskunst* meant that variations in style were explained as rooted in racial factors operating in a specific time and place. Heavily influenced by contemporary concepts of physiognomics based on understandings of race and nationality, an extreme form of physiognomic theory emerged during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This racialised physiognomics was supported by false analogies drawn from scientific Darwinism, Psychology (and the emerging science of Psychiatry), which were applied to a racialised (and at times, racist) Archaeology (G. Kossina,²⁶ L. Curtius²⁷, A. Hekler²⁸). Applied to studies of portraiture, it was claimed that psychological diagnoses concerning the character could be made based on the physical features of the individual, which in turn were used to support generalisations regarding the psychology and character of the nationality or race to which the individual belonged, which, in a circular application of logic, were then substantiated by referring back to the physiognomy of individual members as depicted in their portraits.²⁹ Roman Republican portraits lent themselves particularly to this type of analysis, due to the widely held belief that they presented photo-realistic images of individual Romans. Following the Second World War, such 'racialised physiognomics' fell

26 P. G. Bahn, *The Cambridge illustrated history of archaeology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 136-38.

27 L. Curtius, "Geist der römischen Kunst," *Ant* 5 (1929). L. Curtius, "Physiognomik des Römischen Porträts," *Ant* 7 (1931).

28 A. Hekler, *Greek and Roman Portraits* (London: Heinemann, 1912; reprint, New York 1972). Hekler believed that the Roman *imagines maiorum* were in a direct line of development from Etruscan burial urns, such as those found at Chiusi: Hekler, *Greek and Roman Portraits*, 28. His view was based on that of Amelung, who saw in these urns a vigorous individual accent that led to Etruscan realism that eventually infiltrated Roman art: W. Amelung, *Führer durch die Antiken in Florenz* (Munich: 1897), 181. This view was similar to that of della Seta, who believed that the urns represented an uninterrupted line for development through to Roman art, and that they represented a sub-current of Greek traditions which incorporated local traditions which emphasised individual expression: A. della Seta, *Religione e arte figurata* (Rome: 1912), 182.

29 Ibid., 25: "...we must not forget that we are dealing with the representatives of a new race, of great interest physiognomically, but very different to the mobile, lively and highly intellectual Greek types. The ethical cast and sobriety of expression were therefore inherent in these portraits as the outcome of the healthy, vigorous Roman peasant strain. The models were excellent specimens of genuine Romans...". Hekler, *Greek and Roman Portraits*, 27: "[T]he chief merit of Roman Republican Portraiture is that they immortalised the dominant ethical qualities of the Roman peasant-class in grandly conceived physiognomical variations. In spite of the great variety in rendering of physical phenomena, they reflect ethical and racial character rather than the individual mind and soul".

into disfavour, since its methodology and conclusions were recognised as overtly politicised, “non-factual” and empirically unsupportable.³⁰

In relation to Italian, and more specifically Roman archaeology, it had always been noticed by scholars that Roman art contained elements that could be viewed as ‘non’, and at times even ‘anti Classical’ (despite the presence of Greek stylistic elements in art at Rome from the earliest period). Simultaneously, studies on pre-Roman cultures of Italy³¹ made it clear that the peoples of the Italian peninsula, and the Roman citizen body, were far from being a singular or homogenous ethnic group but in fact encompassed a great diversity of ‘nationalities’, cultures and linguistic groups³² – and this posed some problems to those scholars who viewed art in Hegelian racial and nationalist terms. This ethnic diversity was seen to be reflected in ‘Roman’ artworks themselves, since they appeared to contain an eclecticism of styles unseen until the modern era.³³

30 For instance, Curtius based his theory of physiognomics on the writings of R. Kassner, such as the latter's essay ‘Zahl und Gesicht’ (R. Kassner, *Zahl und Gesicht: nebst einer Einleitung: Der Umriss einer universalen Physiognomik* (Wiesbaden: Insel-Verlag, 1956). Kassner based this view on the presumably identifiable ‘racial’ features of people which he believed had direct bearing on their character and which predetermined their behaviour. These features were somehow influenced by the climate, and here we can see the influence of the ancient physiognomic theories of the Pythagorean and Hippocratic schools (cf. the *Airs, Waters and Places*) – particularly in the conclusions Kassner made from his comparison of the strong ‘alpine type’ of European, whose strength of character is reflected in the features of the face, with the so-called ‘Judas type’. Curtius, “Physiognomik des Römischen Porträts,” 238: “Was war der grosse Geiz des Judas schliesslich anders als Mangel an vision und ein Fehlen im Glauben an die inneren Mächte ! Judas sah nicht; mit seiner Nase geht fast immer ein kleines, nacktes, spitzes, unschauendes Auge zusammen, desgleichen ein dünner scharfer Mund mit herabgebogenen Winkeln, eine harte, nicht gewölbte Stirn...Zu dieser physiognomischen Analyse des Judastypus gibt es eine schlagende Illustration in einem römischen Porträt des Museums von Neapel aus dem Ende der Republik. Habsüchtiger, geiziger kann niemand sein als dieser Sechszigjährige mit seiner nach unten überhängenden Habichtsnase, den schmalen Lippen des breiten verschlingenden Mundes und der gleichsam metallischen Verhärtung des Gesichts mit dem kalten Auge. An diesem Kopf ist alles Angriff und erraffen. Er baut sich vom Wirbel ab vor bis zu kinn und Nasenspitze. Das Ohr sitzt nicht hoch in der Achse der Augen, um mit ihnen geniessend zu empfangen, sondern tief an die Kinnlade gebunden, gleichsam ihr dienend und nur das erhorchend, was sie zermalmt.”

31 See n. 22 above. For the latest comprehensive survey of literature on Etruscan and Italic sculpture and portraiture, see M. Papini *Antichi volti della Repubblica* (Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2003), 11-57.

32 Evidenced in the writings of P. Ducati, *Etruria antica* (Torino: 1927), P. Ducati, *L'arte in Roma dalle origini al sec. VIII*, vol. 26, *Storia di Roma* (Bologna: Istituto di Studi Romani, 1938), P. Ducati, *Storia dell'arte etrusca* (Firenze: 1927). A good summary of the writings of the period can be found in M. Pallottino, *Civiltà artistica etrusco-italica* (Milano: Hoepli, 1971). These writers concentrated on the art of the Etruscans and the neighbouring Italic peoples, themselves partly Hellenised, out of which mixed artistic environment Roman art and culture were believed to have emerged.

33 O. J. Brendel, *Prolegomena to the Study of Roman Art* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978; reprint, 1978), O. J. Brendel, *The Visible Idea: Interpretations of Classical Art* (Washington D.C.: Decatur House Press, 1980).

Attempts to answer how to account for the non-Classical elements of Roman art, appeared from the time of Riegl and Wickhoff onwards. Although still adhering to the largely Hegelian principle that artistic expression equated with specific national groups, some scholars explained this as the result of non-Classical cultural contacts external to the Roman sphere which influenced the local art industry (J. Strzygowski³⁴ and G. Rodenwaldt³⁵).

Guido Kaschnitz von Weinberg,³⁶ drawing on the previous scholarship of Riegl,³⁷ Wickhoff³⁸ and (to a lesser extent) Strzygowski,³⁹ recognised the problem of applying a singular definition of 'race' or 'nationality' as consonant with a definable cultural output. He attempted to solve it, defining and describing 'Italic' elements that were present in 'Roman' art in stylistic and cultural/geographic terms,⁴⁰ by developing and applying a highly structuralist methodology. By so doing he shifted the search for a unifying principle of Roman art to inherent 'artistic principles of form' which were passed down through diverse peoples of the Italian peninsular, as a common 'cultural impulse', which he described by the term *Kulturwollen* (derived from Riegl's *Kunstwollen*). He thus proposed a means for defining 'culture' by identifying similar formal elements within particular assemblages of artefacts which are common to diverse peoples within a specific time and region.

Evidently, Kaschnitz von Weinberg believed that Roman Republican portraits manifested a long standing cultural preference for composition based on juxtaposition of lines, planes and

34 J. Strzygowski, *Orient oder Rom: Beiträge zur Geschichte der spätantiken und frühchristlichen Kunst* (Leipzig: 1901; reprint, 1923).

35 G. Rodenwaldt, "Eine spätantike Kunstströmung in Rom," *MDAI-R* 36-37 (1921-1922), G. Rodenwaldt, "The Transition to Late Classical Art," *CAH* 12 (1939).

36 G. Kaschnitz von Weinberg, *Die Mittelmeerischen Grundlagen der antiken Kunst* (Frankfurt a.M.: Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung, 1944), G. Kaschnitz von Weinberg, "Italien mit Sardinien Sizilien und Malta," in *Handbuch d. Archäologie*, ed. R. Herbig and J. Otto (Munich: 1950), G. Kaschnitz von Weinberg, *Mittelmeerische Kunst, Eine Darstellung ihrer Strukturen*, vol. 3, *Ausgewählte Schriften* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1965), G. Kaschnitz von Weinberg, *Römische Bildnisse*, vol. 2, *Ausgewählte Schriften* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1965), G. Kaschnitz von Weinberg, "Studien zur etruskischen und frühromischen Porträtkunst," *MDAI-R* 41 (1926).

37 Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*.

38 Wickhoff, *Roman Art: Some of its Principles and their Application to Early Christian Painting*.

39 Strzygowski, *Orient oder Rom: Beiträge zur Geschichte der spätantiken und frühchristlichen Kunst*.

40 Kaschnitz von Weinberg utilised an empiricised Hegelian framework – Hegelian aesthetics described all art as expressive of a *Zeitgeist* which manifested itself at a local or regional level as a *Volksgeist*, and physically as the *Volkskunst* (art representative of a 'people'); however, Kaschnitz von Weinberg ascribed the italic element of art, not to ethnic causes, but to an overall 'cultural urge' (*Kulturwollen*) common to the peoples of the Italian peninsular: Kaschnitz von Weinberg, *Mittelmeerische Kunst, Eine Darstellung ihrer Strukturen*, 107.

surfaces (formed from inherently unrealistic 'parts' or elements) which were applied artificially to 'represent' a human face. By contrast, he believed that Greek portraits were conceived as an organic whole, each part inter-related and plastically flowing one to the other.⁴¹ Kaschnitz von Weinberg believed that this inherent artistic preference for disjunctive, lineal representation was evident in all Roman artworks, and that it would assert itself fully in the late Imperial period, when art would finally be steered away from Classical Greek conceptions to the lineal abstraction found in medieval art.

On the mechanical level, Kaschnitz von Weinberg attributed the form of Roman portraiture to the death masks used in Etruscan culture which were transmitted to Rome during the Archaic period (and hence transmitting the predilection for linear forms). He did not believe that these *imagines* were originally 'realistic' in their appearance, being analogous to the 'canopic' urns found in Chiusi, but that they only became 'realistic' in the late third century B.C. However, he believed that even then this 'realism' was largely illusional, since the composition remained lineal.⁴²

The blatant political manipulation of the human sciences at the hands of the totalitarian regimes in pre-war Europe shook the confidence of social scientists regarding non-inductive or non-empirical approaches to scientific theory. Many scholars, rejecting the excesses of 'scientific' physiognomics of the pre-war period, also rejected the hermeneutic approach to studies of Roman portraiture altogether, preferring to rely on a more traditional art historical 'empirical' approach using 'scientific' tools such as typology and stylistic analysis simply to quantify and qualify artefacts. However, the blatant political manipulation of Art and Archaeology did make scholars more acutely aware of other factors, such as the nature of power as a tool of economic, social and political interests (as emphasised by Marxist and Socialist theories), and how these could influence or dictate cultural expression. Stripped of Hegelian presumptions of 'Progress' and the physiognomic equation that "art = nationality/race", scholars were free to re-examine Roman art unfettered by any notion of

41 Kaschnitz von Weinberg, *Römische Bildnisse*. Also E. Gazda, "Etruscan Influence in the Funerary Reliefs of Late Republican Rome: A Study of Vernacular Portraiture," *ANRW* 1, no. 4 (1973): 866.

42 Kaschnitz von Weinberg, *Mittelmeerische Kunst, Eine Darstellung ihrer Strükturen*, Kaschnitz von Weinberg, "Studien zur etruskischen und frühromischen Porträtkunst."

superiority/inferiority or rise/decline in artistic styles. As a result, many scholars shifted to a more culturally oriented approach for analysing art and culture as advocated by the cultural art historians, such as Ernst Gombrich.

Some archaeologists continued to view Roman art as symptomatic of a 'conflict' between Classical and non-Classical elements brought about by social, religious and political factors.⁴³ Others, such as Bianchi Bandinelli⁴⁴ and Felletti Maj⁴⁵, influenced by Kaschnitz von Weinberg's methodology and possibly by Marxist and Socialist philosophy, believed Roman Republican portraiture exemplified a power conflict within Roman society, in that the Republican portraits were a manifestation of a 'plebeian' or 'Italic' expression overlaid, or influenced, or in conflict with Hellenistic styles of individual representation favoured by the élite classes imposed from above.

Interestingly, it was this search for an indigenous antecedent for Roman art stimulated by the writings of Kaschnitz von Weinberg, *et al.*, and influenced by the cultural art historians, which gave physiognomics a fresh impetus – drawing on structural analyses and literary evidence to identify the italic or indigenous element that made 'Roman art' Roman.⁴⁶ Some scholars believed that Roman portraiture presented a 'warts and all' 'veristic' or 'realistic' image of the Roman élite, who adopted Greek and Hellenistic methods of representation, but adapted them to specific, pre-existing Roman expectations formed within the cultural milieu of the Italian peninsular (O. Vessberg⁴⁷ and B. Schweitzer⁴⁸). According to this view, Roman art and portraiture formed a subset of a wider Greek cultural *koine*.

Other scholars concentrated on the physiognomic communicational aspects of gesture combined with specific modes of portrayal as evident in Greek and Roman statuary, portraiture, and theatrical masks which were representative of social, political or religious

43 J. Bazant, "From Connoisseurship to a Semiotic Analysis of Roman Portraiture: Hans Peter L'Orange," *PP* (1992): 230.

44 R. Bianchi Bandinelli, "Sulle formazione del ritratto romano," in *Archeologia e cultura* (Roma: Editori riuniti, 1979).

45 Felletti-Maj, *La tradizione italica nell'arte romana*.

46 E. C. Evans, "Physiognomics in the Ancient World," *TAPhS* 59, no. 5 (1969).

47 Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik*.

48 Schweitzer, *Die Bildniskunst der Römischen Republik*.

factors operating within Roman society (H. P. L'Orange⁴⁹, G. Krien⁵⁰, R. Brilliant⁵¹). Others utilised analysis of primary literary sources to arrive at a contextualised physiognomic understanding of Roman Republican portraits. The conclusions of such studies are that Roman portraits were formed by cultural attitudes indigenous to Rome but influenced by cultures with which Rome came in contact through a process of cultural diffusion. The Republican portraits served as an active means of communicating cultural, political and social values of the Roman élite (E.C. Evans⁵², R. Winkes⁵³, L. Giuliani⁵⁴, and G. Aldrete⁵⁵). This focus on the Greek and Roman aspects of physical communication was an attempt at reintroducing an hermeneutic approach without any of the pseudo scientific psychologising and race-based conclusions that characterised such studies in the pre-War period.

Other scholars, still largely working within Winckelmann's concept of style and Hegel's universal model (most notably Archaeologists specialising in Greek art) similarly relied on ancient literary evidence concerning ancient Greek and Roman physiognomic beliefs, to propose that Roman portraiture was a manifestation of Greek cultural attitudes to the Romans as a 'barbarian' (non-Greek) people. This theory assumed that Greeks were the artists who created the Roman Republican portraiture, or that Romans intentionally took over the style of representation used by the Hellenistic kings (G. M. A. Richter⁵⁶ and R.R.R. Smith⁵⁷).

It should be noted that one of the assumptions underpinning many of these more formal, stylistic oriented approaches is the acceptance (explicit or implicit) that Roman Republican portraits can be defined by their 'verism', 'realism', or 'naturalism' – a penchant that the

49 H. P. L'Orange, *Apotheosis in Ancient Portraiture* (Oslo; Cambridge, Mass: H. Aschehoug; Harvard University Press, 1947).

50 G. Krien, "Der Ausdruck der Antiken Theatermasken nach Angaben im Polluxkatalog und in der pseudoaristotelischen 'Physiognomik'," *JÖAI* 42 (1955).

51 R. Brilliant, *Gesture and rank in Roman art; the use of gestures to denote status in Roman sculpture and coinage* (New Haven: The Academy, 1963).

52 Evans, "Physiognomics in the Ancient World."

53 R. Winkes, "Physiognomia: Probleme der Charakterinterpretation Römischer Porträts," *ANRW* 1, no. 4 (1973).

54 L. Giuliani, *Bildnis und Botschaft: eine hermeneutische Untersuchungen der römischen Porträts* (Frankfurt a.M: Suhrkamp, 1987).

55 G. S. Aldrete, *Gestures and Acclamations in Ancient Rome* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999).

56 Richter, "Origins of Verism in Roman Portraits."

57 Smith, "Greeks, Foreigners, and Roman Republican Portraits."

Romans (or their Greek artists) had for ruthlessly portraying élite Romans of the period in a photo-realistic manner.⁵⁸ Just whether this was ever in fact the intention of Roman Republican portraiture has been very rarely questioned.⁵⁹

Other studies applying a culture-specific based approach to methodology have relied on ancient literary references to portraits in order to recreate the contextual display and meaning of portraits within Roman Republican society. Such studies are historical in their approach, many concentrating particularly on the significance and meaning of the Latin word *imago* (and a form of portraits referred to in Latin as the *imagines maiorum*⁶⁰) to reconstruct a Roman Republican portrait type and to explain its use and meaning (O. Benndorf⁶¹, G. Lahusen,⁶² and to a much lesser extent H.I. Flower⁶³).

A criticism of this 'text-based -historical' methodology is that it displays:⁶⁴

"... a reflex of ancient historians writing essentially formalist art histories [to] show an unwillingness to extend analysis of mounds of textual evidence concerning the social functions and uses of art to cultural analysis of the corresponding corpus of images on the grounds that they are not art historians."

58 R. P. Hinks, "Review of the 'Hadrianic School; A Chapter in the History of Greek Art' by Jocelyn M.C. Toynbee," *JHS* 54 (1934): 232; Richter, "Origins of Verism in Roman Portraits." See B. von Bothmer's attempt at a delineation between 'realism' and 'verism': B. von Bothmer, "Egyptian Antecedents of Roman Republican Verism," in *Ritratto ufficiale e ritratto privato: Atti della II Conferenza Internazionale sul Ritratto Romano 1984, Quaderni de "La ricerca scientifica"* (Roma: Consiglio nazionale delle ricerche, 1988), 55. Also Hinks, "Review of the 'Hadrianic School; A Chapter in the History of Greek Art' by Jocelyn M.C. Toynbee," 232. See also Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 9: although Flower questions the relationship between what she views as *imagines maiorum* made of wax and particularly associated with office holders, and other forms of Roman portraiture, she still accepts that this portraiture was 'realistic' or 'veristic'. She also accepts that these wax *imagines maiorum* may have stimulated the Roman preference for 'realistic portraiture'. Cf. Smith, "Greeks, Foreigners, and Roman Republican Portraits," 32; and R. R. R. Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 126.

59 J. Elsner, *Art and the Roman Viewer: The Transformation of Art from the Pagan World to Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 13.

60 See R. van Bremen, *The Limits of Participation: Women and Civic Life in the Greek East in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods* (Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1996). G. Lahusen, *Untersuchungen zur Ehrenstatue in Rom: literarische und epigraphische Zeugnisse* (Rome: G. Bretschneider, 1983). A. P. Gregory, "Powerful images: responses to portraits and the political uses of images in Rome," *JRA* 7 (1994): esp. 82.

61 O. Benndorf, "Antike Gesichtshelme und Sepulcramasken," *Denk(K)Wien* 28 (1878).

62 G. Lahusen, *Schriftquellen zum römischen Bildnis*, vol. 1 (Bremen: B.C. Heye, 1984).

63 Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*.

64 Tanner, "Portraits, Power and Patronage," 19.

In essence, historical studies tend to be devoid of explanation as to social, economic or other cogent factors which influence or even dictate style, including factors related to production and placement, or they rely on historical analysis of purely literary sources with little or no reference to surviving archaeological material. Essentially, by failing to link the literary references to the artefacts themselves, significant gaps emerge in formulating a coherent theory which explains the complex phenomenon that Roman Republican portraiture represents.

Many recent studies have attempted to broaden the methodological framework within which Roman portraiture has been analysed. These studies appear to be heavily influenced by semiotic theories of interpretation, such as 'Iconography' and 'Iconology' developed by Panofsky.⁶⁵ These theories have focused on the simple realization (consonant with some of the more recent physiognomic approaches to Roman portraiture) that an artwork must serve a social function to the people who create it, inherent in which is its communicative capability. Accordingly portraits are analysed by recreating them within the physical environment in which they were displayed (context), and by examining the complex social interactions that went into their creation and according to which they were viewed. This methodological framework brings into focus the notion of the 'viewer' and the response that such an artwork elicits. Portraits essentially invite (or require) a 'response', and response varies according to context and type of representation being viewed.⁶⁶ What precisely constitutes 'the viewer' is at times ambiguous,⁶⁷ and can involve several levels of analysis, from the psychological

65 According to Panofsky, there must first be a formal analysis of the object which entails a description of specific elements. The next level is to assess or analyse the subject matter in terms of natural meanings which could be attributed to that object in terms of our own culture (iconography). The third level is the 'culture bound analysis' which requires the viewer to define what the object means (iconology) via description of specific motifs, the imagery of which is evoked and instantly understood by individual members of the culture who view it, drawing on particular, consciously held ideas. Set further within the social and cultural context which led to an object's production, is the attempt to discover the underlying cultural premise on which the artist's work was drawn and which may well have been unconsciously expressed: E. Panofsky, *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1939), 1-17, esp. 14-17. See also E. Gombrich, "In Search of Cultural History," in *The Essential Gombrich - Selected Writings on Art and Culture*, ed. R. Woodfield (London: Phaidon Press, 1996); E. Panofsky, *Aufsätze zu Grundfragen der Kunstwissenschaft* (Berlin: 1964), E. Panofsky, *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism* (New York: Meridian, 1985); E. Panofsky, *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1960); E. C. Fernie, *Art history and its methods: a critical anthology* (London: Phaidon, 1995), 17.

67 P. Stewart, *Statues in Roman society: representation and response* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 14.

68 Ibid., 14-15.

impact of an object on a particular individual viewer, to the culturally preconditioned responses with which a particular group within society have in relation to it.

Cultural-based, semiotic approaches to the study of Roman art have drawn on tools from a variety of academic disciplines, especially those which attempt to adduce meaning in terms of political, sociological, and economic factors. Applying such a methodology to a complex phenomenon such as Roman Republican portraiture demands a detailed examination of factors perceived to be intrinsic to Roman culture, and requires analysis of the responses to the portrait from the individual to the group, including the patron, artisan, and actual or intended viewer. Some scholars have done so by analysing Roman art as a vehicle for a dynamic and interactive dialogue between the patron and artisan with the intended and actual viewer (P. Zanker⁶⁸, J. Elsner⁶⁹, P. Stewart⁷⁰, J. Højte⁷¹).

In a corollary to this approach, art (and portraiture in particular) is sometimes seen as propaganda,⁷² particularly so with those writers influenced by Derrida's 'Deconstructionism'.⁷³ To P. Zanker, art is a reflection of the propaganda of the power elite.⁷⁴ R.R.R. Smith views art as an expression of self- or sub-conscious identity or ideology.⁷⁵ Within the broader context of international relations in the Mediterranean basin, he suggests

69 P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, trans. A. Shapiro, Rep. ed. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998).

70 J. Elsner, *Art and Context in Roman Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

71 Stewart, *Statues in Roman society: representation and response*.

72 Højte, ed., *Images of Ancestors*.

72 Although the term itself is often left ambiguous; see Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 11-12.

66 J. Derrida, "Restitutions of the Truth in Pointing ["Pointure"]," in *The Art of Art History: a Critical Anthology*, ed. D. Preziosi, Oxford history of art (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

74 According to Zanker "visual imagery reflects society's inner life", whilst 'artistic style [is a] faithful reflection of social and political setting'. For instance, the absence of any stylistic norm reflects the normlessness of late Republican Roman politics. Stylistic contradiction and dissolution, for example in the portrait of Pompey, corresponds to political contradiction and dissolution of the Republic: Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, 1-31, esp. 3 and 11.

75 Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 115-30. cf. Smith, "Philorhomaioi: Portraits of Roman client rulers in the Greek East in the 1st Century B.C.," 497: "The portraits of the client kings ...show that the late Republican portrait style was not primarily a matter of how Romans looked, nor of a different aesthetic taste, but a matter of political expression - of desire to project a particular image. This portrait style was programmatically 'Roman'. These client kings and local Greek dynasts in the cities, like Theophanes, use a deliberately Roman-looking portrait style by which they announced their loyalty to and dependence on Rome and that the Senate was the ultimate guarantor of their power and position. For these client rulers this was a pro-Roman style. It expressed the political quality of the title Philorhomaioi, Friend of the Romans."

that Roman Republican portrait art was designed to symbolize the 'hard' style of Roman politics in contrast with the 'soft, effeminate, and deceitful' style of self-representation characteristic of late Hellenistic monarchs, which especially emphasized 'ideal and divine heroic elements'. Hence, Roman Republican portraiture was a form of 'nationalist' propaganda, in which was manifest the conflict of different cultural ideologies⁷⁶ and which was 'made to express the opposing ideologies with which the conflict between Rome and the [Hellenistic] kings was fought'.⁷⁷ L. Giuliani sees Roman portraits as a tool of 'internalised' propaganda for the ruling élite which served as a dynamic means of communication that reinforces those power structures through reliance on commonly understood rules of rhetoric.⁷⁸ According to his model, Roman Republican portraiture is a physical statement of the value placed on age and experience within Roman society as manifest in the minimum age limits for holding certain offices.⁷⁹ Furthermore in the context of the ruling élite, portraits served as a precise political propaganda, created so as to engage political support for the person portrayed amongst his peers and the *populus* at Rome.⁸⁰

In a critique of these approaches Tanner states:⁸¹

"On a theoretical level such arguments lack any sense of works of art as more than privileged indicators of social and cultural context. There is no account of works of art or their particular visual components as active elements in the articulation of social relationships, the mobilization of cultural ideologies and the material transformation of relationships of power and solidarity. For the ancient historian the new contextual classical art history tends merely to confirm what was already known: that the Republic was conflictual and contradictory, that the Romans valued age as a sign of political authority in contradistinction to the charismatic ideologies of Hellenistic kingship."

76 Tanner, "Portraits, Power and Patronage," 19-20.

77 Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 115-30. See also T. Hölscher, "Die Anfänge römischer Repräsentationskunst," *MDAI-R* 85 (1978); T. Hölscher, "Die Geschichtsauffassung in der römischen Repräsentationskunst," *JDAI* 95 (1980); T. Hölscher, "Römischer Nobiles und hellenistische Herrscher," in *Akten des XIII. Internationalen Kongresses für Klassische Archäologie in Berlin 1988* (Mains: 1990); K. J. Hölskeskamp, "Conquest, Competition and Consensus: Roman Expansion in Italy and the Rise of the Nobilitas," *Historia* 42 (1993).

78 Giuliani, *Bildnis und Botschaft*, 51-55.

79 Ibid., 190-99, esp. 98, where the style corresponds to a "structural element of the Roman constitution".

80 Ibid., 51-55, esp. 52. Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*.

81 Tanner, "Portraits, Power and Patronage," 19-20.

This criticism may be considered a little harsh – in that it can be argued that most ‘art’⁸² (until recently) was in reality a commodity created by the demand of élite sectors of society, whether those sectors be religious, social, economic or a combination thereof. Non-élite members of society (those excluded from the power and the economic élites) rarely create what modern connoisseurship would class as ‘great’ art⁸³ – and even if those from outside the élite class create ‘art’, it becomes so only if the élites (the people with the money or power, etc.) come to value it as reflecting or communicating something to or about them.⁸⁴ In this sense, power relationships and social structure are essential factors in the creation, context of display, viewing and classification of artworks – and this is no less true in relation to portraits, which traditionally tend to represent individual members from the élite classes. This makes portraiture an extremely important social and political means of communication, as well as a tool of social reaffirmation for those with a vested interest in the power structures. This is especially so in a world, such as ancient Rome, where there was no mass media (as we understand it) as a form of social control, and where greater reliance was placed upon images and the spoken word, rather than on volumes of written material.⁸⁵

Despite this, Tanner makes an important point: ‘propaganda’ theories tend to focus on one aspect of the equation: the ‘intentions’ (or the context) of the patrons in having art created, but then often ignore how an artwork is received by the viewer(s) or expresses, shapes or effects those same social relationships, which in turn influences the creation of further artwork. While models explaining art as propaganda would seem to offer a solution, they tend, as Tanner observes, “[to] assume a passive viewer inoculated with the dominant meaning

82 As we commonly understand the term, imbued as we are with our Renaissance heritage.

83 I am aware of the elitism which usually determines what constitutes this genre, as opposed to what is characterised as ‘folk art’ or ‘craftwork’ Ironically it is these élites who tend to define what is culturally regarded as ‘great art’ and this tends to exclude folk art as having any artistic, monetary or social worth.

84 Even in our own contemporary period, the choice of which art is considered ‘good’ (and hence which art has value) is rather an elitist choice. A walk through any contemporary national art gallery and the prices paid for such artworks are indicative. Ironically, contemporary connoisseurship also extends to similar judgements regarding the art of ancient cultures, irrespective of what role or value such artefacts may have had within their original cultural contexts.

85 In this sense there is a danger in using the terms ‘art’, ‘artwork’, ‘sculpture’ etc, since these are imbued with meanings that we have largely inherited from the Renaissance as refined by modern Art Criticism and Art History. The mass of what we may call ‘artworks’ that were on view in a city like Rome, may not have been viewed in the same way by the Roman audience given their context, purpose, form, and function: See Stewart, *Statues in Roman society: representation and response*, 8.

propagated from above, a meaning decoded through iconographic analysis".⁸⁶ In this way, art is treated as a 'symptom' of historical (political, economic or social) processes, but not as making any particular contribution to them.⁸⁷

There are great difficulties in specifying the processes through which art plays a role, not only in representing the cognitive elements of culture, but as expressing the psychological elements inherent in personal and cultural identity, especially with regards to those which operate from the perspective of the individual viewer. Given the communicational intent inherent in artwork, there must be some shared cultural and psychological understandings between individuals who constitute the community in which an artwork is created and viewed – otherwise there would be no point. This does not mean that individuals from different groups within society will view the same object in the same light. However, once these cognitive, psychological and cultural attitudes are expressed by an artwork, the artwork in turn goes to shaping, reinforcing or adapting those very same psychological and cultural attitudes which formed the social relationships that went into the creation of the artwork in the first place and effect the environment in which further artworks may be created, viewed and understood.⁸⁸ This requires a synthetic approach to the problem. Tanner proposes just such an approach by drawing on sociological theory in order to reformulate the directional attitude of studies on art (specifically on Roman portraiture) from one focused on object, problem, and context, to one whereby portraiture constitutes, represents and shapes a dynamic social and cultural process.⁸⁹

Recent scholarship on Roman portraiture has attempted to provide a mechanism whereby its uses, context of display and meaning are analysed in terms of a text or dialogue that takes

86 Tanner, "Portraits, Power and Patronage," 19-20. For criticisms of the propaganda model see A. Wallace Hadrill, "Review of P. Zanker, 'Rome's Cultural Revolution,'" *JRS* 79 (1989); J. Elsner, "Cult and sculpture: sacrifice in the Ara Pacis Augustae," *JRS* 81 (1991).

87 E. K. Gazda, Haeckl, A.E., "Roman portraiture: reflections on the question of context," *JRA* 6 (1993): "Part of the problem in contemporary approaches lies in the invocation of an unexamined conception of 'context' as a response to the shortcomings of formalist art history".

88 The danger is, however, that such an approach can become circular in its application: the evidence of social relationships being utilised to extract the meaning from the artwork which in turn goes to substantiate the assessment of those same relationships.

89 Tanner, "Portraits, Power and Patronage," 20.

place between the patron, the artist and the viewer.⁹⁰ According to this (essentially hermeneutic) methodology, a portrait is representative of a dynamic process of cultural and social interactions. It is these social interactions, the resulting messages conveyed by the portrait and the effect that the portrait has on those relationships which the modern viewer must attempt to understand.⁹¹

1.3 Methodology

The present study focuses on the question whether a 'Roman' portraiture existed during the Republican period, and whether this portraiture can be defined and identified. If so, it must then be asked why it was produced; what was the physical context of its usage; what the stimuli were for the development of the genre; and what do these factors suggest about Roman social relationships and culture during the middle and late Republic. I specifically examine the portraits of male members of Roman Republican society made of diverse materials which were viewed in diverse contexts⁹² and I particularly concentrate on one communicational aspect of these portraits as expressed by their physical form and appearance.

I have adopted a two-pronged approach for this study drawn from a variety of methodologies. Firstly, I rely on an amalgam of hermeneutic and empirical investigation: meaning, the quantification and analysis of evidence (both literary and archaeological) to arrive at a culture-specific understanding of a visual sign system which can be read in the extant portraits. Secondly, I investigate the role and impact of portraiture (not as a work of art) but as an active means of communication, simultaneously being produced by, constituting, expressing and influencing an evolving relationship that existed between the patron, the

90 Stewart, *Statues in Roman society: representation and response*, 12.

91 A study published in late 2004 by M. Papini, in which that author utilized traditional tools of stylistic analysis and art criticism to examine the subject of portraiture in Italy between the fourth and second centuries B.C., came too late to be extensively examined in relation to the subject matter of this thesis before submission for examination. Subsequently, I have added a synopsis of this work in *Appendix I*: Papini, M. *Antichi volti della Repubblica: La ritrattistica in Italia centrale tra IV e II secolo a.C.* Supplementi 13, Bolletino della Commissione Archeologia Comune di Roma. Rome L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2004.

92 This by no means should be taken to infer that portraits of women from the Republican period are not worthy of study, nor that they are not related to the principles examined in this study. However, this would require more detailed examination than space would here permit.

portrayed, the artisan and the viewer over a distinct period of time.⁹³

Influential to my methodology is that proposed by Tanner. According to him, analysing artistic culture (iconographic codes and stylistic conventions) as a set of cultural patterns mediating expressive action in the context of cultural, social-structural, and psychological environments, permits formulation of a mechanism by which “culture plays an active role in the articulation of social relationships, the mobilization of cultural ideologies and material transformation of relationships of power and solidarity”.⁹⁴ In other words, a portrait must be viewed as forming part of a chain of ‘gestures’ and ‘responses’ (i.e., an ‘action system’), wherein shared meanings which have the character of language arise out of the processes of social interaction. These processes lead to the formulation or creation of the portrait, the context of its placement, and the meaning extrapolated from its viewing.⁹⁵

‘Pragmatic semiotics’ alone does not explain how varying elements of socio-cultural interaction might give rise to qualitatively different kinds of gestures, or, in their more elaborate forms, cultural systems – religious, cognitive, expressive, aesthetic, and so on. Tanner resolves this by fusing his model of ‘symbolic inter-actionism’ with the ‘functional theory of action systems’. Accordingly, art must be viewed as ‘expressive symbolism’, a specialized strand of the cultural tradition of an ‘action system’ which serves to mediate the relationships which constitute the social system with the personalities of the individuals who are members of that system. It is these particular, dynamic factors that serve to give shape to culture and social organization, and to elaborate or control emotions generated during the course of social interaction.⁹⁶ These aspects give to artworks (including portraits) their communicational capacity which itself formulates and conditions the content of social

93 Tanner, “Portraits, Power and Patronage,” 22-23.

94 Ibid.: 20. Tanner bases his approach on a synthesis of the sociological ‘semiotic ‘pragmatism’ and ‘action theory’: G. H. Mead, *On Social Psychology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), 115-96., 199-246, 249-82; also M. P. Jones, “Post-human agency: between theoretical traditions,” *SocTh* 14.3 (1996). In essence, his model is a reformulation of structuralist (and post-structuralist) semiotics where art is viewed as the sign of a ‘dyadic structure’ – encompassing the ‘signifier’ and ‘signified’ – extended to create a ‘triadic system’ which encompasses ‘signifier’, ‘signified’ and ‘interpreter’: Tanner, “Portraits, Power and Patronage,” 22.

95 Tanner, “Portraits, Power and Patronage,” 23.

96 T. Parsons, *The Social System* (London: Routledge & Keegan Paul, 1951). Tanner, “Portraits, Power and Patronage,” 24: “The formal meanings of languages, verbal and visual, represent only the most fully articulated, abstracted component of the various social and cultural substances – moral attitudes, feelings, social expectations – carried by languages in processes of action”.

relationships in response to it.

However, Tanner's model essentially leaves aside the question of *why* these interactions form social structure in the manner they do – containing a certain circularity in its logic. Accordingly, I also draw on principles drawn from Neorealist International Relations Theory to explain the mechanism of cultural interaction and change which I believe underpin the process of cultural interaction that Rome experienced throughout its history. Just as the structure of a community or society evolves from the complex social interaction of its individual members which are determined by the resources available (which differs from community to community), the evolving community structure (both political and social) tends ultimately to reflect the interests of the actor (or actors) within the community who are more capable or efficient in monopolising or controlling these resources. As its power increases, these actors eventually form an *élite* which, and by asserting greater control over these same resources it further reinforces and maintains its position within the developing structure. The greater the capacity of the *élite* to efficiently use or control the resources available (the 'domestic agential power'), the greater the power of the *élite* to conform and shape the internal power structures of that society so as to serve its interests. By maintaining effective use and control of resources (i.e., ensuring its high domestic agential power) and by manipulating the balance of power in its external relations, the community may be able to claim a more dominant position in its relations with external communities. Eventually, the community with the highest domestic agential power and which is most capable of manipulating the balance of power in its interactions with other communities will emerge as the *Hegemon* (most powerful actor in the realm of intercommunity relations). Due to its dominance the *Hegemon* derives a degree of 'intercommunity agential power', meaning its power to conform and shape the intercommunity structures in which all other communities must operate. Where the *Hegemon* has high intercommunity agential power, it can also shape the internal structures of other, subject communities.⁹⁷ The success of the *Hegemon* will depend on its continued efficient use and control of its resources (both internally and externally) and in its effective manipulation of the balance of power, including its capacity to

96 J. E. Dougherty and R. L. Pfaltzgraff Jr, *Contending Theories of International Relations: A Comprehensive Survey*, 4th ed. (New York: Westview Press, 1997), 83.

coerce other communities within the system to conform to the structures it has imposed (the 'stick' approach) or to encourage those communities (usually controlled by like-minded élites⁹⁸) to conform to its will by the prospect of sharing to a degree in the benefits of the power it wields (the 'carrot' approach).

The élite, as its domestic agential power increases, monopolises resources (economic, social and political) and hence orders the internal structures of the community to reflect its priorities. The élite coerces acquiescence or obedience of the members of the community through the use of force (via law, religion, economics and custom) or it can encourage compliance by offering benefits to them (such as a share in economic, political or other social power). If the equilibrium of the system is disturbed (either internally or externally) through a loss of domestic agential power by the élite or from the threat of outside coercion by a more powerful community, the disequilibrium may lead to violence (internal or external).

In extreme cases, if the élite fail to manage the balance of power within the community by maintaining effective control of the power resources (and thus fail to satiate the demands of other emergent members of the community who increasingly control the power resources), the balance of power within the community may shift, forcing the élite either to reformulate or reconstitute itself to maintain its position, or to rely on force to impose the necessary compliance of recalcitrant members of the community. At this stage the security seekers of the emergent power wielding class (if they perceive they have more to lose than gain by further supporting the *status quo*) may seek to challenge, or possibly overthrow the existing élite.

If the community in question also happens to be a *Hegemon*, then it will coerce or encourage emulation of its structures, customs, institutions (and this often involves its identifying power

97 Where the *Hegemon* has maximised its power it may impose the internal structure of its subject communities or these communities may conform their internal structure in imitation of the *Hegemon* so as to gain maximum benefit from the intercommunity structure in which it must operate – either with the prospect of sharing in the benefits that the *Hegemon* offers, or in being itself able to manipulate its own resources and the balance of power to hopefully emerge as the *Hegemon* itself. In simple Neorealist International Relations Theory, states must conform to the power of the *Hegemon* if they are to survive and remain viable.

iconography) within the hierarchical order of those communities subject to it.⁹⁹ Subject communities themselves will willingly try to emulate the structures of the *Hegemon* as an act of self-survival.

This model can be extended to the role of art and culture within a particular social structure or community. As art serves as a visible symbol or means of communication expressive of the power relationships within the community. Since art is a manifestation and tool of power, it tends to be the élite which dictates how, when and where art is created and displayed. It also tends to be the élite who are the arbiters of the moral and social code for the community – basically determining through law, custom, religion and ethics, what kinds of behaviour by individual members are to be tolerated and which are not.

According to this model, art expresses the complex relationship of the élite vis à vis other members of the community – so the élite exploits art as a tool for expressing, reinforcing and maintaining its position within the system. The fact that most members of a particular community are ‘security seekers’ (as opposed to ‘radicals’ or ‘revolutionaries’) means that they hope to share in the benefits of power and control of resources that the élite offers. This explains why members of the non-élite classes tend to want to adopt and adapt the political,

98 In Neorealist International Relations Theory, states survive within the system by adapting and emulating the most successful states. Maladaptive states do not survive: M. W. Doyle and G. J. Ikenberry, eds., *New Thinking in International Relations Theory* (Boulder Co: Westview Press, 1997), 11. See also R. G. Gilpin, "The Richness of the Tradition of Political Realism," in *Neorealism and Its Critics*, ed. R. O. Keohane (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), 301-21; K. N. Waltz, "Reflections on *Theory of International Politics: A Response to My Critics*," in *Neorealism and Its Critics*, ed. R. O. Keohane (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), 322-45. However, a state's ability to adapt is determined by its own domestic agential power (i.e., its capacity to maximise efficient control and use over its resources, something which varies from state to state) as well as socio-economic fetters which can constrict the state's expansion: J. M. Hobson, *The State and International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 32; Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff Jr, *Contending Theories of International Relations: A Comprehensive Survey*, 84. A state with strong domestic agential power can use this to overcome these restrictions.

social and cultural agenda of the élite rather than challenge or destroy it.¹⁰⁰

There are some further observations regarding the underlying premise of this study. More importantly, while diverse people in different places may express their uniqueness through distinctive artefacts, much of what one regards as 'culture' is purely abstract: it is the attitude about oneself within the context of the group or community that is the determining factor in identity through which meaning is imparted to an object. These psychological factors may or may not leave a mark in the archaeological or textual record. The expression of these psychological understandings is also subject to fashion, technological capacity, external and internal interactions, social structure, customs, morals, politics, economics and religion etc., all of which also inform and infuse the desires, intentions, expectations, and understandings of the individual, whether that person be the patron, artist or viewer. An object, once created, has the capacity to influence or to mould the formulation of further expressions of this psychological or communicative content. An artwork is therefore reflective, didactic, instructive, constitutive and influential simultaneously. This is no less so than with the most human of art-forms, the depiction of a fellow human being – a portrait confronts us with a range of responses from the purely physiological to the psychological, and encompassing all those responses which are socially determined, culturally learned, or individual and emotive.

It is also pertinent to keep in mind that culture, including language and group identity, is 'learnt' by an individual from childhood by the fact of being born into a particular environment and through active teaching, and is affected or develops through social interaction. It is thus transmitted from person to person and from generation to generation, and is acquired, consciously or unconsciously, by the mere fact of interacting with other human beings within this human environment. How it is expressed will depend on the

99 According to Neorealist International Relations theory, throughout history it is the distribution of power which constitutes the principles form of control in every international system: R. G. Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 29; it operates in a series of cycles of birth, expansion, decline and death of dominant powers based on economic factors. The *Hegemon* declines because of three processes: the increasingly low returns from the cost of maintaining the hegemony; the rising consumption of *Hegemon* which invests less; and diffusion of technology and economy which permits underlings to threaten or challenge the *Hegemon*: Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff Jr, *Contending Theories of International Relations: A Comprehensive Survey*, 84-85; i.e., once decline sets in, disequilibrium replaces equilibrium and the world moves towards a new round of hegemonic conflict in which other states attempt to maximise efficient use of their resources (i.e., maximise their domestic agential power) so as to establish their position within a new balance of power: Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics*, 210.

dynamic interactional elements of that society and the individual's experience in relation to these. One must remember that society and culture are not merely abstract in the academic sense, but constitute a dynamic organism formed, formulated and constituted by *human beings* – acting both as a group and as individuals.

Several important *caveats* flow from these observations. Merely because objects from different places and times superficially *appear* the same (*to us*), this by no means suggests that such objects have the same significance to the people who create, view or utilise them in different times and places. Indeed, without a written or literary tradition accompanying such artefacts, the 'abstract' or 'psychological' element of culture may be lost entirely.

It should also be remembered that with something as amorphous as culture, the boundaries between 'cultures' are often a matter of pure conjecture predicated on the taste or preconceived viewpoint of the commentator. It is quite problematic even how one should identify or define a culture from a specific time and place. The dynamics of human interaction (on the micro and macro levels) do not really permit it. 'Culture' and its various definitions as applied to a specific place and time may be specific or broad depending on the context and the subject under discussion. Within a 'culture' there can exist manifold 'cultures', and *vice versa*. It flows from this that merely because a form of facial expression came to be applied to Roman portraits in the Republican period, in no way means that this form of expression was utilised only by 'Romans', however this term is defined. Given the formative and normative aspect of the communicational power of portrait images, any individual, given their placement within the social and political structures of the empire could have utilised, directly borrowed, or adapted the style to convey a consonant set of messages.

A further *caveat*: it should be noted from the outset that for the purposes of this study there is *no* underlying premise that there exists an orderly progression and/or 'development' of a

particular 'style'¹⁰¹ over a defined period of time - excepting those factors evidenced by datable technological innovation in the production of portraits, or securely datable changes in fashion.¹⁰²

In relation to the present study, how one defines and applies the label 'Roman' to art is problematic. It is my contention that 'Roman Republican portraiture' and its meaning can only be understood when viewed as a product of Roman society at a particular time - and this means particularly as a product of the ruling élite which dominated Roman political and social life through competitive, intra-class election to political office. This élite, with its control of power (military, political, social and economic) and resources, and its vertical interactions within Roman society, possessed values and ethics which were communicated via their portrait images to all levels of their society. It was the élite form of portraiture that was adopted by lower classes within Roman society and then by classes external to Rome but connected to it through the imperial social and political structures. These culture-specific shared 'Roman' values were expressed by the facial expression, form and context of their portraits, not only internally to the primary audience (being other members of the élite class and members of the Roman community at large), but also to those external to the community.

By using the above methodology I believe it is possible to create a unified scheme by which not only a Roman Republican portraiture can be defined, but by which examples can also be identified. Furthermore, the proposed methodology helps to explain the apparent 'stylistic diversity' often perceived to exist within examples of Roman Republican portraiture and provides for identifying its origins and course of development. As an interpretational tool, the importance of physiognomics (essentially, Roman attitudes to physiognomic communication) is fundamental to this study and can not be underestimated.

101 'Style', as a term of art criticism and art history, refers to the formal qualities of an artwork. A style is characterised by the range of subjects it depicts, by the regular shapes to which elements of these subjects are reduced and by the manner that components of the art work are organised into a composition. Style is not concerned with the meaning of either the elements or of the whole, such interpretation being in the domain of visual grammar, iconography or physiognomics. Style can be defined as being personal to the artist, or more generally, defining a particular school or even a whole culture. While technology may influence the range of styles available and the manner in which style develops, style may vary widely even in similar ecological and environmental conditions. For a fuller discussion see Preziosi, *The Art of Art history: a Critical Anthology*, 582; also Fernie, *Art history and its methods: a critical anthology*, 361-64.

102 The reasons for this are discussed in Appendix 1 - where there is a fuller account of the definition of portraiture adopted for the purposes of this study.

1.4 Sources and evidence

The evidence I have relied on for the purposes of this study is a mixture of ancient Latin and Greek written sources and surviving archaeological material. There are also references to secondary sources of modern scholarship. However, it remains first and foremost a study based on primary (archaeological and literary) evidence.

In discussing Roman and Greek Physiognomic principles, Roman value terms, the existence of Latin words denoting portraiture, the link between physical characteristics and facial expressions with precise Roman moral and ethical terms, the importance of portraits to the Roman ruling élite during the Republican period, the context in which these portraits were utilised, and the social relationships that went into their creation, I have drawn on references found in surviving ancient Greek and Latin literary sources, including texts and inscriptions. There is a full citation of ancient literary texts with accompanying translations referred to in the thesis in bold square brackets “[...]” which can be found in Appendix 2, set out in number order according to chapter number. I have also relied on secondary sources provided by modern scholarship.

In order to exemplify the findings based on literary evidence, I have relied on surviving archaeological material: portrait heads in stone, terracotta and bronze, theatrical masks and representations of theatrical masks found in other contexts and at various locations. Important, and now highly contentious, evidence regarding the dating of Roman Republican portraiture is provided by the portrait heads from the island of Delos. Most of these have been dated to between 166 B.C. and 88/66 B.C., and so they are often relied on by scholars in the debate as to whether an actual ‘Roman’ portrait art existed or not, and whether its source lay within what is described as ‘Greek’ or ‘Roman’ cultural traditions. A catalogue of portrait images discussed in Chapter Six can be found in Appendix 4, while the illustrations referred to in the text in round brackets “(ill. ...)” are contained in an Appendix at the end of the thesis.

In the final chapters examining the origins of Roman portraiture, I have utilised an amalgam of literary (ancient and modern) and archaeological evidence. Material includes sculpted portrait heads (in bronze, terracotta, marble), images from coins, wall painting and other media, as well as archaeological material obtained through excavation.

In analysing the archaeological evidence one problem must be acknowledged *ab initio*. This concerns one form of portrait often referred to by the Latin sources as *imagines maiorum*, particularly those that these sources suggest were made of wax and were placed in the *atrium* of the *domus*. The problem is that there are no surviving examples that can be certainly identified.¹⁰³ Hence, I have analysed the surviving archaeological material and relevant textual information in order to conjecture about these specific *imagines maiorum* and their relationship with other portrait forms.¹⁰⁴

A further problem relates to the corpus of surviving portraits – this being that there are very few that date with any certainty before the first century B.C. Most portraits we now possess are made from marble, travertine or tufa – and because literary sources attest to the fact that marble did not become widely available as a material at Rome before the opening of the Luna marble quarries in the mid-first century B.C., most marble portraits have been dated to this period, while those of travertine and tufa have been dated on stylistic grounds from the end of the second century B.C. to the Augustan period. However, the ancient literary sources are replete with references to portraits made in diverse materials from an early period (such as bronze, terracotta, wax, gypsum etc.), so, despite the fact they have not survived, it cannot be seriously doubted that they actually existed. In fact there may be one or two examples of such portraits that do survive.

103 The dubious exception being a full wax bust found in Cumae in 1852 and now in the Museo Nazionale Archeologico, Napoli, Room 97 (see Ill. 106). See Swift, "Imagines in Imperial Portraiture," 293; Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 6-7.

104 It has been asserted that the *imagines maiorum* (as opposed to *imagines simpliciter*) were specifically those portraits which represented office holders, were made of wax and were stored in *armaria* in the *atrium* of the *domus*. Furthermore, that these only have a questionable relationship with other portrait forms, evidenced as portrait busts or attached to *statuae*, such as those appearing on tombs of the non-élite classes at Rome: see Kleiner, *Roman Group Portraiture: The Funerary Reliefs of the Late Republic and Early Empire*, 84-87; Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 1, 5 and 8-9; Kleiner, *Roman Group Portraiture: The Funerary Reliefs of the Late Republic and Early Empire*, 84-87. However, I reject this thesis categorically, based on the fact that there are several assumptions underlying it which are not supported by the evidence. While portraits may have differed in material or context of display, and that one particular form of portrait was made of wax and kept in the *armaria*, the Latin literature of the Republican period clearly demonstrates that all portraits were referred to by the Romans as *imagines*, and any portrait of a Roman who was deceased could be referred to in a collective sense as *imagines maiorum*, irrespective of the material of manufacture or context of display. See Chapter Two, pp. 38-45, and Chapter Eight, pp. 241-253 *infra*.

1.5 Definition of 'portraiture'

The precise definition of what constitutes a portrait poses a somewhat difficult question due to the fact that the contemporary observer has a retrospective view over thousands of years of artistic and cultural development (and not just with regards to the continuity of our own cultural traditions but in the global and historical experience of humanity). We can pick and choose styles (or elements of styles) from most of history to communicate our attitude concerning ourselves and our experience. Complicating this is that art and culture have become consumable, merchantable, mass produced units. Our view of art is thus highly conditioned by our own cultural context. The danger, therefore, is that we will impose this eclectic and diverse cultural experience onto past cultures when formulating models for archaeological interpretation.

Accordingly, it must be stated from the outset that, due to our own eclectic experience, what constitutes a portrait is no easy thing to answer – its meaning varies considerably according to time, place, and culture. However, in formulating a definition of 'portraiture' there are a few factors which are relevant for consideration and I have placed these in Appendix 1 – since despite the fact they are fundamental to the approach to portraiture that I have taken in this thesis, they are not strictly relevant to the primary subject under examination.

Keeping in mind the discussion in Appendix 1A, the definition of 'portraiture' which I shall adopt in the following discussion is as follows:

'PORTRAITURE': the creation of an image of a person which conveys to the viewer something concerning the character, personality, rank or mental state of that individual through the physical appearance, including manipulation of the gesture, dress, imagery and physiognomic traits. The transmission and reception of these messages are determined by the cultural context in which the portrait is created, who makes it, the social background of the sitter and viewer, the materials available, and the cultural values linked to physical expression or appearance of the face portrayed.

PART 1

ROMAN PHYSIOGNOMICS

*nonne ipsum caput et supercilia illa penitus abrasa olere malitiam et clamitare
calliditatem videntur? Cicero, Pro Quinto Rabirio, 7.20*

("Do not the head itself, and those completely shaved eyebrows seem to reek of bad
intentions and to proclaim slyness aloud?")

CHAPTER TWO

ROMANI IPSI LOQVVNTVR

The first step in this study is to ascertain what terms the Romans employed in their language to describe their own images and portraits, the meanings those words encompassed, and whether these conform to the definition of portraiture adopted above.¹ It is also necessary to understand the value and moral terms that the Roman's used to express their self-identity, as it is these values that one might expect to find expressed physiognomically by their portraits and which were understood by the viewer.

2.1 Latin terms for statuary and portraiture

There are several words used in the extant Latin literature to describe manufactured representations of the human form in painting, sculpture and other media - some of which were used to refer specifically to 'portraits' of individual people. The following definitions of Latin terms are taken from Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary*.²

2.1.1 simulacrum (neuter singular noun), simulacri (genitive sing)

"An image or a likeness of a thing; a likeness, image, form, representation, or semblance. Of images formed in art, especially statues of the Gods; an image, portrait, figure, effigy, statue. Also of images seen in dreams or reflected in mirrors." Examples of the use of this term are:

*alicuius effigiem simulacrumque servare...*³ (Cic. Verr. 2.2.65 §159)

See also [1]⁴ Cic. *Rep.* 3.9.14; [2] Cic. *Div.* 1.3; [3] Lucr. *De Re. Nat.* 5.75; [4] Caes. *B.Gall.* 6. 16.3; [5] Caes. *B.Gall.* 6. 17.1; [6] Verg. *Aen.* 2.172-175.

Simulacrum is used generally to imply an image representing a whole body, and can even be used to describe a complete statue, but conveying the idea of artificiality, not necessarily an exact likeness of the physical reality of a specific individual. The representation, however,

¹ Given that the sources utilised date from the third century B.C. until the end of the first century A.D. it must be kept in mind that, like Roman society itself, the precise meanings encapsulated by these words changed over time.

² C. T. Lewis and C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980).

³ '...to preserve the *effigies* and *simulacrum* of this man'

⁴ Bold numbers in brackets throughout the text refer to the full quotation and translation contained in Appendix 2.

retains some inherent reference to the personality, power etc., of the subject - similar to the older meaning of the English word 'facsimile'. In this sense a *simulacrum* "stands in for" or is "representative" of something and may therefore possess something of the aura or power of that object. For this reason, the word is used frequently in reference to idols or images of the gods: [7] Cic. Cat. 3.19). See also [8] Cic. Cat. 3.20; [9] Cic. Div. 3; [10] Livy AUC 9.44.16; [11] Livy AUC 8.5.8; [12] Livy AUC 10.23.12; [13] Verg. Aen. 2.517; [14] Verg. Aen. 2.232; [15] Hor. Carm. 3.6.4; [16] Ov. Met. 10.694.⁵

The word *simulacrum* was also used to describe a statue made to represent a person who has had divine honours accorded to them, as was the case with the cult statue of Julius Caesar: [17] Cic. Phil. 2.110.

The word could also convey the meaning of an 'image', 'form', 'shade' or 'phantom' of a deceased person. In this context it has the connotation of something not quite real or imaginary or representative, but retaining something of the form, personality and memories of the deceased, but intangible and not the actual individual themselves. This is similar to images seen in a dream or a vision of a ghost:

*quaecunque apparent nobis simulacra*⁶ (Lucr. De Re. Nat. 4.99)

See also [18] Lucr. De Re. Nat. 1.123; [19] Ov. Met. 3.432; [20] Ov. Her. 9.39; [21] Ov. Met. 4.435; [22] Ov. Met. 3.430; [23] Ov. Met. 14.111-113; [24] Ov. Met. 10.14; [25] Verg. Aen. 2.772; [26] Verg. Aen. 7.89; [27] Verg. G. 4.472; [28] Verg. G. 1.477.

Servius, commenting on Vergil's *Aeneid*, explains more fully the difference between the physical body and a *simulacrum*, stating that there is a contrast between an *imago* which is a representation of a man (both physical and ethical), and a *sumulacrum*, which is an imitative likeness to the physical body or spirit that substitutes for the real thing: [29] Verg. Aen. 4.654 apud Serv.

In older Latin, *simulacrum* also expresses the idea of a likeness or similitude, but again with the connotation of artificial representation: [30] Plaut. *Mostell.* 1.2.6. It can also be used when referring to the semblance of ideas, institutions, actions or qualities when they are not real but

⁵ See also Cic. Dom. 121: *simulacrum autem aut aram si dedicasti*; also Cic. Dom. 110 and 137: *simulacrum Concordiae*; Cic. Verr. 1. 7 and 2.5.72 §165.

⁶ '...whatever *simulacra* appears to us'

insubstantial or merely representative, or when their substance or actuality has been removed leaving only a vestige. This is reminiscent of the English usage 'to be a shadow of one's former self': [31] Verg. *Aen.* 5.585; [32] Verg. *Aen.* 5.674. By extrapolation, it is used to refer to things that have no corporeal being, but a semblance, pretence, or vestige of one - such as the 'State' or 'community' when its actuality or substance no longer exists: [33] Cic. *Fam.* 10.1.1.

Cicero sometimes uses *simulacrum* in conjunction with the word *imago*, to refer to a free standing statue with a portrait bust attached (instead of *statua* - which would be the more usual word to describe a free standing statue of a person). The choice of word seems to be that (in the instance cited below), the people are venting their anger against the statue of Verres, and so, like an effigy carried and burned in popular demonstrations today, it has come to be a totem or surrogate representative of Verres himself⁷: [34] Cic. *Pis.* 93.

2.1.2 statua (feminine singular noun), statuae (genitive singular)

"An 'image' or 'statue', commonly made of metal [Quint. *Inst.* 2.21.10]; rarely used to describe the statues of the Gods: *statuae deorum* [Cato apud Priscum P.72. P; Plin. (E) *HN* 34.7.18]. More frequently, however, used to denote statues of men (simpliciter) which are full body or free standing"; [35] Cic. *Cael.* 33; Also [36] Plaut. *Curc.* 3.80; [34] Cic. *Pis.* 93.⁸

The word hence describes actual, tangible statues of individuals. Cicero draws the distinction between images of the gods and statues of men by the use of different Latin words to describe them. Again, *simulacrum* seems to have some power embodied in it drawn from the thing it represents and is thus the more usual word to describe statues of the gods: [37] Cic. *Cat.* 3.19.

The word *statua* commonly refers to a full-body image of a person, not a mere bust or head, and not, in essence, a true photographic likeness, but a representation of a person *in toto*. It frequently appears in conjunction with the word *imago* where it implies a free standing statue (which thus has a portrait head attached), as well as in the plural phrase *statuae ac imagines* ('portrait statues' and 'image likenesses' as busts or heads) to convey the full range of

7 Perhaps in such instances the image serves subconsciously like a voodoo doll: by hurting it (and via sympathetic magic) it may be hoped that some of the pain may also be inflicted on Verres. This capacity of a *simulacrum* to retain or house some power or link to the object it depicts may explain why it is used to denote statues of the gods.

8 Cic. *Sest.* 38.83; Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.20.

representations of an individual: [38] Cic. *Arch.* 30.

Statua appears to have been used to denote a statue set up or dedicated in a public or private spaces, including honorary and votive statues of Roman leaders, generals and politicians. Such statues could be private or public dedications, depending on the circumstances and location. Such statues would frequently bear inscriptions (known as *tituli*) outlining the subject's career and achievements: [39] Cic. *Att.* 6.1.17.

Despite the semi-mythical status of the Roman kings, it seems there was a group of statues on the Capitulum which were thought to represent them and were referred to collectively as *statuae*: [40] Cic. *Clu.* 101. Interestingly, there is a reference to the statue of Julius Caesar which had been voted a place among the kings' statues on the Capitol. In talking about this, Cicero tells us that another prestigious place for publicly voted honorary statues was on the *Rostra*: [41] Cic. *Deiot.* 34. Cicero says that the practice of setting up public honorary statues at eminent locations in the city was ancient, dating to the earliest years of the Republic: [42] Cic. *Phil.* 9.4. He specifically confirms that the award of such a public statue was a highly prestigious honour voted by the senate or by the popular assemblies: [43] Cic. *Phil.* 5.41; also Livy: [44] Livy *AUC* 9.43.22.

While the state appears to have been responsible for many public dedications, statues could also be dedicated in certain 'public' spaces by private individuals or groups, such as *clientes*; for example the statue dedicated to M. Antonius by the *Equites*: [45] Cic. *Phil.* 6.13. Cicero refers to the importance of such dedications and their inscriptions as a public source of documentation, for example the statue of Scipio set up by Metellus: [39] Cic. *Att.* 6.1.17. However, both Livy and Pliny (E) tell us that due to the clutter of such statues, the Censors often ordered these to be cleared away from where they encroached into public space without proper authorisation.⁹

2.1.3 effigies (feminine singular noun), effigiei (genitive singular)

"ante-classical form: *effigia* (Plaut. *Rud.* 2.4.7). In essence it conveys the meaning of an artistic copy or imitation of something, with the accessory idea of resemblance obtained by constructed imitation":

⁹ Plin. (E) *HN* 34.30; Livy *AUC* 40; & 51.3

...*effigies formarum*¹⁰ (Lucr. *De Re. Nat.* 4.105)

*effigia Veneris*¹¹ (Plaut. *Rud.* 2.4.7)

See also [46] Cic. *Nat. D.* 1.37.103; [47] Cic. *Verr.* 2.159; [48] Verg. *Aen.* 2.167; [49] Verg. *Aen.* 2.184.

These sources indicate that *effigies* could convey the idea of an artificial imitation of a person or god of which the image thus becomes representative - but something made, constructed or artificial. The word is also found referring to the shade or ghost of a deceased person, but implying illusion or artificiality, something fabricated, created, or summonsed, although not necessarily real:

*effigiem nullo cum corpore falsi finxit apri*¹² (Ov. *Met.* 14.358).

The word *effigies* was also used to describe representations or exemplars created in order to celebrate a person's good deeds, nobility of spirit and moral values, according to the moral and ethical code of the time [i.e., a 'depiction']: [50] Cic. *Phil.* 9.12.

Interestingly there was a tool employed in oratory and biography known as *effictio* (to which *effigies* is etymologically linked). This was a description in words of physical peculiarities, i.e., the actual physical appearance. The *Auctor* defines *effictio* as a representation of the essential physical form of a person which can be utilised to divine something about that person's psychology or character.¹³ This is in contrast with the use of the Latin word *imago*, which is a physical representation of the likeness of an individual through which their morals, emotions, or states of mind (in Latin, *motus animi*) would be communicated. It is interesting to note that in most Latin literature it is not *effigies* which refers to a portrait of an individual, but the word *imago*.

2.1.4 signum (neuter singular noun), signi (genitive singular)

Among diverse meanings, "an image, as a work of art, a figure, statue, or picture, or an artwork created as such from diverse media":

10 '...*effigies* of shapes'

11 '*effigia* of Venus'

12 '...(and then) she created an *effigies* of an artificial boar with no body...'

13 *Rhet. ad Her.* 4.49.63.

*inerant (classi) signa expressa, Titani quomodo*¹⁴ (Naevius 2.13)

*statuas deorum, exempla earum facierum, signa domi pro supellectile statuere*¹⁵ (Cato apud Priscus: P.72P)

See also [51] Plaut. *Merc.* 2. 2. 44; [52] Plaut. *Rd.* 2.7. 2; [53] Cic. *Div.* 1.35.77; [54] Cic. *Verr.* 2. 4.1 & 1.

A *signum* could be made from any material and could represent anything (not necessarily a person). It does not usually refer to a portrait likeness, but to a work of art, sometimes with religious association, and usually something valuable: [55] Serv. *Comm.* 6.9, such as imported marble:

e Pario formatum marmore signum...,¹⁶ (Ov. *Met.* 3.419)

See also Pliny (E) *HN* 35.4-14.¹⁷

2.1.5 *imago* (feminine singular noun), *imagine* (genitive singular)

“In general, a representation, likeness (usually of a person), statue, bust, picture; In particular, an ancestral image of a distinguished Roman (often of one who had been a curule magistrate: aedile, praetor, or consul; usually made of wax, and placed in the *atrium* of a Roman house, and carried in funeral processions). Also, an image or likeness of a thing formed in the mind, a conception, thought, imagination, idea. Also, a mere form, image, semblance, appearance, shadow; a representative. That which suggests or recalls something by resemblance, a reminder.”

The Latin word *imago* has many uses and encapsulates many different levels of meaning. It is this word which refers most often to an image of a person as a portrait – more precisely, it refers to depictions or representations of the face of a particular individual, and hence *imagines* were often in the form of a bust, which portrayed a person from the neck upwards. It encapsulates the attempt to project a ‘likeness’ or ‘image’ representative of a particular human being, which simultaneously conveyed something about the character, attitudes,

14 ‘The class of Titans only are moulded *signa*’

15 ‘*statuae* of the gods, examples of their faces’

16 ‘...a *signum* formed from Parian marble...’

17 See Appendix Two, Chapter 9 [1].

morals, emotions, or states of mind (*motus animi*) of that individual. Implicit in the meaning of *imago* was that it served as a *monumentum* to 'remind' or inform the viewer about the personal values, character and achievements of the individual communicated specifically through the physical appearance.¹⁸

The word *imago* encompassed the head and facial representation of a human, either living or dead, in diverse formats, such as on coins, *clipeati*, gems, busts, statues with portrait heads, and reliefs. An *imago* could also be made of diverse material: bronze, terracotta, wax, marble, gypsum, travertine or tufa, etc.: [56] Cic. *Fam.* 5.12.7; [57] Cic. *Orat.* 110; [58] Plin. (E) *HN* 35.12.44. §153; [59] Cic. *Fin.* 1.6.21; [60] Tac. *Agr.* 46.3; [61] Tac. *Dial.* 11.3.¹⁹

An *imago* need not have been solely in bust form, and could be found attached to a *statua*, although in this case it would most likely to be simply referred to as a *statua*, but sometimes conjoined with *imago* to form the phrase *statua ac [et] imago*. This is particularly so when portraits and statues were referred to in legal contexts, such as *leges* or *senatus consulta*; for example, the *senatus consultum* of 20 December 20 A.D. condemning Cnaeus Calpurnius Piso on a charge of *maiestas* – several copies of which have been discovered in Spain.²⁰ Hence, the phrase *statuae ac (et) imagines*²¹ could refer specifically to all representations of an individual, free standing, full-bodied or busts, votive and honorary statues and portraits, public and private, and made of any material. In this context, *imago* referred to representations of the face and head of the individual, and could include those attached to statues. However, images in public places were often described simply by the term *statuae* (whether they had an *imago* attached to it or not) which were usually free standing statues, but these could also be referred to as *imagines* on occasion.

On occasion, *imago* was used in conjunction with the word *maior* in the phrase *imagines*

18 *exegi monumentum aere perennius...*: Hor. *Carm.* 3.30.

19 Plin. (Y) *Ep.* 4.7.1: *Placuit statuas eius et imagines quam plurimas facere: hoc omnibus officinis agit, illum coloribus illum cera illum aere illum argento illum auro ebore marmore effingit.* ['How much it pleased him to make statues and images of him: he pursued this in all the workshops: he had made this one in colours, that in wax, that in bronze, that in silver, that in gold, ebony and marble.']

20 A. Caballos, Eck, W., Fernandez, F., "S.C. de Cn. Pisone Patre: informe preliminar," in *Il Congreso de Historia de Andalucía*, ed. A. Fraschetti (Cordoba: 1991); W. Eck, "Das S.C. De Cn Pisone Patre und seine Publikation in der Baetica," *CCG* 4 (1993); A. Caballos, Eck, W., Fernandez, F., *Das Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre, Vestigia Bd. 48* (München: Beck, 1996).

21 Especially in the context of the senatorial decree concerning the *statuae et imagines* of Piso the Elder discussed in Chapter 9, 250-252, *infra*. For full text of the decree, see Caballos, "S.C. de Cn. Pisone Patre: informe preliminar"; W. Eck, "Das S.C. de Cn Pisone Patre und seine Publikation in der Baetica," *CCG* 4 (1993).

maiorum to refer to images of a person's deceased ancestors, although the word *imagines* is more often found used by itself, not necessarily accompanied by the genitive plural '*maiorum*'. When used in this way, the word could refer to portraits of deceased Roman citizens. On occasion it could refer more specifically to a type of portrait image which some sources suggest was made from wax, was placed in a specially constructed cupboard called an *armarium* which was to be found in the *atrium* of the house and which possessed special significance to Roman élite society.²² This usage is attested by the sources from approximately the third century B.C. to the first century A.D.:²³

*Non tibi ab Corintho nec ab Tarquiniis, ut patri tuo, peregrina regna moliri necesse est: di te penates patriique et patris imago et domus regia et in domo regale solium et nomen Targquinius creat vocatque regem.*²⁴ (Livy AUC 1.47.4)

See also [62] Cic. *Sull.* 88; [63] Claud. Princ. *CIL* 13.1668.2.25; [64] Juv. *Sat.* 8.22; [65] Sen. (Y) *Contr.* 2.3.6; [66] Sen. (Y) *Contr.* 7.6.10; [67] Suet. *Vesp.* 1.1; [68] Tac. *Ann.* 6.1.2; [69] Val. Max. *Mem.* 5.5; [70] Val. Max. *Mem.* 5.8.3; as *imago avorum* ('masks of grandfathers'): [71] Sil. *Pun.* 17.12. More often than not, they are simply referred to as *imagines* (without *maiorum*) and while the context of such usage suggests that it is the wax *imagines* specifically that are being referred to, it also seems that it includes the *imagines* of ancestors in other formats or materials also on view in the *atrium*: [57] Cic. *Or.* 110; [72] Val. Max. *Mem.* 3.3.7; [73] Sen. (Y) *Clem.* 1.9.10; [74] Tac. *Hist.* 2.76.2; [75] Plin. (Y) *Ep.* 5.17.6.

How these portraits were made, precisely what form they took and what they looked like is rarely (if ever) referred to - even though there are references by the poets that they could be made of wax,²⁵ there are other references which indicate that they were also made of other

22 Some scholars think that a wax *imago* was only made to represent curule office holders within the family since it was used primarily for the funerals of deceased office holders; see H.I. Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996) 59. However, there are references to *imagines* of non-office holding relatives seen among the *imagines maiorum* on display in the *atrium*: Cic. *Fam.* 9.21.3 where he lists some of Paetus' relatives who were plebeians and who do not appear to have been curule office holders and who he suggests should be omitted from the display; also, Tac. *Ann.* 2.43.6.

23 See Chapter 8, 225-230, *infra*.

24 'Nor for you is it necessary to fashion a foreign kingdom from Corinth or from Tarquinia; it is your penates and *imago* of your father and ancestors and the royal house, and in that house the royal throne and name of Tarquin which create and call you king.'

25 Ov. *Am.* 1.8.65; Ov. *Fast.* 1.591; Mart. *Ep.* 7.44; Juv. *Sat.* 8.19.

materials, as some sources already noted above indicate.²⁶ Contrary to some beliefs, these *imagines* were not likely to have been death masks, since references are made to *imagines* of individuals who were very much alive.²⁷ Some scholars believe that the form of this *imago* was an actual mask modelled in some way on the face of the individual – primarily from a reference in Polybios (at 6.53.6) who (possibly) suggests that the *imagines* made of wax and stored in the *armaria* were used by actors in the funeral procession (*pompa funebris*).²⁸ However, while a few Latin sources directly attest to the fact that at the funeral actors might wear *imagines* representing the deceased ancestors,²⁹ there is absolutely no mention by any source (except for Polybios) that these were identical with the wax *imagines* made to represent the deceased and later placed in the *armaria*, nor is there any mention by any Latin source that the wax *imago* itself was in the form of a mask that could be worn.³⁰ In poetry, the *imago* made of wax which was placed in the *armarium* was often referred to simply by the medium of manufacture, i.e., *cerae*.³¹

26 Such as Cic. *Or.* 110; Plin. (E) *HN* 35.4-14; Juv. *Sat.* 8. 1-23, etc. The fact that the Romans used only one word, *imago*, to refer to a range of portraits of diverse materials suggests that although wax was a material used for one form of *imago*, it cannot be concluded, as Flower does (Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 5), that the ancient sources always describe *imagines maiorum* as made from wax. In fact, where the exact phrase *imagines maiorum* is used by the Latin sources, the medium of manufacture is never mentioned, and where it is it is only used in reference to an *imago* which is perhaps used for representing the deceased at his funeral and which may have been the same that was then placed in the *armaria* in the *atrium*. See Chapter 8, 235-248, *infra*.

27 Cic. *Or.* 110, who refers to seeing a bronze *imago* of Demosthenes among the *imagines* of Brutus himself and his ancestors (*...inter imagines tuas ac tuorum...*); also the Senate's *consultum* against Gn. Calpurnius Piso of 20 A.D. also suggests that the *imagines* were made while Piso was alive and that after his death copies were being made for placement in the *atria* of the *familia* and *gens*. See *Ibid.* 2.

28 *Ibid.*: 'Unlike death masks, the *imagines* were made during a person's lifetime and could be worn as real masks.'

29 Diod. Sic. 31.25.2 (quoted by Photius, *Bibliothēke* 383B); Plaut. *Amph.* 458-9; Polyb. 6.53.6; Suet. *Vesp.* 19.2. However, there are far more references in Latin sources which suggest that the wax *imagines* were carried or transported on a *lectus* before the bier carrying the body: Appian *Ib.* 89; Cic. *De or.* 2.225-6; Cass. Dio 56.34; Pomp. Porph. *Comm.*; Livy *AUC* 38.56.12-13; Plin. *HN* 35.6; Plut. *Caes.* 5; Sil. *Pun.* 10.556-9; Tac. *Ann.* 2.32.1; Tac. *Ann.* 3.5; Tac. *Ann.* 3.76. Sometimes these sources indicate that these *imagines* were full-bodied effigies, since they are referred to as wearing triumphal garb.

30 In relation to this it is interesting to note that in Latin the facial representation of an individual Roman was referred to as an *imago*, the word for a mask (such as that used in the theatre) was a *persona*. Similarly the equivalent in Greek sources for *imago* was *εἰκὼν* f. (gen. -οῦς) which meant a 'likeness, image, whether picture or statue'; vis., Hdt. 2.130, 143, A. *Th.* 559; also a 'living image', 'representation'. The verb frequently used when one put on or wore an *imago* was *induo*, -ere: Cic. *Tusc.* 1.38.92; whereas the verb *pono*, -ere is more usual for putting on a *persona*: Cic. *Off.* 3.10.43; although on some occasion, *fero*, *ferre*, is used in the sense of wearing a *persona* or of taking the part of someone in a play: Liv. *AUC* 3.36.1; Suet. *Vesp.* 19. The verb *fero*, *ferre*, (or its variant *praefero*, *praeferre*) which is that usually used in the Latin sources in connection with the *imagines* in the funeral procession, simply means 'to carry', and since this verb is usually used in the passive, it simply implies that the *imagines* were carried.

31 Wax *imagines maiorum* are also referred to in Sen. (Y) *Ben.* 3.28.2 and *Ep.* 44.5; Juv. *Sat.* 8.19-23; Mart. *Ep.* 2.90; Vitruvius *De Arch.* 6.3.6, and Suet. *Vesp.* 19.

*nec te depiciant veteres circum atria cerae; tolle tuos tecum, pauper amator, avos;*³² (Ov. *Am.* 1.8.65)

See also [76] Ov. *Fast.* 1.591; [77] Mart. *Ep.* 7.44.

There are instances where several terms, such as *vultus*, *imago*, *effigies* and *cerae*, are used interchangeably to convey the full range of images of one's ancestors that could be found in the home: [78] Juv. *Sat.* 8.19. Interestingly, Juvenal tells us that among the portrait images found in the *atrium* of a *nobiles'* house, there were wax (and possibly clay) *imagines* of the notable ancestors, that they were smoky in texture due to the incense or fires that were burned there, that there were also painted lineages and tables listing the achievements of these ancestors, that there were sometimes full-bodied and even equestrian statues of individuals, and that in some instances there could be great numbers of these statues. It also tells us that a certain amount of upkeep was necessary to maintain these *imagines* in good order. Cicero also suggests that other *imagines* were on display in the *atrium*, and that on occasion some of these were made from bronze and other materials.

While *cerae* most often refers specifically to a specific form of the *imagines maiorum*, it is also apparent from the sources that not all waxen images were necessarily of the *maiores*. Poets, particularly, referred to the fact that a paramour could have a wax *imago* of a lover made as a memento.³³ This is possibly alluding to the reverence and devotion with which a lover would tend such an image, in a poetic analogy with the manner in which the *imagines maiorum* were tended by the descendants. This passage also suggests that a wax *imago* might well have been made from the face of a living person (or from other three dimensional portrait images that may have existed of the individual) - and need not have been made solely as a death mask.³⁴ See also [79] Ov. *Rem. Am.* 723-4; [80] Mart. *Ep.* 11.102.

Directly relevant to ascertaining the appearance of Roman *imagines* in light of Roman physiognomic beliefs, is the fact that the sources often use word *imago* (when referring to the *imagines maiorum*) accompanied by adjectives which reflect the moral and ethical values which Romans attached to them:

32 'Neither the old waxes [*veteres cerae*] around the *atria* look down on you; take your grandfathers with you, poor lover'

33 Mart. *Ep.* 7.44.

34 See also Ov. *Pont.* 13.149-156.

*Nonne te, si nostrae imagines viriles non commovebant*³⁵ (Cic. Cael. 33)

See also [81] Cic. *Pis.* 1; [82] Cic. *Sull.* 27; [83] Livy *A.U.C.* 3.58.2; [84] Hor. *Ep.* 8.11-12; [85] Prop. *El.* 1.5.23-4; [86] Val. Max. *Mem.* 2.9.6; [87] Plin. (Y) *Ep.* 8.10.3; [88] Tac. *Hist.* 4.39.2; [89] Mart. *Ep.* 2.90.6; [90] Mart. *Ep.* 5.20.7; [91] Suet. *Aug.* 4.1. These sources highlight the venerable and worthy nature of *imagines*, as well as emphasising their connection to members of the *nobiles* and senatorial class at Rome: i.e., those who monopolised and controlled the high offices of state, military, religious and political: [92] Plaut. *Amph.* 458. This particularly interesting since it confirms that in funeral processions of the time it was customary to have an *imago* wearing actor representing the deceased (or possibly the notable deceased ancestors) – a phenomenon which was commented upon by Polybios.³⁶ Because of this connection and the significance which *imagines maiorum* held within *nobiles* society, most references to *imagines* are positive, and even in those instances where the *nobiles* are attacked, the *imagines* are never (or extremely rarely) referred to disparagingly. They are frequently referred to as embodying proper, ethical behaviour which serve as a benchmark for assessing or judging the behaviour of those who possessed them. Since *imagines* in the context of the home usually represented illustrious ancestors of the house owner, they thus were a highly important symbolic propaganda for individuals wishing to establish their prestige and position within Roman society. This aspect of the context of display and meaning of portraiture to Roman society is discussed more fully in Chapters Eight and Nine.

The word *imago*, when denoting a portrait of an individual, includes reference to the expression of an individual which necessarily communicated the *motus animi* of the person portrayed. The sources confirm that the Romans believed that for every emotion or state of mind (*motus animi*) there is a requisite facial expression and gesture; the eyes and forehead were particularly seen as revealing what the mind was thinking, and the *vultus* ('face' or 'expression') is explicitly stated to be the *imago* of the mind. This is a clear indication that an *imago* of an individual was considered to be just as much a physical likeness of a particular individual as a representation of their *motus animi*: [93] Cic. *De Or.* 3.216, 221-223; [94] Cic. *Leg.* 1.9.27; [95] Plin. (E). *HN.* 11.55; [96] Q. Cic. *Comment. Pet.* 44. As Ovid states:

35 'Surely what then moves you, if the manly *imagines* of our ancestors do not?'

36 Polyb. 53.1.

Crede mihi, plus est, quam quod videatur, imago (Ov. *Her* 13.155)

It could even refer to a 'phantom', 'shade' or 'ghost' etc.:³⁷ [97] Verg. *Aen* 1.353-356 ; [98] Verg. *Aen* 2.369; [99] Verg. *Aen*. 6.701; [100] Verg. *Aen*. 2.773. See also [101] Lucr. *De Re. Nat.* 4.156; [102] Lucr. *De Re. Nat.* 2.112; [103] Livy *AUC* 3.16.5; [104] Tac. *Hist.* 1.84; [105] Tac. *Hist.* 3.28. In this context, the *imago* still embodies the over-riding *motus animi* of the deceased: [106] Verg. *Aen*. 1.405-508; [107] Verg. *Aen*. 6.695-698. This may explain why the *imagines* are frequently 'animated' in the course of forensic and political speeches, since in the Roman mind they are seen as embodying and communicating proper Roman ethics and standards of behaviour which can thus serve a didactic, exhortative or political role: (See Appendix 2, Chapter Nine [85] Cic. *Cael.* 33; [86] Cic. *Cael.* 34; and [87] Cic. *Planc.* 21.51).

Imago can also be used poetically to refer to one's reflection - thus confirming that it can imply an actual physical correspondence to the individual it represents: [108] Verg. *Ecl.* 2.26-28. Plautus also uses the word in this sense, although to what degree of verisimilitude is impossible to ascertain: [92] Plaut. *Amph.* 458; Similarly, another scene in *Amphytrio* when Jupiter turns himself into (or assumes) the likeness of Amphytrio: [109] Plaut. *Amph.* 121-122. See also [110] Plaut. *Amph.* 124-125; [111] Plaut. *Amph.* 140-141; [112] Plaut. *Amph.* 265; [113] Plaut. *Men.* 1063; [114] Plaut. *Cas.* 515-516; [115] Plaut. *Mil.* 150-152. Whatever the degree of verisimilitude to the face of a living person, some degree of likeness should not be discounted.³⁸

In *Pseudolus*, Plautus uses the term to refer to the portrait of a soldier on his ring, which also confirms that finger-rings bearing the portrait of an individual were commonly used around the beginning of the second century B.C. and that these images may have had a degree of similarity or verisimilitude to the person portrayed:

*ea causa miles hic reliquit symbolum, expressam in cera ex anulo suam imaginem, ut qui huc adferret eius similem symbolum, cum eo simul me mitteret.*³⁹ (Plaut. *Pseud.* 56-58)

³⁷ Cic. *Div.* 1.63; Cic. *Sest.* 19; Cic. *De or.* 2.266; Cic. *Rep.* 6.10; Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 47. Varro *Rust.* 3.16.12.

³⁸ The matter is indeed complex: given the fact that the comment comes in the course of a play, Hermes would no doubt have been wearing a mask which was probably identical in appearance to that of the butcher – thus indicating an 'exact' likeness between them. However, whether outside of the stage, the *imago* would look *exactly* as the individual it represented is more open to debate.

³⁹ '...for this reason this soldier left this sign, his own *imago* cast in wax from a ring, so that whoever should bring here his similar sign, with him at the same time shall he send me.'

See also [116] Plaut. *Pseud.* 649; [117] Plaut. *Pseud.* 986; [118] Plaut. *Pseud.* 1000; [119] Plaut. *Pseud.* 1097; [120] Plaut. *Pseud.* 1202.

From these citations, it can be ascertained that at the time of Plautus the word was viewed as encompassing the idea of imitative likeness to the person whom it was meant to represent; a meaning which can also be drawn from its use by Cicero in certain instances: [121] Cic. *Q. Fr.* 1.3.3; [122] Cic. *Tusc.* 1.92; and later by Pliny (E) [Plin. (E) HN 35.4-14]. However, there are also references by Cicero to the fact that a person might look very different from their *imago* in comparison to real life - this being explained by the fact that a true *imago* was not merely a representation of physical appearance, but rather was an active means of communicating an individual's *motus animi*: [123] Cic. *Somn.* 6.10. Precisely what Cicero means by this comment, however, is somewhat obscure.

To some degree it seems that an *imago* portrays the true character of a person – it is not merely a feigned, untruthful or ‘artistic’ representation of a person; nor is it simply a mirror reflection of physical reality, nor is it a totem for the physical being himself (as in the way *effigies* or *simulacrum* is used). It would seem that the word *imago* encapsulated all these things simultaneously. This has important ramifications when viewed in light of Roman physiognomic beliefs as will be discussed in subsequent chapters.

The word *imago* often referred to all the nuances of meaning contained in the English words ‘image’, ‘likeness’, ‘copy’. It can also be used to convey the sense of the ‘image’ of something, as in the English phrase, the ‘image of goodness’ etc, thus embodying or personifying the true quality itself, not feigned or pretended: [124] Verg. *Aen.* 10.824.

The word *imago* is also used as a term denoting a device used in rhetoric where by the fact of similarity the qualities of one thing are deliberately attributed to another. For instance:

*Imago est formae cum forma cum quadam similitudine conlatio.*⁴⁰ (*Rhet. Her.* 4.62)

2.1.6 Summary

The above excursus clearly shows that the Romans possessed a portrait art, that their portraits were made of diverse materials, and that they could be set up in private or public contexts. Of

⁴⁰ ‘*Imago* is the comparison of form with form when there is a certain similarity between them.’

all terms employed in Latin for statues and representations of people, the most important in regards to this study is the word *imago*. It is evident that this was a complex term, revealed by its range of nuance and meaning, and from its long usage throughout Republican and Imperial times. This word was frequently linked with Roman moral and ethical values.⁴¹ It is also evident that an *imago* was necessarily a depiction of the individual's true *motus animi*, and hence it can be concluded that absolute faithfulness to physical exactitude was not of absolute primary importance. Since the texts show a correlation in the Roman social context between *imagines* and the élite classes of society, it is the socially acceptable *motus animi* of this élite that we should expect to see present in the facial features of their portraits. Just what constituted an appropriate *motus animi* for members of the *nobiles* class may be suggested by their moral and ethical values as discussed below.

2.2 Value terms

As indicated above, an *imago* was not just a physical representation of an individual but a representation of the individual's *motus animi*. This indicates a specific awareness among the Romans of the communicational capacity of the physical features and of the facial expression in particular. However, before examining the precise content of Roman physiognomic beliefs, it is first necessary to identify the values or virtues that a Roman might have wished to communicate through specific combinations of facial expressions or gestures on a portrait.

It is evident that from the middle to the late Republic when a person identified himself a *civis romanus* or *quiritis* he had in mind a very definite set of social, political and legal values and traditions. Such values changed over time, but they nonetheless remained distinctly 'Roman'. The most important of these values during the Republican period was *virtus*. This term, while constitutive of the proper ethical standards of a good Roman, also encapsulated various other moral concepts and states of mind, such as *honestia*, *fides*, *modestia*, *temperantia*, *pietas* etc. In possessing values such as these, a man showed himself worthy (*dignus*) of holding public office and as justified in taking a full and proper role in the affairs of the state (*res publica*). As a man involved in affairs of state, he was expected in both his public and private life to act above all with *severitas* and *gravitas* – values which not only fell within the ambit of *virtus*, but which were considered as essential for a person of political and social rank. *Severitas* and

41 Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 35. "The various uses of the word *imago* help to suggest the studied awareness Romans had of the function of ancestor portraits as both symbol and reality within their culture."

gravitas thus represented not only an important element of the general Roman moral code, but expressed a state of mind linked to action that was considered quintessential for members of the élite classes. By holding various public offices a man gained *dignitas* and *auctoritas*, and by performing great deeds on behalf of the *res publica* he gained *fama* (repute) and *gloria* (renown), all of which could be handed down to his heirs.

2.2.1 *virtûs* (feminine singular noun), -*ûtis* (genitive singular)

“Manliness, manhood, i.e., the sum of all the corporeal or mental excellences of a man: strength, vigour; bravery, courage; aptness, capacity; worth, excellence, etc.”: *virtus clara aeternaque habetur*: Sall. *Cat.* 1.4.⁴² *Virtus* is also stated specifically to embrace certain other moral terms: *virtutes continentiae, gravitatis, iustitiae, fidei...*: Cic. *Mur.* 10.23. The term thus includes nuances of moral perfection, virtue: *est autem virtus nihil aliud quam in se perfecta et ad summum perducta natura*: Cic. *Leg.* 1.8.25.⁴³

The word is also used to describe animals, and inanimate or abstract things, implying goodness, worth, value, power, strength, etc.: *nam nec arboris, nec equi virtus (in quo abutimur nomine) in opinione sita est, sed in natura*: Cic. *Leg.* 1.16.45.⁴⁴

Virtus is used in the phrase *deûm virtute*, usually with *dicam*, ‘by the aid or merit of the gods’: i.e., the gods be thanked.⁴⁵ Also *virtute deûm et maiorum nostrum*: Plaut. *Aul.* 2.1.44; an interesting usage because of its invocation of the ancestors (the *maiores*) in the same phrase.⁴⁶ In fact, *virtus* is attributed specifically as a trait of the ancestors, as in: *virtute eorum [maiorum]*: Plaut. *Trin.* 3.2.17.

The word is also utilised in the military sense, denoting ‘bravery’ and ‘courage’: *nec minus se ab milite modestiam et continentiam quam virtutem atque animi magnitudinem desiderare* (Caes. *B. Gall.* 7.52.4).⁴⁷ There are also references in poetry that suggests a man’s deeds and

⁴² *ni virtus fidesque vostra spectata mihi forent*: Sall. *Cat.* 20.2; and Sall. *Iug.* 74.1; *his virtutibus ornatus, modestiâ, temperantiâ, iustitiâ*: Cic. *Off.* 1.15.46.

⁴³ *cum omnes rectae animi affectiones virtutes appellantur ... Appellata est ex viro virtus...*: Cic. *Tusc.* 2.18.43.

⁴⁴ *merci pretium statui, pro virtute ut veneat*: Plaut. *Mil.* 3.1.131; *oratoriae virtutes*: Cic. *Brut.* 17.65; *oratio habet virtutes tres*: Quint. *Inst.* 1.5.1.

⁴⁵ Plaut. *Trin.* 2.2.65.

⁴⁶ See Plaut. *Capt.* 2.2.71.

⁴⁷ Also in this sense: Caes. *B. Gall.* 7.53.1; 7.59.51; 7.59.6; 7.62.2; 7.77.4 ; 7.77.5 ; 7.80.5; 7.83.4; and Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 1.5.

virtus could be the subject of dirges or songs, especially at funerals: [125] Catul. 64.348.

Cicero himself links the possession of *virtus* with the ability or capacity to win election to public office and then to carry out well the duties involved: [126] Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 2.3. See also [127] Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 2.23 [128] Cic. *Clu.* 133.⁴⁸

While *virtus* was a peculiarly Roman concept, even a client king (or any non-Roman) could be praised as possessing *virtus* if he behaved according to the Roman moral code. A notable example is Cicero's speech in defence of King Deiotarus, in which he spells out the *virtus* of the King - thereby depicting him as a model Roman *nobilis*: [129] Cic. *Deiot.* 16. An impressive list of virtues is mentioned by Cicero in relation to the King - among which are *probitas*, *integritas*, *gravitas*, *virtus* and *fides*: [130] Cic. *Deiot.* 26; [131] Cic. *Deiot.* 37.⁴⁹

Virtus was a general moral concept denoting excellence and that which was expected of a man. It is apparent that hand-in-hand with *virtus* were other virtues such as *magnitudo animi*, *gravitas*, *severitas*, *constantia*, *temperantia* and *modestia*, to name but a few. In an extended sense, it was therefore necessary for an individual to possess a series of virtues in order to be said to possess true *virtus*. The most important are discussed immediately below.

2.2.2 Other values

There were various moral values which were consonant with *virtus* that were considered essential for a Roman man to be considered as *bonus* (good) and *dignus* (worthy). Among these are:

- *fides*, -ei: trust, confidence, reliance, belief, faith; that which produces confidence; faithfulness, fidelity, conscientiousness, honesty.⁵⁰
- *honestas*, -atis: honourable consideration which a man enjoys, honour reputation respectability and credit; connected with the terms *honos*, *honor*, *honestus*.⁵¹
- *pietas*, -atis: dutiful conduct towards the gods, parents, relatives, benefactors,

48 ICL.1.30 and 34; *his virtutibus ornatus modestia, temperantia, iustitia*: Cic. *Off.* 1.15.46; *virtutes continentiae, gravitatis, iustitiae, fidei*: Cic. *Mur.* 10.23.

49 In relation to the attribution of precise Roman virtues to Deiotarus, it is important to recall his role as a Roman *cliens*, especially when one considers the portrait style of certain client kings on their coinage: see Chapter 9, 272-274 *infra*.

50 *bonis viris ita fides habetur, ut nulla sit in iis fraudis injuriaque suspicio... prudentia sine iustitia nihil valeat ad faciendam fidem*: Cic. *Off.* 2.9.33; *homo antiquae virtute ac fide*: Ter. *Ad.* 3.3.88; *exemplum antiquae probitatis et fidei*: Cic. *Rep.* 3.5; *hinc fides, illinc fraudatio*: Cic. *Cat.* 2.11.25.

51 *nihil esse in vita magnopere expetendum nisi laudem atque honestatem*: Cic. *Arch.* 6.14. It could be achieved through the holding of public office - both civil and military.

country;⁵²

- *modestia*, -ae: moderation, unassuming conduct, sobriety;⁵³
- *temperantia*, -ae: like *moderatio*; moderateness, sobriety, temperance;⁵⁴

Men who possessed these virtues and who took an active part in the life of the state and the community were referred to as the *vires boni* ("good men"), or *boni* ("the good") for short.

2.2.3 *dignitas* (feminine singular noun), -atis (genitive singular)

By possessing and displaying the above mentioned values, and through gaining public office or performing beneficial deeds on behalf of the *res publica*, one gained *dignitas*: 'worth', 'worthiness', 'merit', 'dignity', 'greatness', 'authority', 'rank', 'esteem'. The attainment of *dignitas* was also linked to *honos*, *honestas*, *laus*, *existimatio*, *gloria*, *fama*: [132] Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 1.2. See also [133] Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 1.17; [134] Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 1.27. Cicero makes clear the link between one's *dignitas* and the level of public office held: [135] Cic. *Mur.* 21; see also *ILLRP* 311 and *ILLRP* 316 from the *Tomb of the Scipiones*.⁵⁵

Hence, a person's status or rank (*dignitas*) was measured as a combination of the offices of state that a man had held, and the opinion of others towards him. Cicero suggests that in his time if a man attained the consulship (the highest magistracy), then that man and his descendants became *nobiles*. It is suggested in other sources that attaining the rank of curule aedileship was sufficient.⁵⁶ There was thus an element of heredity in possessing *dignitas* - as it could clearly be inherited from one's ancestors, although there was the need to keep it 'updated' by ensuring that members of the immediate family were regularly elected to office.

52 *aequitas tripartita dicitur esse; una ad superos deos, altera ad manes, tertia ad homines pertinere. Prima pietas, secunda sanctitas, tertia iustitia aut aequitas nominator*: Cic. *Top.* 23.90.

53 *modestia est in animo continens moderatio cupiditatem*: *Rhet. ad Her.* 3.2.3; *quam soleo equidem tum temperantiam, tum moderationem appellare, nonnumquam etiam modestiam*: Cic. *Tusc.* 3.8; *temperantia partes sunt continentia, clementia, modestia*: Cic. *Inv. Rhet.* 2.54.164; *modestia est, per quam puto honestus clarum et stabilem comparat auctoritatem*: Cic. *Inv. Rhet.* 2.54.164; *sarta tecta tua precepta usque habui mea modestia*: Plaut. *Trin.* 2.2.36; *et sententiarum et compositionis et vocis et vultus modestia*: Quint. *Inst.* 4.1.55; antonyms for modestia are: 'immodestia', 'superbia', 'licentia'.

54 *quae (virtutis vis) moderandis cupiditatibus regendisque animi motibus laudatur, eius est munus in agendo cui temperantia nomen est*: Cic. *Part. Or.* 22.76; *temperantia est rationis in libidinem atque in alios non rectos impetus animi firma et moderata dominatio*: Cic. *Inv. Rhet.* 2.54.164.

55 *ILLRP* 311: *qui apicem insignem dial[is] flaminis gessisti | mors perfec[it] tua ut essent omnia brevia | honor fama virtusque gloria atque ingenium | quibus si in longa licuisset tibi uti vita | facile factis superavisses gloriam maiorum qua re lubens te in gremium scipio recip[i]t | terra publi prognatum publico corneli. ILLRP* 316: *gnaeus cornelius gnaei filius scipio hispanus praetor aedilis curulis quaestor tribunus militum bis decemvir slitibus iudicandis decemvir sacris faciendis | virtutis generis meis moribus accumulavi | progeniem genui facta patris petii | maiorum obtenui laudem ut sibi me esse creatum | laetentur stirpem nobilitavit honor.*

56 See n.55 supra.

2.2.4 *auctoritas* (feminine singular noun), *-atis* (genitive singular)

The actual power one held while holding public office was known as *imperium*. However, the personal power or influence that one wielded, or deference that others showed to one's opinions, *auctoritas*, depended on the offices held, the probity of the character and the services that one had rendered on behalf of the state. The more esteemed a person was, the more *auctoritas* they could be said to have. In debates in the senate, for instance, the senior senator with the greatest *auctoritas* (apart from the consuls themselves) was the person bestowed with the title *princeps senatus* and it was he who was usually called upon first to deliver his *sententia* (opinion).⁵⁷ As such, his *sententia* could definitively sway the outcome of the debate. *Auctoritas* thus encapsulates diverse elements involving one's 'personal prestige', 'influence', 'might', 'power', 'authority', 'reputation', 'dignity', or 'weight':

*ut vostra auctoritas meae auctoritati faulrix adiutrixque sit.*⁵⁸ (Ter. Hec. 40)

The word also expresses the idea of general 'authority': *nec cognovi quemquam, qui maiore auctoritate nihil diceret* (Cic. Div. 2. 67.139). See also [136] Caes. B. Gall. 1.17.1; [137] Caes. B. Gall. 1.31.15; [138] Cic Leg. Agr. 1.24; [134] Cic. Leg. Agr. 1.27.⁵⁹ It is often used in the phrase, *auctoritatem habere* (Cic. Phil. 11.10) particularly in reference to those who have played an important part in public life. The higher the office and the better the individual fulfilled the duties while in office, the greater the *auctoritas* that the individual would accrue. *Auctoritas* was also said to bring its benefits: *fructus capere auctoritatis* (Cic. Sen. 18.62). Importantly, it was something that could be seen from an individual's appearance: *auctoritas dignitasque formae* (Suet. Claud. 30).

Cicero, in enumerating the proper virtues required for people in public life and for those conducting public business, specifically states that one should act consonant with one's

⁵⁷ The senate (and hence the magistrates - since they belonged to the senate) formed the only deliberative body in Rome i.e. it was the *publicum consilium*. Here policy could be discussed, debated and formed. It received embassies, made alliances, and recommended declarations of war or peace to the people. It could also review legislative proposals or provide for legislation to be put to the people. Occasionally it claimed to be able (rather suspectly) to annul legislation not passed in the public interest or without the observance of the due forms. Membership was for life, and so it contained all men of any political experience and standing. Within the senate, the members were rated according to rank - rank being determined by how many magistracies that person had held; ie, their *auctoritas*.

⁵⁸ Also, *aequitate causae et auctoritate sua aliquem commovere...*: Cic. Verr. 2.1.48; *maxima auctoritate philosophi adfirmant...*: Cic. Off. 3.29.105; *Digna est memoria Q. Catuli cum auctoritas tum verecundia...*: Vell. Pat. 2.32; *optimatum auctoritatem deminuere...*: Suet. Iul. 11.

⁵⁹ Likewise Caes. B. Gall. 1.33.1; 2.4.3; 2.4.5; and 6.11.3.

auctoritas in conjunction with the other main virtues – *fides*, *integritas* and *virtus*: [139] Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 2.23.

The senate, since it was constituted by all men who had held public office from the curule aediles above, was said to possess *auctoritas* collectively:⁶⁰ [140] Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 2.41. So much so that its opinions (framed as *consulta*) came almost to have the force of law.

Men engaged as *legati* or as governors, proconsuls and propraetors etc. (and in the Republican period, all these were former public office-holders at Rome) or who were conducting business on behalf of the state also possessed and exercised *auctoritas*: [141] Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 2.45. See also [142] Cic. *Arch.* 8; [143] Cic. *Att.* 1.13.2; [144] Cic. *Att.* 1.14.5; [145] Cic. *Att.* 1.16.1; [146] Cic. *Att.* 1.16.7. Those holding (curule) magistracies and governorships also possessed real, lawful power, or *imperium* – a fact which was marked by other trappings of office: the *sedes curulis*, the *lituus*, and the most important emblem of *imperium*, the *lictors* bearing the *fascēs*.

Thus, *auctoritas* could be direct authority granted to someone to act in a certain way, but more usually it denoted the personal authority and aura that a person possessed from having held various public offices.⁶¹ Due to the fact that there were age limits set down in law for the holding of various magistracies,⁶² meant that it was usually middle aged or older men who held the most *auctoritas*.

60 Debates were commenced by the presiding magistrate addressing the most senior member (either the *princeps senatus* if there was one, or the consuls elect followed by the senators according to seniority) with the question *Quid censes?* (Livy *AUC* 1.32.) and either stated a specific topic, or left it open (*de re publica*?). Senators were asked to give their opinions or judgements (*dicere sententiam*) and the resulting decisions formed by majority vote of the senate were known as *consulta* (Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.66§146), or were introduced by the phrase *Senatus censuit* (Cic. *Mil.* 27.73; Caes. *B. Civ.* 3.21).

61 *iubeo, cogo, atque impero. Numquam defugiam auctoritatem*: Ter. *Eun.* 2.3.99; might power authority reputation, dignity, influence, weight etc.; *digna est memoria Q. Catuli cum auctoritas tum verecundia*: Vell. *Pat.* 2.32. The nature of *auctoritas* as emanating from the fact of holding office and the personal influence of the individual concerned should be compared with the notion of *imperium*, which was the actual lawful element of power itself: i.e., the lawful power and force to back up one's commands, decisions and dictates. In this sense, a man of middle age (from early thirties to late fifties, would probably be the mainstay of office holders and hence would be the ones who wielded lawful *imperium*. *Auctoritas* was thus the moral authority exerted by older men emanating from the fact of having held high office. *Auctoritas* thus ensured a continued role for older men at the end of their careers within the senate and assured them of influence on public policy of the state despite not holding actual office.

62 See n. 76 *infra*.

2.2.5 gloria (feminine singular noun), -ae (genitive singular)/fama (feminine singular noun), -ae (genitive singular)

By attaining a certain level of *dignitas* and *auctoritas* from holding public office and through performing beneficial deeds on behalf of the *res publica*, one gained what was known as *fama* or *gloria* - repute and acknowledgement. This *gloria* and *fama* could persist after one had died, and it became a part of the patrimony handed down to one's heirs. Thus, great deeds and achievements, or the holding of public office by which one performed such deeds, gave one not only *dignitas* and *auctoritas* but ensured *gloria* for the individual: and this was the essential point for the Roman *nobilis*. It included fame, renown, honour, praise. It was primarily bestowed through the opinion of others (*existimatio*), and most importantly, it could be inherited.⁶³ Of course this implies a need to aggrandize or publicise the achievements of oneself or one's ancestors in order to acquire the necessary *existimatio* and to ensure that the *gloria* of members of the *familia* would not be forgotten.

However, if one failed in one's duty and did not act in accordance with the required social moral code (laid down by *mos*, custom, identified from the practice or precedent of the ancestors, the *mos maiorum*), then one's *memoria* would not be revered - on the contrary, one could gain *infamia*. As a result of *infamia*, one's deeds and memory (and this could mean one's portrait statues, inscriptions etc.), would be reviled. This could lead to the ultimate penalty (if one's behaviour had been severe enough) whereby an injunction by the senate or the assembly would condemn one's memory to oblivion, or what we refer to as *memoriae damnatio*: [147] Cic. Pis. 96.

Above all, Romans (particularly those involved in affairs of state) were expected to behave according to such moral standards, in the *romane more* - in the Roman manner/custom: i.e., plainly, openly, honestly, frankly etc.⁶⁴ They were expected to live openly⁶⁵ in accordance

⁶³ *est enim gloria solida quaedam res et expressa, non adumbrata: ea est consentiens laus bonorum, incorrupta vox bene iudicantium de eccellente virtute; ea virtuti resonat tamquam imago*: Cic. Tusc. 3.2.3; *sit in aeterna gloria Marius, qui ...*: Cic. Cat. 4.10.21.

⁶⁴ Cic. Fam. 7.5.3; 7.18.3; 7.16.3.

with the expected moral code, which would serve as a model for society as a whole.⁶⁶ They were also expected to be seen as embodiments of the moral traditions and to communicate these through their demeanour, gait, gesture and facial expression, thereby showing that they were worthy of the privileged political and social position that they held within the *res publica*.

2.3 *severitas* (feminine singular noun), *-atis* (genitive singular) and *gravitas* (feminine singular noun), *-atis* (genitive singular)

Perhaps the two states of mind or virtues most frequently referred to in the surviving Latin literature in relation to good Roman citizens as constitutive of a proper *motus animi*, are those of *gravitas* and *severitas*.

Gravitas encapsulated weight, dignity, importance, seriousness, gravity;⁶⁷ often linked with *severitas* – strictness, seriousness, austerity, sternness. It was a trait particularly associated with (and expected of) older men, and was particularly expected in their actions, speech and bearing: *haec genera dicendi in senibus gravitatem non habent* (Cic. *Brut.* 95.326).⁶⁸

Gravitas was expected of magistrates when carrying out their duties, as consonant with the holding of public office, and of ex-magistrates: [148] Cic. *Pis.* 23; [149] Cic. *Fam.* 1.7.7. See also Cic. *Sull.* 33.92, Cic. *Clu.* 20.56; Cic. *Verr.* 1.10.30; Cic. *Pis.* 23. It was also considered necessary to bring to bear the necessary *gravitas* when delivering an opinion or

65 A Roman member of the élite class, a *nobilis*, was expected to be accessible to the public, given his particular social and political role within Roman society. This is revealed by the exchange reported by Velleius Paterculus between Livius Drusus (*tribunum plebis* in 91B.C.) and his architect that his house being built on the Palatine overlooking the forum should be arranged so that whatever he should do would be visible to everyone (Vell. *Pat.* 2.14.3). Cicero says later of this house (which he had acquired) that it stood virtually in view of the entire city (Cic. *Dom.* 100). The other aspect of the accessibility of the *nobilis domus* was that the doors stood open except when closed as a symbol of mourning (Val. Max. *Mem.* 5.7; Sen. (Y). *Liv.* 183; Sen. (Y) *Vit. Beat.* 28.1; Sen. (Y) *Brev. Vit.* 20.3; Luc. *Phars.* 2.22; Tac. *Ann.* 2.82).

66 This is implicit in much of the thinking of members of the *nobiles* in relation to their position within Roman society. For instance, a *nobilis* should be seen to embody the appropriate virtues, one of which was *moderatio*. Accordingly Cicero condemns the extravagance of Lucullus' villas as setting a bad example (Cic. *Leg.* 3.30). Lucullus replied that his villa at Tusculum merely evidenced his right to at least equal the standard of the homes of his two neighbours (one an *eques* and the other a *libertus*), persons who were clearly Lucullus' social inferiors. Cicero's counter response was that Lucullus should not have set them the bad example in the first place. This reveals a certain pressure on members of the *nobiles* class to lead by example, and therefore to keep constantly one step ahead of not only aspiring classes within Roman society which were lower down the social order, but also with each other so as to maintain their visible prestige. See A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society in Pompeii and Herculaneum* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 4-5.

67 *magnitudo, dignitas, auctoritas; omnium sententiarum gravitate omnium verborum ponderibus est utendum*: Cic. *De or.* 2.17.72.

68 'this kind of thing when said by old men does not convey *gravitas*'. See also Cic. *Rep.* 1.10.

speech in the senate or in deciding important matters of state: [150] Cic. *Att.* 1.16.8. See also Cic. *Flac.* 31.36. In fact, *gravitas* was a trait particularly associated with the senate: [151] Cic. *Att.* 1.14.4. *Gravitas* was a value particularly expected of judges and jurors sitting in the courts generally: [152] Cic. *Div. Caec.* 27. Cicero confirms that other office holders, including religious officials, such as the *pontifices*, should be characterised by *gravitas*: [153] Cic. *Dom.* 104.

Severitas, as noted, encompassed seriousness, sternness, strictness, and severity. Similar to *gravitas*, it was particularly associated with, and expected from, the older man:

severitatem in senectute probo, acerbitatem nullo modo (Cic. *Sen.* 18.65)⁶⁹

Romans were expected to have this quality in their private and public lives. A good example is the story of Titus Manlius Torquatus (Cic. *Fin.* 1.7.24: *Torquatus cum illam severitatem in eo filio adhibuit, quem...*). Valerius Maximus tells us that Titus Manlius Torquatus, in a display of *severitas*, not only ordered the execution of his son for failing to live up to the expected Roman ethical code, but while the funeral was taking place he preferred to sit in his *atrium* surrounded by his *imagines maiorum*, all of who are characterised by the adjective *severus*, where he conducted his normal daily business (*negotium*): [Appendix Two, Chapter Nine: [154] Val. Max. *Mem.* 5.8.31].

Severitas was expressly used to describe the demeanour of magistrates, including the office of *censor* (Cic. *Rep.* 4.6.15; Cic. *Clu.* 129; Val. Max. *Mem.* 2.9; Gell. *N.A.* 4.20.1; Cic. *Phil.* 7.27). This was primarily because it was the role of magistrates as judges to try cases and to dispense punishments – symbolised by the fact that magistrates were proceeded by the emblems of power, particularly the *lictors* bearing the *fascēs*. Judges (are most often senators) are continually characterised by their *severitas* in the sources.⁷⁰ The senate, as the supreme council of state made up of all sitting and ex-magistrates, was believed to be particularly characterised by *severitas* as an *ordo*: [150] Cic. *Att.* 1.16.8. [155] Cic. *Verr.* 5.9.25. Given the senate's rather paternalistic role in the social and political affairs of the Roman state, any misbehaviour by a Roman citizen, or act of bad faith by ally or client of Rome could provoke the *severitas* of the senate: [156] Cic. *Planc.* 45.

⁶⁹ Also Cic. *Off.* 1.37.134.

⁷⁰ Cic. *Verr.* 5.29.74; Cic. *Verr.* 3.36.83; Cic. *Verr.* 5.18.45; Cic. *Cael.* 12.29; Cic. *Rab. Post.* 3.6; Cic. *Div. Caec.* 21; Cic. *Verr.* 5.67.172; Cic. *Caec.* 2.6; Cic. *Sull.* 92 etc.

Often *severitas* and *gravitas* were linked together, constituting the specific states of mind thought most becoming of a Roman citizen generally, but especially expected of a person involved in affairs of state:

civis severus et gravis...(Cic. *Lael.* 25.95)⁷¹

See also [157] Cic. *Fam.* 1.8.3; [158] Cic. *Fam.* 4.13.4; [159] Cic. *Fam.* 6.6.10; [160] Cic. *Fam.* 10.19.1; [161] Cic. *Flac.* 31.36. See also Cic. *Fam.* 1.7.7. Indeed, *gravitas* and *severitas* were traits considered to be typical of, and peculiar to, Roman citizens and were not generally considered as characteristic of Greeks and non-Romans: [162] Cic. *Sest.* 141.

As stated, *severitas* and *gravitas* were thought to be especially necessary for senators: [163] Cic. *Mur.* 6, and they were supposed to bring to bear *gravitas* and *severitas* when considering important matters of state or passing judgement in any matter: [164] Cic. *Cael.* 29. The senate collectively, as an *ordo*, was said to possess and embody both *severitas* and *gravitas*,⁷² which were considered particularly necessary when delivering a speech, especially one concerning a serious issue of public concern: [165] Cic. *De Or.* 2.71. See also [166] Cic. *Att.* 2.1.4. This meant that judges and jurors in court cases (who for the special standing courts before the end of the second century B.C. were traditionally senators) were also characterised as embodying *severitas* and *gravitas*: Cicero *Pro Murena* 31.66: *sed si illius comitatem et facilitatem tuae gravitati severitatieque asperseris, non ista quidem erunt meliora, quae nunc sunt optima, sed*

71 'A citizen *severus* and *gravis*'; Also, *si illius comitatem et facilitatem tuae gravitati severitatieque asperseris*: Cic. *Mur.* 31.66; *Torquatus cum illam severitatem in eo filio adhibuit, quem...*: Cic. *Fin.* 1.7.24; *Catoni severitas dignitatem addiderat*: Sall. *Cat.* 54.2

72 *etenim haec erat hypothesis, de gravitate ordinis, de equestri concordia, de consensione Italiae, de intermortuis reliquiis coniurationis, de vilitate, de otio. Nosti iam in hac materia sonitus nostros*: Cic. *Att.* 1.14.4; *...senatum ad pristinam suam severitatem revocavi atque abiectum excitavi, Clodium praesentem fregi in senatu cum oratione perpetua plenissima gravitatis tum altercatione huius modi*: Cic. *Att.* 1.16.8; *retinenda est igitur nobis constantia, gravitas, perseverantia; repetenda vetus illa severitas, si quidem auctoritas senatus decus, honestatem, laudem dignitatemque desiderat, quibus rebus hic ordo caruit nimium diu*: Cic. *Phil.* 7.5. *nam Ti. Graccho invidia Numantini foederis, cui feriendo, quaestor C. Mancini consulis cum esset, interfuerat, et in eo foedere improbando senatus severitas dolori et timori fuit, eaque res illum fortem et clarum virum a gravitate patrum desciscere coegit*: Cic. *Har.* 20.43. See also Cic. *Att.* 1.14.5.

certe condita iucundius. See also Cic. *Sull.* 64 and Cic. *Sull.* 92.⁷³ It was also necessary to compose oneself with the requisite *severitas* and *gravitas* when called upon to give evidence: [167] Cic. *Rab. Post.* 35.

Other passages emphasise this same point; that *severitas* and *gravitas* were values clearly expected of senators and office holders in conducting their affairs: [168] Cic. *Mur.* 6. Not only should they possess these virtues, but these should be seen embodied and communicated by their facial expressions: dynamic evidence of their strictness, harshness, severity and moral rectitude. Owing to their *severitas* and *gravitas*, senators and magistrates in general were considered to be of constant and reliable character and therefore deserving of the offices and positions they held. An example is provided by Cicero, who refers to *severitas* and *gravitas* in relation to the college of pontifices and the esteemed position they held in Roman society: [169] Cic. *Dom.* 4.

Severitas and *gravitas* characterised the core values of members of the Roman ruling élite over a long period of time. Livy (by transferring contemporary values back into the past) relates the story of how the senators, sitting in their chairs (*solia*) at the entrance to their homes, awaited the Gauls during the sack of the city in 390 B.C. He explicitly says that the senators possessed such *gravitas* in their appearance that the barbarians thought they were *statues of deities*: [170] Livy *AUC* 5.41.8. Cicero also refers to *severitas* and *gravitas* as “old fashioned” virtues which are embodied (or should be embodied) in the senate and those who hold public office: [171] Cic. *Clu.* 129. In this passage he refers to the *censores* who had the duty of revising the citizenship and senatorial role, and of removing those members who had failed to live up to the moral code expected of senators.

What was considered to be acceptable behaviour in terms of social and political morality, was

⁷³ Cic. *Clu.* 20.56; Cic. *Verr.* 1.10.30. Collectively senators were referred to as *patres ac conscripti* which reveals another important aspect of Roman values. The word *senator* is derived from the word for ‘old man’ ie, *senex*; and combined with the age requirements for holding public office, this meant that the *senatus* was usually made up of men of at least 30 years of age; while its most prestigious members were well over the age of 40. The older the senator, and the higher the magistracy he had held, the more *auctoritas* and the more likely that his views would form the policy under discussion. This emphasis on ‘old men’ (*senes*), old age (*senectas*), experience (*experientia*), wisdom (*sapientia*) and proper behaviour (*virtus*), combined with the *dignitas* and *auctoritas* underpins the Roman social order during the Late Republic. *gravitas* and *severitas* were the key states of mind that a senator was supposed to bring to bear in all his public and private dealings. As such these values can be said to encapsulate the appropriate *motus animi* of a man involved in the affairs of state, and hence of the *nobilis* class. while holding public office one’s *virtus* which enabled the individual to attain even further office. By holding high office and achieving well in that office, one obtained *dignitas* and *auctoritas*, and hence *fama* and *gloria* that could be handed down to one’s posterity.

identified by reference to custom, *mos* – particularly custom as laid down by the actions and precedent of the ancestors of the Roman community, *mos maiorum*. Just how deeply the virtues of *severitas* and *gravitas* were linked in the Roman mind with the *maiores* (ancestors) is revealed by Cicero in his speech in defence of Aulus Cluentius. There Cicero states that Cluentius is a man of such upstanding character that he equals the *gravitas* of his ancestors: [172] Cic. *Clu.* 196. This is high praise to a Roman. Elsewhere, Cicero refers to the *severitas* of the *optimates* (i.e., the *senatores*) – the conservative faction of the ruling élite in the second century B.C. – which he says was equal to that of their ancestors and which was manifest in their facial expressions and demeanour: [173] Cic. *Fam.* 1.9.17.

By the first century B.C the surviving Latin literature reveals that *severitas* and *gravitas* were considered essential for senators, particularly when comporting themselves in their varied roles as judge, juror,⁷⁴ magistrate, and *paterfamilias*. In the private sphere, a *paterfamilias* was also judge of his own *familia*, and as shown by the story of Manlius Torquatus cited above, a man was expected to bring *severitas* and *gravitas* to bear even in his private life. These were the same values expected of Roman citizens in any dealings they may have with foreigners: [174] Cic. *Font.* 24. Also Cic. *Fam.* 1.8.3; Cic. *Fam.* 4.13.4; Cic. *Fam.* 6.6.10; Cic. *Fam.* 10.19.1; Cic. *Flac.* 31.36; Cic. *Fam.* 1.7.7; Cic. *Har.* 41; Cic. *Mil.* 22; Cic. *Mur.* 23; Cic. *Mur.* 66; Cic. *Phil.* 2.14; Cic. *Sest.* 60; Cic. *Sull.* 82.

Since these values were linked inextricably with office holding, it seems that the ruling élite at Rome, the *nobiles*, came to regard these values as characterising their class and as justifying their privileged position within the Roman social and political order. It is these virtues particularly the Romans believed had contributed to making Rome a great power – in that each member of the senate – as a body formed from ex- and current magistrates – was expected to give weighty deliberation to the serious matters before it and to offer sensible advice regarding the development of domestic and foreign policy: [171] Cic. *Clu.* 129.

2.4 Summary

The sources create a picture of Roman society in the second and first centuries B.C. as one

⁷⁴ I speak generally about the role of senators as jurors. Under the Tribune Saturninus, the role of jurors had been transferred to the Equestrian class; Sulla restored this role to Senators. Under the 'First Triumvirate', the role was accorded to a mixture of *senatores* and *equites*. No doubt, however, *eques* who served as jurors would have been expected to act with the appropriate *severitas* and *gravitas* in carrying out this function.

based on the power and authority of a middle aged or older man⁷⁵ who had attained military and political office, and who was possibly the head of his own *familia*.⁷⁶ By virtue of his *dignitas* (inherited from the fact his ancestors had obtained public office) and whatever *dignitas* he managed to attain for himself, he was able, through manipulation of his connections (*amici* and *clientes*) and advertising his moral and political worth (particularly in relation to his notable ancestors - *maiores*), to obtain public office. Once elected he could display his own *virtus*, *gravitas*, and *severitas* which thereby justified his election and made him worthy of even higher office. By so doing, he increased his *dignitas* and *auctoritas*, and maintained the *dignitas* of his family. He thus ensured the continuing status of his *familia* within the élite class (*nobiles*) or ennoblement for his descendants if no ancestors before him had held public office.

Moral and ethical values as these outlined are culturally specific and do not translate easily into other languages. It should be noted that these are the terms which the Romans chose to describe *themselves*. They are values particularly associated with the élite classes – which in the middle and late Republic were the *nobiles*⁷⁷ who dominated social and political power at Rome.⁷⁸ The *nobiles* thought that they encapsulated and monopolised proper Roman values – particularly *severitas* and *gravitas* – which went some way in justifying their domination of

75 See Cic. *Sen.* 61 on A. Atilius Calatinus (cos. 258 and 254 B.C.): *apex autem senectutis auctoritas. Quanta fuit in L. Caecilio Metello, quanta in A. Atilio Calatino! in quem illud elogium hunc unum plurimae consentiunt gentes populi primum fuisse virum. Notum est Carmen incisum in sepulcro* [‘the highpoint of old age, however, is *auctoritas*: how much did L. Caecilius Metellus possess, how much A. Atilius Calatinus! on whom was the eulogy that ‘most of the *gentes* are in agreement that this one man was first among the people’. These notable lines were incised on his tomb’]. Cf. Cic. *Fin.* 2.35; Cic. *Tusc.* 1.7.13.

76 The *cursus honorum* was more or less formalised by the *lex villia annalis* in 180 B.C (Livy *AUC* 40.44.1). This held that a man had to be 32 years old to be elected as quaestor and so gain membership of the senate. The minimum age for the praetorship was 39, and for the consulship 42. There had to be a two year interval between holding magistracies. The law was reintroduced and somewhat tightened by Sulla in 90 B.C. The fact that there were minimum ages for holding office suggests that senators would not have had young lineless faces. On the importance of older individuals in the senate see H. Brandt, *Wird auch silbern mein Haar: eine Geschichte des Alters in der Antike* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2002) chapt 4, sect. 2 *passim*. See Chapter 9, 264-277, *infra*.

77 It is a natural corollary that, since by the end of the second century B.C. some members of the non-élite class had acquired great wealth – giving them the same financial standing as a true *Eques* – they too adopted the moral code and traditions of the class they aspired to. This perhaps explains the use of the portrait forms of the élite on the tombs of the non-élite and freedman classes at Rome – what greater statement of their standing could there be, than to pronounce their citizenship status or their wealth (or both) and the virtues to which they aspired than on a tomb in full public view. See Chapter 8, 230-235, and Chapter 9, 275-277 *infra*.

78 Roman society itself was ever changing and evolving. From ‘chieftain’ led clans of the early Republic and the domination of the Patrician houses, through the struggle of the orders to the emergence of the *nobiles* class, thence to the political disturbances between ‘*optimates*’ and ‘*populares*’ of the last years of the Republic and to the creation of the Principate, the underpinning of the Roman state was the political, social and religious role of the *paterfamilias*, the *tribus*, the *gens* and the *familia* set within the changing framework of the state structure and the evolving social order. Thus, while these terms remained almost constantly in use throughout the period under discussion, their precise meanings evolved over time.

the high offices of state and the privileges attached thereto. Linked with this was the belief that the *Romani*, as a *populus* and *natio*, influenced by their excellent geographical placement, combined the right mixture of intelligence and realism, good faith and moral values which had made them masters of their world: see [175] Plin. (E) *HN* 3.5.38-40 & 43-45; [176] Plin. (E) *HN* 37.77.201 and [177] Cic. *Rep.* 2.5-6.

Given the importance of *severitas* and *gravitas*, it is perhaps these values that the Romans would have expected to be communicated by precise facial expressions.

CHAPTER THREE

ROMAN PHYSIOGNOMIC PRINCIPLES

3.1 Introduction to Roman physiognomic beliefs

It has been shown that the meaning of the word *imago*, which was used to denote portraits during the Republican period, encapsulated the idea that a portrait should communicate something of the *motus animi* of the individual portrayed. This indicates that the Romans believed in physiognomic principles that might have influenced or determined how their portraits may have appeared, or how they may have been interpreted by the contemporary Roman viewer. It is now necessary to consider whether these physiognomic beliefs are revealed in more detail by other forms of Latin literature. It is then necessary to examine which parts of the body were considered particularly important for physiognomic communication.

The extant Latin epigraphic and literary references of the Republican and early Imperial periods confirm that the Romans believed in basic physiognomic principles, both specifically expressed and subconsciously understood, according to which there was believed to be a link between facial expression, gait and gesture, and precise emotions, elements of character and mental states (*motus animi*) of an individual.¹ This has ramifications in all situations in which a Roman (particularly a member of the senatorial élite), was acting in a public capacity and was therefore on 'view' to his peers, his clients, and the general members of the community. It thus included any circumstance when a Roman was operating in the public arena, and by extension, given the semi-public nature of the Roman *domus*² and the blurred distinction between the public and private roles of male members of the élite class, it was also of significance in the private sphere.

The literary evidence indicates that the Romans had knowledge of the formal Greek theory of physiognomics at least from the first century B.C. Cicero's statement concerning Zopyrus,

¹ These beliefs are found elaborated in the writings of the Roman orators including Cicero and Quintilian, the historians such as Sallust, Livy and later, Tacitus, the Roman philosophers (Seneca the Younger etc.), the Roman dramatists (Plautus, Terentius etc.), and the Roman natural historians, such as Pliny the Elder, as well as in a variety of Latin fragments dating during the middle and late Republic which are discussed below.

² A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society in Pompeii and Herculaneum* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994) 4-5.

and the use of 'geographic physiognomics' by Cicero, Vitruvius and Pliny the Elder confirm this.³ Despite this Greek influence, literary evidence suggests that it was adapted to suit Roman social conditions, preconceived notions regarding physiognomic communication, and Roman cultural/social values.⁴ The Roman emphasis on the nuances of facial expression, gesture and gait as communicating the *motus animi* is in contrast to Greek physiognomic principles (as discussed in Appendix 3), where the emphasis lay on the expression of πάθος or generalised emotional or ethical states via the πρόσωπον, and on the idealised construction of the physique.⁵

3.2 Roman oratory and physiognomics

Oratory was an important tool of political and social life throughout the middle and late Republic - not surprising since the state was dominated by an oligarchy which was engaged in intra class competition to gain political influence and power.⁶ Roman oratory, as with other Latin literary genres, was influenced by Greek rhetorical theory and practise, particularly

3 Cic. *Rep.* 2.5-6; Vitruv. *De Arch.* VI.1.1-11; Plin. (E) *HN* 3.5.38-40 and 43-45; Plin. (E) *HN* 37.13.77. The fact that the Peripatetic and Academy philosophers, as well as the later Stoics (particularly Theophrastus *et al.*), had a great influence on the philosophical belief system of the Roman aristocracy probably facilitated the reception of Greek physiognomic theory by Roman society.

4 D. Dudley, *Roman Society* (London: Pelican, 1983) 132-35; M. Rostovtzeff, *Rome*, trans. J.D. Duff (London and New York: O.U.P., 1927) 92-94 & 156-61; H.H. Scullard, *From the Gracchi to Nero*, 5th ed. (London and New York: Methuen, 1986) 204-07.

5 For an interesting discussion on the differences between the use of masks in Greek (and later Roman) theatre representing pathos, and the *motus animi* exhibited by Roman speakers emphasising gesture, gait, facial expression and delivery, see F. Dupont, "Le masque tragique à Rome, Rome et la tragique," *PALLAS* 49 (1998).

6 See Chapter 2, 46-47, and Chapter 9, 249-262.

from the second century B.C. onwards,⁷ however, there existed a strong tradition of Roman oratory from which these Greek principles were adapted.⁸ This domestic tradition is best exemplified by the genre of Roman *laudatio*, or funeral oratory.⁹ Despite the Greek influence, there persisted in Roman oratory a heavy reliance on physiognomics, in both speech delivery and in the content of the speech itself, as a tool for heightening the impact of the speaker's

7 Suetonius says Greek rhetorical principles were formally introduced to Rome in the first part of the second century B.C. [Suet. *Rhet.* 1]. However, there appears to have been a reaction against the Greek Rhetoricians, for in 161 B.C. the Praetor Marcus Pomponius was empowered to expel both the philosophers and the rhetoricians [Suet. *Rhet.* 1]. Indeed, Cato the Elder is recorded as providing two mottos for the orator, which appear to be opposed to the skilled programme of these Greek rhetoricians. The first was that an orator is a *vir bonus dicendi peritus*, while the second involves technique: *rem tene, verba sequentur*. Within a few years the rhetoricians returned, since it is recorded that they were employed as tutors to the sons of Aemilius Paullus, while Tiberius Gracchus had Diophanes of Mitylene and Gaius Gracchus had Menelaus of Marathus - both Greek masters of rhetoric [Plut. *Aem.* 6.5; Cic. *Brut.* 100, 104 & 125]. By the end of the second century B.C., Greek Rhetoric was exercising quite an influence, as is evidenced by Lucil. *Sat.* 26, 181, 383, 385, 603, 1133; Cic. *De or.* 1.72. In 92 B.C. the censors Licinius Crassus and Domitius Ahenobarbus issued a decree disapproving of the newly appeared 'Latin rhetoricians' [Suet. *Rhet.* 1]. One of these L. Plotius Gallus survived this censure to provide a speech for Sempronius Atratinus in his action against Caelius in 56 B.C. [Suet. *Rhet.* 2]. Indeed the censure may well have had political overtones, since Plotius (and possibly the other Latin Rhetoricians) were attached to Marius. Marius was (supposedly) unversed in Greek culture [Cic. *Arch.* 20; Sall. *Iug.* 63.3, and 85.32; Plut. *Mar.* 2.2.]. The attempt to suppress the Latin schools did not succeed, for in the following years two tracts on Latin rhetoric were published - Cicero's *De Inventione Rhetorica* (written while Cicero was still an *adulescentus*) and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* - both of which date to some time in the second decade of the first century B.C. It has been suggested that there is a tradition of Latin teaching behind both works: *Rhet. ad Her.* 4.7.10: M.L. Clarke, *Rhetoric at Rome: A Historical Survey* (London: 1996) 13. At the same time, both tracts incorporate elements of Greek rhetorical theory. This is exemplified by the *Rhetorica* which appears to draw on sources probably subsequent to Theophrastus: E.C. Evans, "Physiognomics in the Ancient World," *TAPS* 59, Pt5 (1969) 39. The *Rhetorica* may have originated within the school of Latin Rhetoricians - since it was addressed to Gaius Herennius, and the *gens Herennia* was aligned with Marius and the *populares*. The Latin school was probably attempting to simplify Greek rhetorical theory, adapting it to Roman circumstances by drawing on illustrations from Roman history and literature. It was not the invention of a new system of oratory: Clarke, *Rhetoric at Rome: A Historical Survey* 15. Note particularly in relation to this the diatribe against Greeks in the opening of the *Rhetorica*: *Rhet. ad Her.* 1.1.

8 For early oratory, Cicero records only one extant written speech from Appius Claudius Caecus the Censor, as well as some funeral speeches (a particularly Roman genre) which he noted for their deceptiveness [Cic. *Brut.* 61-2]. Cicero also mentions many famous men whose eloquence he inferred from their *auctoritas* and their position within the life of the state [Cic. *Brut.* 52-60]. The fact that the *lex cincia* banned the payment of advocates in the courts also confirms that forensic oratory was well established in the early second century B.C.: Plaut. *Men.* 581; Plaut. *Poen.* 1244; Plaut. *Rud.* 705. Cato the Elder is the first known Roman to have published his speeches. Cicero praised his witticisms, his *sententiae*, eulogy, vituperation and the acuteness of the exposition of his speeches: Cic. *Brut.* 65; 69] - although he was critical that Cato seemed prepared to forego elegance for the matter at hand: Gell. *NA* 6.3.52. Cato appears to have used elements of everyday speech (such as alliteration and assonance and hyperbole - devices which were also common in Roman comedy) that were reconstructed to suit the context: Clarke, *Rhetoric at Rome: A Historical Survey* 41. According to Cicero it was a younger contemporary of Scipio Aemilianus, Marcus Aemilius Lepidus Porcina, who first displayed the smoothness, periodic structure and artistry that belonged to the Greeks: Cic. *Brut.* 82 and 96. Also T. Albucius at the end of the second century B.C. who was satirised by Lucilius: Lucil. *Sat.* 84ff; Cic. *Brut.* 92; Cic. *Tusc.* 1.5.

9 The practice of delivering a *laudatio* was said to be of great antiquity at Rome first introduced by Publicola, who pronounced a funeral oration in honour of his colleague Brutus: Plut. *Public.* 9; Dionys. 5.17.

words on the listener and in elaborating the subject matter.¹⁰

In the final quarter of the second century B.C., Caius Gracchus was known for the passion and theatricality of his delivery.¹¹ The important thing is not what Cicero records were his words, but the way in which Gracchus allegedly delivered them. Cicero notes that Gracchus' eyes, voice and gestures were such that not even his enemies could refrain from tears. If Cicero's comment is a correct record of the way Gracchus' speech was received by the audience at the time, it strongly indicates that by the third quarter of the second century B.C. Roman orators and their audiences were fully aware of the importance of gesture and facial expression as a tool in speech-making.¹²

By the end of the second century B.C. oratory was flourishing at Rome.¹³ Among the most renown orators of this period Cicero mentions Crassus and L. Antonius. Cicero records that Crassus was relatively staid in his manner of delivery: he did not walk about and seldom stamped his foot.¹⁴ Antonius, on the other hand, was known to employ every trick and gesture to enhance his words and to reinforce the meaning: even kneeling down during a vehement speech in his own defence.¹⁵

10 See G. S. Aldrete, *Gestures and Acclamations in Ancient Rome* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999) 20-43; A. Vasaly, *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).

11 Cicero quotes one of his speeches, Cic. *De or.* 3.214: *Quo me miser conferam? Quo vertam? in Capitoliumne? At fratris sanguine madet. An domum? Matremne ut miseram lamentatem videam et abiectam?* ["To where should I, wretched, take myself? whither should I turn? to the Capitol? But it flows with the blood of my brother. Or to my home? should I see my mother, wretched, crying and cast down?"]. See also Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.115, where the same passage is cited.

12 For how widespread understanding of the gestures, movements and facial expressions of orators were in relation to the Roman audience: see Aldrete, *Gestures and Acclamations in Ancient Rome* 44-84.

13 The period between the death of C. Gracchus and the end of the first decade of the first century B.C. saw a proliferation of capable and well known speakers: Crassus and L. Antonius (active until around 90 B.C.), Flavius Fimbria, Quintus Scaevola, C. Catulus, M. Philippus etc. Beginning their careers at about this time were Julius Caesar Strabo, Lucius Aurelius Cotta and Gaius Sulpicius Galba: Clarke, *Rhetoric at Rome: A Historical Survey* 45.

14 Cic. *Brut.* 158: *Pergamus ergo, inquam, ad reliqua et institutum ordinem persequamur. paratus igitur veniebat Crassus, exspectabatur audiebatur; a principio statim, quod erat apud eum semper accuratum, exspectatione dignus videbatur. non multa iactatio corporis, non inclinatio vocis, nulla inambulatio, non crebra suppositio pedis; vehemens et interdum irata et plena iusti doloris oratio, multae et cum gravitate facetiae; quodque difficile est, idem et perornatus et perbrevis; iam in altercando invenit parem neminem.*

15 Cic. *Brut.* 141: *Quo in genere quia praestat omnibus Demosthenes, idcirco a doctis oratorum est princeps iudicatus. schemata enim quae vocant Graeci, ea maxime ornant oratorem eaque non tam in verbis pingendis habent pondus quam in inluminandis sentiis. sed cum haec magna in Antonio tum actio singularis; quae si partienda est in gestum atque vocem, gestus erat non verba exprimens, sed cum sentiis congruens: manus humeri latera suppositio pedis status incessus omnisque motus cum verbis sentiisque consentiens; vox permanens, verum subrauca natura. sed hoc vitium huic uni in bonum convertebat; Cic. *Tusc.* 2.57: *Genu, mehercule M. Antonium vidi, cum contente pro se ipse lege Varia diceret, terram tangere...**

Graphic gestures and facial expressions as these were designed to appeal directly to the emotions of the audience – forming an intrinsic part of Roman oratory by the early first century B.C.¹⁶ Contrary to what might be concluded, it seems that such gestures were not viewed as overtly theatrical by the Roman audience, but in the proper context were seen as reflecting the *gravitas* of the speaker.¹⁷ In fact, Cicero and others frequently admonish speakers against the use of gesture and expression considered better suited to the theatre than to the law courts or *curia*.¹⁸ Yet despite this injunction, that there were some gestures in common between orators and actors seems highly likely – such as thigh slapping to show indignation. It may have been that such gestures, representative of generalised emotional states, were influenced by Greek rhetorical practice which were in turn drawn from Greek stagecraft – a link which the Roman orators such as Cicero himself would appear to have recognised.¹⁹

The importance of gesture and facial expression as oratorical tools is confirmed by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* at 3.11.20–3.14.25: a good delivery proceeds directly from the state of mind which will also determine the gestures and facial expressions.²⁰ The *Rhetorica* also treats the issue of voice quality linked with gesture in detail, and warns that there is the need for flexibility in different types of address, such as debate, conversation, and exhortation.²¹ Specifically mentioned is the care required by the speaker in selecting physical gesture in

16 Clarke, *Rhetoric at Rome: A Historical Survey* 45: ‘...[T]hese gestures were an accepted part of oratory as it was generally practised at Rome, and our picture of the Roman orator must be of a melodramatic actor, strutting on his stage, thrilling his listeners by the carefully modulated tones of his voice and the expressiveness of his limbs, rather than of a model of *gravitas*.’

17 Quint. *Inst.* 1.3.65.

18 Rhet. ad Her. 3.15.26; Cic. *Orat.* 25.86; Quint. *Inst.* 1.11.3: *Ne gestus quidem omnis ac motus a comoedis petendus est. Quamquam enim utrumque eorum ad quendam modum praestare debet orator, plurimum tamen aberit a scaenico, nec vultu nec manu nec excursionibus nimis.* [‘Nor yet again must we adopt all the gestures and movements of the actor... the [orator] must avoid all staginess and all extravagance of facial expression, gesture, and gait’]; Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.89: *Abesse enim plurimum a saltatore debet orator, ut sit gestus ad sensus magis quam ad verba accommodatus, quod etiam histrionibus paulo gravioribus facere moris fuit* [‘For the orator should be as unlike a dancer as possible, and his gesture should be adapted rather to his thought than to his actual words, a practice which was indeed once upon a time even adopted by the more dignified performers on the stage’]. Cic. *De or.* 2.47: (*ego*), *qui non heroum veteres casus fictosque luctus velim imitari atque adumbrare dicendo, neque actor sim alienae personae, sed auctor meae.*

19 While Theophrastus did not hand down any precepts on delivery, Athenaeus says at 1.20 that Theophrastus gave freely to gesture in his own delivery; see also Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.123 who states that Cleon at Athens was the first to use this gesture. See Lucian *Rhet. Praec.* 19, where thigh slapping is satirized. Aldrete assumes that the gestures employed by comic actors, dancers in pantomime, and orators belong to comparable systems: Aldrete, *Gestures and Acclamations in Ancient Rome* 57, 51–52 and 77.

20 Also Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.65.

21 Cicero makes the same admonition: Cic. *De or.* 3.40.210 and Cic. *Orat.* 21; as does Quintilian: Quint. *Inst.* 11.1.46–48.

making emotional appeals during a speech – a point made also by Cicero²² and later by Quintilian.²³ By inference, the Roman audience must have understood which physical movements, gestures and facial expressions were considered expressive of particular emotional states or thought processes.

Cicero's speeches provide much evidence of Roman attitudes to facial expressions and gestures and their capacity to communicate the *motus animi*. In the *De Oratore* he provides a detailed analysis of the use of physiognomics in speech making:

[216] *Omnis enim motus animi suum quendam a natura habet vultum et sonum et gestum; corpusque totum hominis et eius omnis vultus omnesque voces, ut nervi in fidibus, ita sonant, ut a motu animi quoque sunt pulsae*²⁴ (Cic. *De Or.* 3.216).

See also [1] Cic. *De Or.* 3.223. In the same treatise he tells us that all movements and gestures convey meaning as a reflection of the speaker's *animus*, while the face is the *imago* of the mind: [2] Cic. *De Or.* 3.221-222. This is an interesting use of the word *imago*, since (as already shown in Chapter Two) it is the same word as used by Romans to denote a 'portrait'. Cicero confirms elsewhere the importance of the *vultus* (face) as the most important indicator of the *motus animi* and of the *mores* of an individual:²⁵

*Vultus indicat mores*²⁶ (Cic. *Leg.* 1.27)

Within the face, of utmost importance in the act of communication are the eyes and eyebrows: whether they are drawn together, relaxed, or arched etc.²⁷ For an orator, this means that one could reinforce or communicate the emotion behind the spoken words through physical gestures and facial expression, but if one's words were not consonant with the physical messages being conveyed, one ran the risk of failing to convince the audience or worse, of

22 Cic. *Orat.* 59-60.

23 Quint. *Inst.* 1.11.9-11; *Inst.* 1.11.16; *Inst.* 11.3.2.

24 'For all motions of the mind from nature has its own certain face, sound and movement; and the whole body of man and his entire face and all his intonations, as strings in a harp, thus sound, just as they are also struck by the motion of the mind'

25 Cic. *De or.* 1.127: *ea, quae nobis non possumus fingere, facies, vultus, sonus*: ['that which we are not able to compose, the face, the expression, the voice']; Cic. *Pis.* 1.1: *oculi, supercilia, frons, vultus denique totus, qui sermo quidam tacitus mentis est, hic in fraudem homines impulit* ['your eyes, eyebrows, forehead, finally your entire face, which is a certain silent interlocutor of the mind, this impels men in deception']; Cic. *Fam.* 12.30.3: *vultus mehercule tuos mihi expressit omnes* ['by Hercules, you face communicates all about you to me'].

26 'The face reveals the character'

27 Cic. *De or.* 3.221-222. See also Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.75.

appearing dissembling or dishonest.²⁸

Quintilian during the last quarter of the first century A.D. elaborated on the importance of gesture, facial expression and gait in speech delivery in the *Institutio Oratoria*: [3] Quint. *Inst.* 1.11.16; particularly in Book 11: [4] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.65. Similar to Cicero, he stressed physical appearance, gesture and facial expression as constituting the most eloquent forms of communication, capable of expressing a diverse range of emotions and states of mind beyond that which mere words were capable.

3.2.1 Oratorical training and *pronuntiatio*

The emphasis in oratory on physical forms of communication required detailed attention from the speaker and was referred to by the technical term *pronuntiatio* (or *actio*)²⁹ which was a major focus of the proper training of the orator.³⁰ *Actio* not only included the actual gestures and facial features but could also include the modulation of the voice and the mode of delivery: [5] Cic. *Brut.* 38. Interestingly, Cicero here describes Pompey's movements as conveying the 'highest worthiness' (*summam dignitatem*) - a clear reference to how a specific Roman value (*dignitas*) could be conveyed through physical movement.

Pronuntiatio, being synonymous with *actio*, also encompassed action and manner of speech delivery.³¹ More importantly, it was concerned with the suitable expression of the face, combined with the appropriate use of voice and gestures. It formed, as the *Rhetorica* tells us, one of the five main divisions of rhetorical training: [6] *Rhet. ad Her.* 3.15. 26 and 27. There it is stated that it is most important for the speaker to have proper regard to the *gestus corporis* and to keep a *vultus moderatio*: since these make plausible that which is spoken.³² Furthermore, the expression of the face must show modesty and keenness, but should *never* suggest the actor or the labourer - and this warning against presenting oneself either as a stage

28 See the discussion in relation to *fraus* and facial expression, Chapter 4, 116-120.

29 There seems to have been a degree of overlap in the use and meaning of these terms. Quintilian tells us that *pronuntiatio* is frequently termed *actio*; however, he clarifies this by saying that the first more rightly concerns the voice, while the latter concerns gesture: Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.1. Cicero uses *actio* as a synonym for *pronuntiatio*, meaning specifically a form of speech: Cic. *Orat.* 17.55; but later he says it is a kind of physical eloquence: Cic. *De or.* 3.49.222. He also states that there are two elements to *actio* - voice and movement, which Quintilian tells us are the same elements which constitute *pronuntiatio*: Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.1.

30 As evidenced by the citations from *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, and from Cicero already referred to, and the fact that Quintilian devotes an entire section of his *Institutes* to the topic: Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.

31 Cic. *Inv. Rhet.* 1.7.9; *Rhet. ad Her.* 3.11.19; Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.1.

32 *Rhet. ad Her.* 3. 26-27.

actor or as a member of the *plebs* is important.³³ The inference is that one's facial expression should never resemble an 'actor's mask'³⁴ – to do so would obviously risk alienating the audience because they would inevitably compare the speaker with an actor. Actors were considered to be the dissemblers of truth – *imitatores veritatis*³⁵ – which was the antithesis of what a Roman orator should be.³⁶

Similarly, the injunction against using gestures or facial expressions of a labourer is a comment on the social standing of the orator – those called upon to deliver speeches in public were more often than not office holders, which implies members of the senatorial classes, and it was socially unacceptable for a senator to indulge in manual work.³⁷ It appears it was just as reprehensible for such a person to present himself in a manner descriptive of these classes. Tangentially interesting, the comment also suggests that labourers (and actors) comported themselves in a way which betrayed their lowly status.³⁸

Irrespective of such warnings, Cicero was well aware (from his own experience as an orator) of the potential theatricality of oratory. Even more dangerously, he was aware that expression and gesture could be purposely contrived in order to conceal the true *motus animi* of the speaker and so to deceive the audience. In this regard, he often draws a parallel between facial expression and theatrical masks.³⁹ The clear difference between them is that the face of the

³³ *Rhet. ad Her.* 3.15.26.

³⁴ *Persona*, -ae (n. fem.): a mask, esp. that used by players, which covered the whole head, and was varied according to the different characters to be represented (syn. *larva*) Gell. *NA* 5.7.1; *personam tragicam forte vulpis viderat*: Phaedr. 1.7.1; *personam capiti detrahere*: Mart. *Ep.* 3.43.4; *persona adicitur capiti*: Plin. (E) *HN* 12.14.32§59. The masks were usually made of clay: *cretea persona*: Lucr. *De Re. Nat.* 4.297, cf. Mart. *Ep.* 14.176.1. But sometimes of the bark of wood: *oraeque corticibus sumunt horrenda cavatis*: Verg. *G.* 2.387; *ut tragicus cantor ligno tegit ora cavato*: Prudent. *C.Symm.* 2.646. The opening for the mouth was very large: *personae pallentis hiatum formidat infans*: Juv. *Sat.* 3.175; *personis uti primus coepit Roscius Gallus praecipuus histrio, quod oculis obversis erat, nec satis decorus in personis nisi parasitus pronunciabat*: Diom. p. 486 P. Heads with such masks were used as ornaments for water-spouts, fountains, etc.: *Butades figulus primus personas tegularum extremis imbricibus imposuit, quae inter initia prostypa vocavit*: Plin. (E) *HN* 35.12.43§152; *personae, e quarum rostris aqua salire solet*: Dig. 19.1.17; *mulier nempe ipsa videtur, non personâ loqui, a mask, a masked person*: Juv. *Sat.* 3.96.

³⁵ Cic. *De or.* 3.216.

³⁶ See Quintilian's observation regarding different stage characters and their respective gaits: Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.112. Likewise, actors were primarily slaves or freedmen, and were frequently Greeks. In contrast, an orator was a highly respected person in Roman political and social life, not to be equated with a dishonourable profession like acting. Indeed, it was forbidden for free citizens to act on the stage. There is a heavy reflection of anti-Greek sentiment involved in such an injunction. See nn. 40 and 101 *infra*.

³⁷ Except for farming, which was considered the only acceptable occupation (apart from government) befitting a person of senatorial rank. In fact, senators were banned from indulging in occupations other than farming by the *lex claudia* of 218 B.C.

³⁸ Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.112, for the statement that different stage characters had different gaits consonant with their roles.

³⁹ Cic. *De or.* 3.216.

orator should convey his true *motus animi*; in other words, his *vultus* (face) should be an *imago animi* (a portrait of his thoughts) - he must never dissemble or merely 'represent' as the actor does. By contrast, the *persona* of an actor is a contrivance, dissembling or hiding the true *motus animi* of the individual who wears it.⁴⁰ Cicero pursues this line of reasoning at some length. He begins the *De Oratoribus* with the statement that orators have left the issue of physical communication unconsidered, which to him is strange since they are in fact the *veritatis ipsius actores* (doers of real truth), whilst actors, to whom the subject of physiognomics is well known, are in fact the *imitatores veritatis* (impersonators of truth).⁴¹

These statements reveal more than a passing knowledge of physiognomics, wherein the physical appearance is deliberately manipulated to convey or conceal the *motus animi*. Such ideas appear to have been peculiar to the Romans and perhaps represent an 'instinctual' distrust of the theatre and actors (who were predominantly Greek or non-Roman citizens).⁴² The Roman view contrasts with the attitude of the Greeks concerning the theatre, where acting was considered 'honourable'. By extension, we may also discern a traditional Roman prejudice against Greeks generally, according to which they were viewed as dissembling and deceitful by nature in contrast to the Roman character which was regarded as naturally *fidelis, rectus* and *honestus*.⁴³

Returning to *pronuntiatio*, the *Rhetorica*⁴⁴ states that much of it lay in the natural and unconscious *bodily expression* of the emotions; gestures should always correspond to the tone

40 T.J. Moore, *The Theater of Plautus: Playing to the Audience* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998) 10: "The actor's position was still more precarious because of their own low status in society: many, if not most actors were foreigners, slaves, or freedman, and those who were freeborn lacked many of the rights of citizens". See E. S. Gruen, "Plautus and the Public Stage," in *Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy* (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 89-90.; S. M. Goldberg, "Improvisation, Plot, and Plautus' Curculio," in *Plautus Und Die Tradition Des Stegreifspiels*, ed. L. Benz and *et al.* (Tübingen: 1995), 31-34. On the social class of actors: E. Rawson, "Theatrical Life in Republican Rome and Italy," *Proceedings of the British School at Rome* 53 (1985): 112.; J.-C. Dumont, *Servus: Rome et l'esclavage sous la République* (Paris: Ecole française de Rome, 1987) 517-24. On *infamia* if a freeborn person acted: F. Dupont, *L'acteur-Roi: Le Théâtre À Rome*, *Collection Realia* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1985) 95-98.; E. J. Jory, "Ars Ludicra and the Ludus Talaris," in *Stage Directions: Essays in Ancient Drama in Honour of E.W. Handley*, ed. A. Griffiths (London: 1995), 139-45. On general attitude to actors: C. Edwards, *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) 123-31.; E. Csapo and W. J. Slater, *The Context of Ancient Drama* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995) 276-79. On the use of '*pergracari*' in Plaut. *Mostell.* 22-23: *dies noctesque bibite, pregraecamini, amicas emite liberate*.

41 Cic. *De or.* 3.216.

42 See n.40 *supra* and n.104 *infra*.

43 See n.40 *supra* and n.104 *infra*. A reason for this dislike may have stemmed from the fact, as Cicero says, actors were *imitatores veritatis* - i.e., they assumed roles of characters that were not their own, and hence said things that were not 'true', meaning that they were inherently dishonest and not to be trusted. Their use of masks may also have meant they were viewed as being 'two-faced'.

44 *Rhet. ad Her.* 1.196.

of the voice and an expression suitable for the subject matter should be adopted. Furthermore the *Rhetorica* provides us with a list of the kinds of actions that immediately convey an emotion. For instance, in expressing pathos it is customary to slap the thigh, beat one's head, and from time to time assume a 'sad' or 'anxious' look so that the speaker might convey exactly what is in his heart.⁴⁵

In Cicero's day careful training was required for correct *pronuntiatio*.⁴⁶ He tells us that it took considerable conscious effort to ensure that appropriate facial expressions and gestures were used in delivering a speech:

*quod me mones de vultu et oratione ad tempus accommodanda, etsi difficile est, tamen imperarem mihi, si mea quicquam interesse putarem.*⁴⁷ (Cic. Att. 11.24.5)

Of paramount importance in *pronuntiatio* was the facial expression, because it is through the face that the strongest messages are conveyed. Cic. *De Or.* 221-222; and again [7] Cic. *De Or.* 1.28.127; [8] Cic. *Pis.* 1.1; [9] Cic. *Fam.* 12.30.3); [10] Cic. *Clu.* 72. At all times it was necessary for gestures and facial expressions to be consonant with the speaker's status and rank: *status, incessus, sessio, accubitio, vultus, oculi manuum motus teneant illud decorum*: Cic. *Off.* 1.35.128.

Pronuntiatio remained an important subject of study to at least the time of Quintilian ([11] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.72), although by this time, one can see the further influence of Greek formal physiognomic theory. Quintilian fully elaborates on *pronuntiatio*: [12] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.1. Like Cicero, he specifically refers to the power of the facial expression and gesture in conveying important messages to the audience: [13] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.14. He says that the disposition of the mind can be inferred from the countenance and in the manner of walking - even animals without the power of speech display anger, joy, or fawning by means of the eyes.⁴⁸ According to him, the angle of the head is important. A *caput rectum* is *secundum naturam* ('according to nature'); a *deiectum caput* is a sign of humility; a rigid and stiffly held head is a reflection of a *barbaria mentis* ('an uncivilised mentality').⁴⁹ Quintilian expressly agreed with the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and Cicero, that the eyes dominate the face and it is

⁴⁵ *Rhet.ad Her.* 1.196.

⁴⁶ Cic. *De or.* 3.221-222.

⁴⁷ 'What you advise me about fitting the face and the speech to the time, although it is difficult, I would, however, impose it on myself if I thought my speech would interest anyone.'

⁴⁸ Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.65-68.

⁴⁹ Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.69.

through them that entreaties, threats, flattery, sorrow, joy etc., are most easily expressed: [14] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.72-74.

Quintilian tells us that the flow of blood is important to an orator, since it can drain away through fear or cause the cheek to blush red, or when the blood flow is moderate a serene expression is produced.⁵⁰ It is hence important for an orator to keep a moderated appearance while delivering a speech, as these changes in physical appearance will communicate various messages to the audience – not all of them desirable.

In general terms, a Roman orator when delivering a speech had to take great care in the arrangement of the stance, and the suitability of the facial expressions and gestures, in order to ensure that the proper messages were communicated to the audience: [15] Quint. *Inst.* 1.11.9; [16] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.159. Interestingly, Quintilian specifically states that the orator's face should convey *severitas*. This is important for the present study, especially when one recalls that *severitas* was considered to be representative of the proper *motus animi* of members of the ruling élite at Rome, and was a term frequently used in the literary sources to characterize the *nobiles* and their *imagines*.

3.2.2 Textual use of physiognomics in speech making

Cicero's use of physiognomic communication, in quite a popular and distinct Roman form, is evident in many passages from his various writings,⁵¹ despite his acquaintance with formal Greek physiognomic theory. Cicero eloquently expresses the Roman-ness of this view in the *De Legibus*:

nam et oculi nimis arguti, quemadmodum animo affecti sumus, loquuntur, et is qui appellatur vultus, qui nullo in animante esse praeter hominem potest, indicat: cuius vim Graeci norunt,

⁵⁰ Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.38. This would appear to have been drawn from Aristotelian and Hippocratic theory of humoral psychology - i.e., that a change in the *κρᾶσις* of the blood flow can reflect upon the emotions.

⁵¹ Cic. *Orat.* 57-60. It is important to note that written texts in this period were largely meant to be recited aloud to an audience. This verbalisation of written texts creates a very different effect in the reception of physiognomic description compared with merely reading silently a written passage – as it suggests that appropriate gestures and facial expressions would have been combined with delivery during such a recital. However, much of the gestures and facial expression that would have accompanied such a recital can now only be guessed at. Even when an individual was reading a text in private, it may have been common that the text be read out loud and not silently. This verbalisation may have greatly enhanced the readers capacity to visualise which gestures and facial expressions would properly accompany the words of the text. Just precisely when reading silently became the norm is debated.

*nomen omnino non habent*⁵² (Cic. Leg. 1.27)

A common device in oratory was for the speaker to make direct references to the physical appearance of another person. This device was known as *effictio* – which the *Rhetorica* defines as a representation of the essential physical form of a person which can be utilised to divine something about that person's psychology or character.⁵³ An example is Cicero's description of Fannius Chaerea in the *Pro Quinto Roscio*:

*nonne ipsum caput et supercilia illa penitus abrasa olere malitiam et clamitare calliditatem videntur?*⁵⁴ (Cic. Q. Rosc. 7.20)

Such *ad hominem* attacks would be considered as distasteful today – but in Roman oratory, such personalised invective was an accepted (and at times an essential) part of forensic and political speech-making. Cicero often dwells in vivid detail on the faces and physique of those he wished to attack, primarily because physiognomic description offered conclusive proof to his listeners of the subject's malevolence or bad character.

Cicero not only describes physical appearance of a permanent cast, but he is a master at honing in on facial expressions and gestures that are momentary, and which he presents to his listeners as reflecting the true *motus animi* of the individual concerned, rather than a feigned facial expression by which that individual might be trying to conceal his true persona: *Red. Sen.* 6.15-16; *Prov. Cons.* 4.8; *Sest.* 8.19-20; *Pis.* 1.9.20 and 6.12; and *Rab. Post.* 12.35. An excellent example is Cicero's attack against Piso in which he blasts Piso's pretence at projecting *gravitas* by his facial expression: Cic. *Pis.* 1. Cicero describes Piso's face almost as though it were a theatrical mask – indicating that Piso has crossed the line from being an *actor veritatis* (an orator, senator, and a *vir bonus*) to become an *imitator veritatis* (an actor). Piso has therefore lost all the honour (*dignitas*) and credibility (*honestas/auctoritas/fides*) that a proper Roman senator should possess, and from his facial appearance he clearly betrays the fact that he has become unworthy of his rank – accruing the negative sentiments to himself that the Roman élite professed to hold towards Greeks, slaves and actors.

52 'For our eyes so bright speak too clearly by whatever we are affected in our minds, and that which is called the face indicates these things, which no other living thing can do: a fact which the Greeks knew but for which they had no name.'

53 *Rhet. ad Her.* 4.49.63.

54 'Do not the head itself, and those clean shaven eyebrows seem to reek of malice and proclaim craftiness aloud?'

It is not only in invective that Cicero makes good use of physiognomic principles. He sometimes used it for eulogistic effects, such as in the *Pro Deiotaro* where he praises Caesar⁵⁵ or in the *Pro Balbo* where he speaks specifically of Marius.⁵⁶ In these contexts, Cicero constantly employs adjectives such as *virtus*, *gravis*, *eruditus*, *honestis*, *severus*, etc., to describe a *vir bonus* - all of which were important Roman (élite) value terms.⁵⁷ Compare this with Cicero's vituperative physical descriptions concerning non-Roman citizens, or those who behave in an 'un-Roman-like' manner such as his attack on Piso, and one understands the physiognomic image that Cicero is drawing. To Cicero, specific Roman (and anti Roman) values are clearly expressed in the physical features and facial expressions of the individual, and it seems from the many instances where such physical descriptions occur, that his audience readily understood the same.

3.3 Physiognomics in Roman historiography, biography and tomb inscriptions

Roman physiognomic principles are equally evident in the Latin literary genres of historiography and biography. Sallust, Tacitus, Suetonius all employed physical description as a tool for communicating the character, or *motus animi* of their subjects.

It has been suggested that Roman historiography and biography were influenced by Greek literary traditions, in that Suetonius followed Varro by adopting the form of biography used by the Alexandrian writers⁵⁸ - and hence that the Ptolemaic legal papyri which often contain physical descriptions of individuals as a means of identification were the origins of the personal descriptions evident in later Roman oratory and history.⁵⁹ B. von Bothmer extended this to Roman Republican portraiture, the roots of which he claimed date from the end of the New Kingdom and the Late Period.⁶⁰ However, other scholars have strongly dissented from

55 Cic. *Deiot.* 2.5.

56 Cic. *Balb.* 21.49.

57 See Chapter 2, 46-56 supra.

58 F. Leo, *Die Griechisch-Römische Biographie* (Leipzig: 1901) 141.

59 G. Misener, "Iconistic Portraits," *CPh* 19 (1924).

60 B. von Bothmer, *Egyptian Sculpture of the Late Period, 700 Bc to A.D 100* (New York: Brooklyn Museum of Art, 1960); Bernard von Bothmer, "Egyptian Antecedents of Roman Republican Verism," in *Ritratto Ufficiale E Ritratto Privato: Atti della I Conferenza Internazionale sul Ritratto Romano 1984*, *Quaderni De "La Ricerca Scientifica"* (Roma: Consiglio nazionale delle ricerche, 1988), 47-65.

this view.⁶¹ While Greek literary genres appear to have had some influence, there was a native Roman form of personal record keeping (such as the *laudationes* (funeral speeches) in which the notable achievements of the deceased were recounted, and the *annales* kept by the college of pontifices and the *nobiles* families) which were possibly seminal.

Evans identified three main types of physical description in biography and historiography⁶² - namely:

- descriptions of the permanent shape or form of the body – ‘*ingens corpus*’, ‘*forma eximia*’ (e.g. Tac. *Ann.* 1.38.)
- descriptions of emotion eg. ‘*laeto voltu*’ (Cic. *Att.* 8.9.2; Tac. *Hist.* 4.81), ‘*truci voltu*’ (Ov. *Ep.* 4.71; Tac. *Ann.* 4.34) - these are found in panegyrics or vituperative attacks, or momentary appearance as reaction to some event.
- ‘photographic’ representation, as in Suetonius’ *De Vitis Caesaribus*, but heavily imbued with physiognomic undertones (i.e., through iconistic physiognomic references and characterology) (Suet. *Caes.* 45).

In historical terms, the earliest description of ‘character’ linked with physical description comes from the epitaph of Lucius Cornelius Scipio Barbatus from the *Tomb of the Scipiones* (Ill. 1), and was of the first type of description mentioned above: [17] *CIL* i².6-7; *ILLRP* 309. One can compare this with the description of the soldier in Plautus’ *Miles Gloriosus*, whose physical appearance is linked with his character via repetition of the word *pulchro* and *forma*.⁶³ Another example is from the epitaph of Claudia (133-122 B.C): [18] *CIL* 1.1211 (1007).⁶⁴ Both these epitaphs suggest the unchanging excellence of the form of the body and, by inference, of the character. From such a generalised physical description, it could easily be

61 D. R. Stuart, *Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1928) 186. With regards to the Egyptian connection for the origins of Roman portraiture the evidence for these assumptions as to why the Romans would have adopted such a style to portray themselves is absolutely lacking - and more shall be said about this in Appendix 5. Suffice to say that when one bears in mind the development of physiognomic theory in Greece and Rome, and the influence this had on Philosophy and Oratory (and *vice versa*) - it would appear that the Alexandrians utilised already existing Hellenistic tradition and not *vice versa*. It can be further observed that the Egyptian tradition had its own social causation and development unconnected with Greek and Roman portrait or literary traditions. It would be more likely that the physical portraits in Roman Biography and History have their roots in Roman oratorical and theatrical traditions - influenced on a theoretical and practical level by Greek philosophy, biography and characterology (the latter genre developed largely by Theophrastus) - rather than on any identifiable ‘Egyptian’ tradition.

62 Evans, “Physiognomics in the Ancient World,” 53.

63 See p. 84 *infra*.

64 Published in H.W. Garrod, *The Oxford Book of Latin Verse: from the Earliest Fragments to the End of the 5th Century A.D.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912).

surmised by a Roman reader just how the individual concerned would have appeared.⁶⁵

Physical descriptions in written history are rarer, although when they do occur, their impact is immediate. Sallust provides an excellent example in his description of Catiline: [19] Sall. *Cat.* 5. And again [20] Sall. *Cat.* 30; and [21] Sall. *Cat.* 61.

In Livy, the occurrence of 'descriptive' portraits is fairly rare, although there is a good instance of temporary facial expression in his description of the power and influence Scipio Africanus had over his mutinous troops at Sucro: [22] Livy *AUC* 28.26; in the events following the suppression of the rebellion: [23] Livy, *AUC* 28.32; and again in the battle of Zama: [24] Livy *AUC* 28.33. Livy's description of Scipio is similar to that of Silius Italicus: [25] Sil. *Pun.* 7.559-661. Later, in his description when Scipio received Massinissa, Livy emphasises the physical appearance and facial expression of the captured king and the effect this had on those who saw him: [26] Livy *AUC* 28.35.

Similar physical descriptions are those of Pompey the Great. Several writers mention that his hair, particularly, was reminiscent of that of Alexander the Great: [27] Plut. *Pomp.* 2. Lucan similarly describes Pompey: [28] Luc. *Phars.* 8.680-681; as does Silius Italicus: [29] Sil. *Pun.* 13.860-861. Velleius Paterculus also speaks of Pompey's '*forma excellens*' [Vell. Pat. 2.29]; while Pliny (E) mentions his noble countenance (*os probum*) and his fine majestic brow (*honorem eximiae frontis*) [Plin. (E) *HN* 7.12.53].⁶⁶ Caesar, also, is described as possessing good looks. Marcus Antonius in delivering Caesar's funeral speech (as reported by Dio Cassius) describes him as *περικαλλεστάτον ἀνδρῶν*⁶⁷ [Cass. Dio 44.38.2]. Velleius Paterculus says that Caesar possessed *forma omnium civium excellentissimus*⁶⁸ [Vell. Pat. 2.41] while Cicero's reference to Caesar's *forma* may also be a reference to his good looks [Cic. *Brut.* 75.251].

65 For a fuller discussion, see Chapters 8, 235-2247, and Chapter 9, 257-259 on the *imagines maiorum*. It may be that such references to beauty (Latin *pulchritudo* f.n; *pulcher/pulchra* adj.) derived from Greek practice of referring to an individual in terms of his or her beauty (*καλλος/καλλη*) and hence excellence of character. See Appendix 3.

66 Just how different our modern physiognomic understandings are from those of the Romans becomes clear when one considers much of the modern academic comment on the physical appearance of Pompey's surviving portraits, such as the one in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen and its analysis in physiognomic terms by Curtius: L. Curtius, "Physiognomik des römischen Porträts," *Ant* 7 (1931).; and Mommsen: T. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, 3 vols., vol. 3 (Leipzig: 1888-1889) 10 and 105. See L. Giuliani, *Bildnis und Botschaft: Eine hermeneutische Untersuchungen der römischen Porträts* (Frankfurt a.M: Suhrkamp, 1987) 27, 45-49.

67 'the handsomest of men'

68 'of all the citizens the most excellent (beautiful) shape'

Regarding Cicero's physical appearance, he himself tells us that when he was young he was thin with a slender neck, but that through exercise he built up the strength of his lungs and the size of his body.⁶⁹ This picture is confirmed by Plutarch⁷⁰ who also comments on Cicero's genial and serene expression.⁷¹ Seneca reports Asinius Pollio as saying that Cicero retained his good looks and health even when in old age.⁷²

A notable factor in these literary physiognomic descriptions is that many occur when the subject is about to deliver a speech.⁷³ This would appear to be a device used to impart to the reader something of the character of the orator and indicates what may be about to unfold. It is also notable that many physiognomic descriptions are of persons acting in an official capacity: generals, politicians, senators etc., and since these persons are (more often than not) members of the Roman élite class, it would be expected by the reader that the physical description of the individuals concerned would be apposite with the values expected of a member of that class.

In the early Imperial period, Tacitus, too, used physical description in a sophisticated way to convey heightened meaning to his readers concerning the morals or character of the individual under discussion.⁷⁴ A good example is his description of Domitius Corbulo:

*corpore ingens, erbis magnificis et super experientiam sapientiamque etiam specie inanum validus*⁷⁵ (Tac. Ann. 13.8)

or of Lateranus: [30] Tac. Ann. 15.53; or of Seianus: [31] Tac. Ann. 4.1. A particularly vivid description is that of the Emperor Tiberius, whose appearance is completely apposite the

69 Cic. Brut. 91: *Erat eo empore in nobis summa gracilitas et infirmitas corporis, procerum et tenue collum... lateribus vires et corporis mediocris habitus accesserat.* ['In that time my body was extremely slender and weak, a thin and scraggy neck ... exercise introduced strength to my lungs and average in body'].

70 Plut. Cic. 3-4: και γαρ ην οντως ισχνος και ασαρχος ... και το σωμα τοις γυμνασιοις αναρρωμενον εις εξιν εβαδιζε νεανικην.

71 Plut. Comp. Dem et Cic. 1.6: το τε προσωπον αυτου μειδιαμα και γαληνην παρειχε.

72 Sen. (E) Suas. 6.74: *facies decora ad senectutem prosperaque permansit valetudo* ['a fine countenance and vigorous strength animated him even in his old age']

73 This is more interesting when one considers, as stated in n.51 supra, that texts were often recited aloud – thus inviting greater physicalisation by the reader when reciting the written words. In a way I have not fully considered and which space does not permit in this study, by reciting a text out loud the reader himself *becomes* the individual who is delivering the speech, which again invites appropriate physiognomic gesture and facial expression by the reader which heightens the immediacy of the text's reception by the listener, who in turn *becomes* the original audience to whom the speech was delivered.

74 See Evans, "Physiognomics in the Ancient World," 53.

75 '...[should Corbulo once enter Armenia to take command of the army, he would draw all eyes on himself], by his imposing stature, his grand eloquence, and the impression he would make, not only by his wisdom and experience, but also by the mere display of showy attributes'.

faults of his character: [32] Tac. *Ann.* 4.57. Interestingly, Tacitus portrays the Emperor as obsessed with scrutinising the facial expressions of others in order to discern hidden meanings: a basic application of physiognomic principles. However, Tiberius' paranoia leads him to misinterpret these physiognomic messages to reveal evidence plots and conspiracies against him.

Tiberius, Tacitus alleges, was also aware of the communicative capacity of his own facial expressions; thus, like an *imitator veritatis*, he was concerned to carefully arrange his facial expressions so as not to betray what he was thinking - thus making his face more like an actor's mask than as the *imago* communicating his true *motus animi*. An example of the Emperor's physiognomic duplicity is revealed when the revolt of the Aedui, the Treviri and the 64 Gallic states was announced to him ("*...neque vultu mutato*"⁷⁶). Another is when Libo was denounced to the Emperor as a traitor. Libo was invited to dine with the Emperor, who concealed his true thoughts by composing his facial expression and employing moderate words: [33] Tac. *Ann.* 2.28. When the accusation denouncing Libo was read, Tacitus tells us that the Emperor's face remained inscrutable: [34] Tac. *Ann.* 2.28.29.

Tacitus informs us that this dissembling aspect of Tiberius' character manifested itself early in his reign.⁷⁷ However, the Emperor seemed concerned that the duplicity of his facial expression might be understood by the public at large. For this reason Tacitus tells us that Tiberius and Livia remained aloof from the public mourning on the death of Germanicus, lest the angry, grieving *populus* should discern their true *motus animi* from their feigned facial expressions: [35] Tac. *Ann.* 3.3.

Tacitus contrasts the character of Tiberius with a description of the physical appearance of his nephew (and adopted son) Germanicus – which is reminiscent of the epitaph of Scipio Barbatus, concentrating as it does on his excellence of form. As a result of such a physical comparison Tacitus' reader is left in no doubt as to the differences in character between the two men: [36] Tac. *Ann.* 1.33.

⁷⁶ Tac. *Ann.* 3.44: *tanto impensius in securitatem compositus, neque loco neque vultu mutato, sed ut solitum per illos dies egit, altitudine animi, an compererat modica esse et vulgatis leviora.* ['Tiberius all the more studiously assumed an air of unconcern. He changed neither his residence nor his look, but kept up his usual demeanour during the whole time, either from the profoundness of his reserve; or was it that he had convinced himself that the events were unimportant and much more insignificant than the rumours represented.']

⁷⁷ Tac. *Ann.* 1.7.

Tacitus wants the reader to be struck by the physical and moral decay of the Emperor, and to do so Tacitus masterfully utilises physiognomic description during the Emperor's last days.⁷⁸ By contrast, one should compare Tacitus' eulogistic physical description of Agricola.⁷⁹

Suetonius also uses bodily description in order to reveal character of the person he is describing. A good example is his description of Germanicus, the father of Emperor Caligula: [37] Suet. *Cal.* 3. Here, Germanicus' physical description is entirely apposite his good character and is reflected in the success he attained in his career. This fact would come as no surprise to the reader. Indeed, Suetonius goes on to tell us that the nobility and goodness of Germanicus' character were well rewarded by the love and devotion of the Roman people: [38] Suet. *Cal.* 4. This description will be in stark contrast to the physical description of his son, Caligula, which occurs towards the end of the piece.⁸⁰ Suetonius proceeds from the physical description of Germanicus to relate certain facts about Caligula's place of birth and early life, before relating mostly positive facts concerning his early deeds as Emperor. This is what the reader would normally expect from the son of so illustrious and good looking a father – that the son would have inherited both his physical appearance *and* moral character. However, about half way through the biography, Suetonius' tone suddenly changes. From this point, Suetonius relates a catalogue of crimes and shameful acts committed by the Emperor which culminate in his assassination.⁸¹ Suetonius leaves the physical description of the Emperor until last – which thus serves as confirmatory proof for the reader of Caligula's crimes and misdemeanours: [39] Suet. *Cal.* 50.⁸²

78 Tac. *Ann.* 6.50: *Iam Tiberium corpus, iam vires, nondum dissimulatio deserebat; idem animi rigor; sermone ac vultu intentus, quasita interdum comitate quamvis manifestam defectionem tegebat.* ['Tiberius's bodily powers were now leaving him, but not his skill in dissembling. There was the same stern spirit; he had his words and looks under strict control, and occasionally would try to hide his weakness, evident as it was, by a forced politeness.']

79 Tac. *Agr.* 44: *Quod si habitum quoque eius posteri noscere velint, decentior quam sublimior fuit: nihil impetus et metus in vultu; gratia oris supererat; bonum virum facile crederes, magnum libenter.* ['Should posterity wish to know something of his appearance, it was graceful rather than commanding. There was nothing formidable in his appearance; a gracious look predominated. One would easily believe him a good man, and willingly believe him to be great. As for himself, though taken from us in the prime of a vigorous manhood, yet, as far as glory is concerned, his life was of the longest.']

80 Suet. *Cal.* 22.

81 Suet. *Cal.* 22: *Hactenus quasi de principe, reliqua ut de monstro narranda sunt* ['so much for the Emperor, it remains to relate the monster.']

82 It would appear that placement of the Emperor's physical description towards the end of the piece was a deliberate choice by Suetonius, so as to heighten the dramatic effect and to surprise the reader from the initially benign opening. If it had been placed at the beginning, it would have merely alerted the reader as to what to expect concerning Caligula's subsequent character and career. Its placement at the end confirms the monstrous picture that Suetonius has painted of the Emperor and serves as a counter point to the eulogistic physical description of his father Germanicus, similar in effect to the tragic denouement in a Drama.

Physiognomic descriptions such as these found in Tacitus and Suetonius remained a feature of Roman biography and historiography throughout the Imperial period, still appearing in the later works of Ammianus Marcellinus.⁸³

As mentioned, the occurrence of momentary descriptions of physical appearance and facial expression takes on particular importance when the subject of the description is about to make a speech or is involved in a public duty. This reveals the strong link between oratory, public office and physiognomic aspects of communication, and it must not be forgotten that oratory was a requisite for involvement in public life. Of course, the individuals who played important roles within the Roman Republican social order and who would therefore be concerned with oratory and mastery of physiognomic techniques were members of the *élite nobiles* classes.

Interestingly, the role a person took in public life (or life in general) was often compared with the role an actor takes on the stage; one only has to note the words of the Emperor Augustus attributed to him on his death-bed by Suetonius.⁸⁴ There is a certain amount of irony contained in this, since as mentioned above, there was a clear contempt in *élite* Roman society for actors *per se*. It may have been that the 'role' one took in life was perceived as the only true (and proper) role a person should play (i.e., an *actor veritatis*) – since a Roman playing his proper role in public life would never regard himself (or have been regarded) in the same terms as an actor.⁸⁵ In this sense, the *vultus* of a Roman was not an actor's mask (*persona*), but an *imago animi* – a means of conveying his genuine *motus animi* in a straightforward manner.

3.4 Physiognomics and Roman theatre

Despite the disdain felt for actors in *élite* Roman society, it may have been that it was through the theatre that many Greek cultural influences were disseminated to the Roman *populus*, and this may also have been the case with formal physiognomic principles, since the use of masks

⁸³ Marcellinus also uses the same effects when describing the Emperor Julianus, e.g., Amm. Marc. 15.8.16: *cuius oculos cum venustate terribiles vultumque excitatus gratum diu multumque contuentes, qui futuris sit colligebant velut scrutatis veteribus libris, quorum lectio per corporum signa pandit animorum interna. eumque ut potiori reverentia servaretur, nec supra modum laudabant nec infra quam decebat, atque ideo censorum voces sunt aestimatae, non militum*; and again at 15.8.11, although the occurrence is less frequent than in Tacitus.

⁸⁴ Suet. Aug. 99.

⁸⁵ See n. 40 *supra* and n. 104 *infra*.

largely adapted from Greek prototypes were frequently used for Roman plays.⁸⁶ However, surviving Latin plays exhibit many precise references to physiognomic description which would appear to be unique to Roman drama, concentrating on the Roman interest in the *motus animi* and the *mores* of the individual character, as opposed to the more generic emotional or iconistic representations frequently evidenced in Greek drama. These differences are particularly evident in Roman comedy from the time of Plautus.

The *Atellanae* provide important information as to the expression and development of Roman physiognomic attitudes. These were a traditional dramatic form, probably depicting 'grotesque' characters motivated by a basic personality trait - such as 'gluttony', 'lust', 'stupidity', or 'anger' etc - in a similar way to many of the stock characters found in later Greek New Comedy, and in that regard similar to Theophrastus' *Characters*. This is suggested by the few names that survive in later literary sources and in extant Roman comedy: *Pappus* (old man), *Bucco* (braggart), *Dossenus* (trickster), and *Maccus* (clown).⁸⁷ Given their original connection with fertility rites and the like, the main form of these plays probably consisted of obscene jokes, horseplay, slapstick and general farcical behaviour etc.⁸⁸ There is also strong inferential evidence that such stock characters would have *looked* the part of the dominating personality trait that characterised them through the use of masks, costume and gesture.

Of the early Roman playwrights Livius Andronicus is known to have written comedies; but the precise nature of these is uncertain. The titles of his plays reveal the same penchant as the earlier Atellan farces, being named after a character with a predominant personality trait: *Gladiolus*, *Ludius* and *Virgo* (or *Verpus* (?)).⁸⁹ As with the *Atellanae*, it appears that these characters used gestures and perhaps wore masks communicating their predominant or motivating character trait.

⁸⁶ Similar to the way television has been a catalyst for introducing American culture and values into many countries of the world.

⁸⁷ Plaut. *Rud.* 535-6.

⁸⁸ R.C. Beacham, *The Roman Theatre and Its Audience* (London: Routledge, 1991) 6.

⁸⁹ It would appear that Andronicus' style had much in common with those later comic works which the Romans enjoyed, being full of alliteration, catchy rhymes, and the use of word play and proverbs - which indeed it has been suggested were characteristics of spoken Latin in this early period. Clarke, *Rhetoric at Rome: A Historical Survey* 41. Cato *fr.* 23, 52, 61, 162; Plaut. *Pseud.* 385; Plaut. *Trin.* 1096. It would thus appear that Andronicus' success was his ability to combine traditional Roman elements of jesting, word-play, music, song, and farcical elements within his plays. It is these aspects that make his plays very different from the Greek New Comedy on which they were ostensibly based.

A major influence on Andronicus was perhaps native Roman farce and other forms of Italo-Greek 'phylakes' which developed at Tarentum and the Greek cities of South Italy, rather than Greek New Comedy as written by Menander *et al.*, which was imported from Greece proper.⁹⁰ These 'phylakes' were known by the Romans as *hilarotragoedia* and were predominantly satires on tragedy (as suggested by their titles) but possibly more sophisticated than the earlier traditional 'phylakes', possessing a basic plot and greater structure, derived from tragedies themselves.⁹¹ However, it is evident from the Gnathia ware that the characters in these 'phylakes' also wore masks, and from other literary references, it would seem that their gait and gestures would have been in keeping with the general character trait motivating them (Ill. 2).

Gnaeus Naevius was born about 260 B.C. and according to Aulus Gellius he came from Capua.⁹² He went to Rome where he began to produce plays in 235 B.C. From such origins, he may have been well-versed in both Greek theatrical tradition as well as the native form of Oscan Atellan farce. The titles of his plays ending in '-aria' [*carbonaria*, *tunicularia*, *testicularia*] suggest a play with a minor plot, not like the earlier plot-less farces, but still concentrating on one particular character who was rather stereotypical. Naevius is also credited with having written tragedies, *fabula palliata* (Greek Stories) and as having invented a form of drama based on legends and deeds of Roman history, the *fabula praetextata*.⁹³ It would be interesting to know what masks, if any, the actors wore in the *fabula praetextata* – as these Roman themed plays may not have had set masks previously associated with the Greek derived drama. The fact that these plays dealt with leading individual Romans may have an interesting correlation with the *pompa funebris* of Roman *nobiles* as witnessed and described by Polybius shortly after Naevius was active, in that he tells us actors were used in

90 It is probable that the important influence on his work were writers such as Rhinthon of Tarentum, who is known to have composed 'phylakes' in proper literary form from around 300 B.C. onwards - and this tradition is to a certain extent confirmed by the frequency of 'phylakes' scenes appearing on contemporary Gnathia ware vases from southern Italy (Ill. 2). Richard Green and Eric Handley, *Images of the Greek Theatre* (London: British Museum Press, 1995).

91 Beacham, *The Roman Theatre and Its Audience* 8-9 and 19.

92 Gell. *NA* 1.24.2.

93 Cicero reports that at this time the law of the Twelve Tables (which prescribed death to anyone slandering a living person in the Fescennine verses) was extended to prevent direct reference to any living Roman: Cic. *Rep.* 4. This may well have been the *nobiles* response to the play written by Naevius called *Clastidium* which may well have been a hagiographic piece in praise of Marcus Claudius Marcellus who, as general at the battle of Clastidium in 222 B.C., defeated the Gallic leader Viridomarus in single combat: Plut. *Marc.* 6-8; Polyb. 2.34 and 6.54.2.

these processions wearing *imagines* of the notable ancestors of the deceased.⁹⁴

With the influx of writers from Greek cities from 240 B.C. onwards, Roman drama went through a period of strong Hellenistic influence – exposing the Roman audience to more drama based on Greek plays.⁹⁵ The use of masks and theatricalised gesture in these Greek plays, also exposed the Roman population to a developed physiognomic and gestic vocabulary. While this Greek influence may have been strong, this does not mean that they appreciated unqualifiedly anything Greek that was laid before them, and this is reflected in the continued presence of jokes against Greeks and a farcical or slapstick element in Roman comedy.⁹⁶ At the risk of stereotyping, it could be claimed that the reasons for this was that the Roman audience was less sophisticated and more vulgar than their Greek counterparts. Stating this in a less prejudiced manner, it could merely have stemmed from different cultural expectations between the two audiences. The increased opportunities for staging plays during this period would also have contributed much to the systematisation and standardisation of the repertoire of gestures and facial expressions (via the use of masks) with their associated iconistic meanings to larger sectors of the Roman populace.

By the time of the comic playwright Plautus, a balancing act had to be performed between satisfying the desire to incorporate those elements the Romans found innovatory in Greek theatre and the demands for the more ‘sophisticated’ Greek theatrical tradition, while at the same time not to make excessive assumptions about the complexity of the audience’s

94 Polyb. 6.53-54.

95 Livy notes that from between 363 to 240 B.C. drama developed a more structured form. Livius Andronicus abandoned the *saturnae*, being the first to introduce a play with a plot (Livy, *AUC* 7.2) in 240 B.C. at the *Ludi Romani*. At about the same time (in 240 or 238 B.C.) another opportunity for plays was provided by the creation of the *Ludi Florales* (Ov. *Fast.* 5.277-94). During the period of the Second Punic War even more opportunities were created for the presentation of theatrical events. The *Ludi Plebii* were founded in 220 B.C. and probably had scenic entertainment from the start, but definitely did so by 200 B.C. The *Ludi Apollinares* were probably dramatic from their inception in 212 B.C. and the *Ludi Megalensis* was exclusively theatrical from its inauguration in 204 B.C. These games were instituted at the behest of the Sibylline oracles in order to honour various gods and goddesses, such as Apollo, the Magna Mater and the Goddess Flora. On the frequency of festivals where dramatic performances played an important part, see L.R. Taylor, "The Opportunities for Dramatic Performance at the Time of Plautus and Terence," *TAPhS* 68 (1937); Beacham, *The Roman Theatre and Its Audience* 20. The staging of these plays were inherently religious from their inception - and this conforms to the conclusion that the ancient roots of theatre at Rome itself were in native fertility cult. Since the Sibylline verses were interpreted by a college of priests - and priests in Rome from the middle Republic onwards were drawn from the *nobiles* class - the introduction of many Greek cults and the emphasis on Greek forms of theatre may have been a reflection of the tastes of the *nobiles* who were increasingly well-versed in Greek culture from the mid-third century B.C. onwards.

96 Beacham, *The Roman Theatre and Its Audience* 28.

understanding of Greek stories and cultural values.⁹⁷ This 'balancing' is clearly evident in Plautus' plays.⁹⁸ He turned Menander's plays from urbane and polite 'comedies of manners' in the Hellenistic tradition, to farcical comedies which emphasised vulgar jests and incorporated contemporary Roman references - thus making them more in the tradition of the native Roman farces.⁹⁹ It has also been observed that there is a high incidence of violence and threatened violence in Plautus' comedies which is absent from New Comedy, which some scholars believe may have been in response to a more 'cruel streak' in the audience.¹⁰⁰

From the text of his plays it is evident that Plautus was not ignorant of the 'theatricality' involved in theatre.¹⁰¹ These involved moralising statements for the edification of the audience;¹⁰² elements of Roman philosophy, allusions to political and historical events¹⁰³ and

97 Moore, *The Theater of Plautus: Playing to the Audience* 52.: "Most spectators probably had at least a superficial knowledge of Greek life and institutions. Plautus own sophisticated use of the Greek language suggests that many of his spectators knew at least some Greek. Veterans in the audience would have served in Greek lands. Many Greeks visited or lived in Rome as slaves, diplomats, teachers and merchants; and affluent Romans taught their children Greek literature and history. Nevertheless, few could have had the thorough knowledge of Greek culture necessary to recognise that many of the items peculiar to Roman life mentioned by Plautus' characters could not be found in Greece."

98 Of Plautus' 21 plays surviving wholly or in part, all are believed to be based on Greek New Comedy texts by writers such as Diphilus, Philemon and Menander. Yet it is apparent from the surviving fragments of Menander that Plautus did not merely translate them into Latin, but transformed them into 'barbarian versions', as he himself stated, in a manner adapted to the tastes and demands of his audience: Plaut. *Asin.* 11; Plaut. *Trin.* 19; Plaut. *Stich.* 193. Ibid. 54: "There is a certain amount of "Hyper Hellenization" which makes it clear that characters and plot are not really Greek at all". On the use of the word 'barbarus' used to mean specifically 'Roman', see G. Petrone, *Teatro antico e inganno: finzioni Plautine* (Palermo: G. B. Palumbo & Co., 1983) 31-37; Dumont, *Servus: Rome et l'esclavage sous la République* 580-83; E.S. Gruen, "The Theater and Aristocratic Culture," in *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1992) 222.

99 There are many 'juxtaposition jokes' i.e., simultaneous allusion to Greek and Roman cultural/social institutions i.e., Sagaristio's descriptive name for himself as a Persian, but playing on Latin words: Plaut. *Pers.* 702-5: *Vaniloquidorus Virginesvedonides Nugiepiloquides Aigentumexterebronides Tedigniloquides Nugides Palponides Quodsemellarripides Numquameripides*. See Moore, *The Theater of Plautus: Playing to the Audience* 55. There are also references to Roman institutions and law: e.g., to the *lex praetoria*: Plaut. *Pseud.* 303-4 and Plaut. *Rud.* 1380-82; to Crucifixion of slaves: Plaut. *Asin.* 548; Plaut. *Aul.* 59; Plaut. *Mil.* 310, 372; Plaut. *Rud.* 1070. See Moore, *The Theater of Plautus: Playing to the Audience* 53.

100 Beacham, *The Roman Theatre and Its Audience* 30-31. Also Walter R. Chalmers, "Plautus and His Audience," in *Roman Drama*, ed. T.A. Dorey and Donald R. Dudley (London: 1965) 28. Gladiatorial games were first mentioned as occurring at Rome during a funeral in 264 B.C. by Val. Max. *Mem.* 2.4.7. Such games were indeed popular, if the reference in Terence's *Hecyra*, Prologue 2, at lines 31-34 are to be believed. There it is stated that the first staging of the play had to be abandoned when the audience left the auditorium in preference at seeing a gladiatorial contest.

101 Plautus emphasis on the fact that the characters are Greek highlights the incongruity of the roles that the actors are playing: see Moore, *The Theater of Plautus: Playing to the Audience* 55. There is a high level of theatricality in that the setting of the plays is in Greece, yet simultaneously the allusions and statements made by the actors themselves make it clear that the action is in fact taking place at Rome. The Greek setting is hence a theatrical allusion e.g. Plaut. *Men.* Prologue 7-12: *Atque hoc poetae faciunt in comoediis/ Omnis res gestas esse Athenis autumant,/ Quo illud vobis graecum videatur magis;/ Ego nusquam dicam nisi ubi factum dicitur/ Atque adeo hoc argumentum graecire, tamen/ Non atticissat, verum sicilicissitat*. Later at lines 49-56 the action is transferred to Epidamnus 'by the actors feet' i.e. the actor walks there (to the stage) which thereby becomes Epidamnus: see Moore, *The Theater of Plautus: Playing to the Audience* 56-57.

102 For example, Plaut. *Rud.* 1249-53; and Plaut. *Mil.* 200-5, 207-8, and 213.

even critical comments about Greeks.¹⁰⁴ Indeed, it has been remarked that the plays could be viewed almost as extended Greek jokes - thus feeding a prejudice against Greeks which Romans continued to possess¹⁰⁵ well into the Imperial period.¹⁰⁶ This also suggests that, on a cultural/ethnic level at least, the Romans were very conscious of differences between themselves and Greeks *per se*, particularly differences in their moral and ethical values.

Roman comedy from this period reveals the seminal physiognomic attitudes of Roman society - parallels being evident in contemporary tomb inscriptions.¹⁰⁷ Roman comedy from this period does not reflect the scientific and philosophical form of developed Greek physiognomic theory evident from Cicero's time, choosing to employ references to precise moral and ethical values as communicated through the gait, gesture and physical appearance of the characters - an emphasis which is largely absent from Greek drama.¹⁰⁸ This concern for precise physiognomic description remained constant in Latin literature, still evident in the plays of Seneca 250 years later - thus revealing a long tradition.

Plautus frequently emphasised one physical feature for comic characterisation and to reveal the motivating *motus animi* of that character. The iconistic or pathos portrait evident in Greek drama is rarer and was reserved for the purpose of identification or for communicating the general emotion or motivation of a character - something which was greatly aided by the mask worn by the character and therefore making many of the generalised physiognomic references redundant. Evans noted that more detailed, individualised portraiture was an integral part of Roman drama - in contrast to Greek drama.¹⁰⁹ An example comes from the portrayal in the *Captivi* when Philocrates and Tyndarus swap roles as described by

103 Plaut. *Capt.* 54-66; Plaut. *Pseud.* 685-689.

104 Plaut. *Curc.* 288-95. On the use of '*pergracari*' in Plaut. *Mostell.* 22-23: *dies noctesque bibite, pregraecamini, amicas emite liberate*. See Moore, *The Theater of Plautus: Playing to the Audience* 10: "The actor's position was still more precarious because of their own low status in society: many, if not most actors were foreigners, slaves, or freedman, and those who were freeborn lacked many of the rights of citizens". See Gruen, "Plautus and the Public Stage."; Gruen, "The Theater and Aristocratic Culture," 189-90; Goldberg, "Improvisation, Plot, and Plautus' *Curculio*." On the social class of actors: Rawson, "Theatrical Life in Republican Rome and Italy."; Dumont, *Servus: Rome et l'esclavage sous la République* 517-24. On *infamia* if a freeborn person acted: Dupont, *L'acteur-roi: Le théâtre à Rome* 95-98; Jory, "Ars Ludicra and the Ludus Talarius," 139-45. On general attitude to actors: Edwards, *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome* 123-31; Csapo and Slater, *The Context of Ancient Drama* 276-79. On the low status of the mime actors: Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.57; Quint. *Inst.* 6.3.8 and 6.4.7; Juv. *Sat.* 6.187; Val. Max. *Mem.* 2.10.8.

105 In an analogous way how in some countries Americans can be criticised for their perceived brashness or vulgarity, but yet at the same time these countries have absorbed much of American material culture.

106 Beacham, *The Roman Theatre and Its Audience* 37.

107 The link between funeral practice, oratory, and Roman Comedy is discussed below.

108 See Appendix 3 - Greek Physiognomic Principles.

109 Evans, "Physiognomics in the Ancient World," 35.

Aristophontes to Hegio:

*macilento ore, naso acuto, corpore albo, oculis nigris, subrufus aliquantum, crispus, concinnatus*¹¹⁰ (Plaut. *Capt.* 647-648)

Such a description appears to have conveyed very precise messages to the audience about the personality of the character and hinted at likely plot development. By contrast is the description of the soldier from the *Miles Gloriosus*, where his ego is highlighted by emphasising his overall physical appearance, built up by Plautus' constant repetition of the words *forma*, *pulchritudo*, and *pulcher* - which must have imparted a very definite image in the mind of the audience of both what the *miles* would/should have appeared like physiognomically and the corresponding aspects of his character. Such a description is especially poignant when one considers the epitaph of Scipio Barbatus from the *Tomb of the Scipiones* already cited. Given the similarities, the portrait of the miles appears to have been consonant with the moral and ethical expectations of the contemporary *nobiles* class.

As well as characterisation by reference to general description, Roman dramatists employed iconistic descriptions which went beyond the mere purpose of identification (as primarily used in Greek theatre) to convey an essential part of the plot. Examples exist in both Plautus and Terence¹¹¹ where there is a tendency to describe the appearance or gait of a character in order to convey his/her *motus animi*, and thereby alluding to the impending action. For instance, the physical appearance of new arrivals is often commented upon by characters already on stage, thereby indicating their relevance to the story - ominous or dangerous characters being frequently marked by two signs: a slow step or a gloomy expression. A good example is the description of the momentary physical features 'seen' in the face of Aeschinus in Terence's *Adelphi*, where one character comments:

*erubuit: salva res est.*¹¹² (Ter. *Ad.* 643)

Likewise in the *Phormio*, where a character's gestures and expression reveal his *motus animi* to another:

110 '[I'll tell you what he looks like]: with a thin face, sharp nose, light skinned body, dark eyes, somewhat ruddy, with hair rather crisp and curling.'

111 For example Plaut. *Asin.* 1218-1220; Plaut. *Merc.* 639-640; Plaut. *Poen.* 1111-1113; Ter. *Hec.* 440-441.

112 'She is blushing: the matter is ok'

*Nunc gestus, mihi vultusque est capiundus novus.*¹¹³ (Ter. *Phorm.* 5.6.50)

Compare this with descriptions (when they occur) in Greek New Comedy, which are mostly iconistic or pathos portraits of general emotional or character traits, and the differences in physiognomic emphasis in Greek and Roman theatre become immediately apparent.

Another type of theatre particularly popular in Rome was that of the mime. This form was possibly introduced to the Romans from the Greek cities of Magna Graecia.¹¹⁴ Writers indicate that mime was also used as a form of entertainment at dinner parties.¹¹⁵ The performers, who could be men or women (!)¹¹⁶, were mask-less (unlike the players of *Atellanae*, comedy or scripted drama) and performed barefoot. A major part of the performance relied on the grimacing, gesticulation and general expressiveness of the actors, which were essential in communicating the elements of the story and the character's role within it.¹¹⁷

The other popular Roman form of theatre was the pantomime.¹¹⁸ Similar to the mime, this was an interpretive dance which had its roots in the same tradition of mimetic dance from which the earliest form of Tragedy and Comedy evolved.¹¹⁹ The style could well have been what the Etruscan troupe performed which Livy mentioned came to Rome in 363 B.C.¹²⁰

Pantomime sought to present characterisations, emotion and narrative entirely through the movements, gestures of the body, or parts of the body of an individual performer who neither sang nor spoke. Hence, it presupposed that the audience was well-versed in the meanings that should be attributed to certain gestures and movements. This form was contrived of moments from Greek mythology generally and from the great tragedies in particular;¹²¹ the scenes all

113 'now his gait and face require me to understand something new has happened'

114 Beacham, *The Roman Theatre and Its Audience* 129.

115 Polyb. 31.25.4; Sall. *Iug.* 85.39.

116 Sen. (Y) *Dial.* 12.12.6-7 *Helv. De Cons.*

117 Beacham, *The Roman Theatre and Its Audience* 130-32.

118 Interestingly, the Romans used a Greek word *pantomimus* to describe it, while the Greeks called it 'Italian Dance', calling their own variety *ὄρχησις* (Orchesis). This suggests that the origin of Pantomime was in the Greek cities of southern Italy - although possibly influenced by Etruscan or Italic traditions, or *vice versa*.

119 However, its formal introduction into Rome took place according to tradition rather late, in 22 B.C., apparently simultaneously by Pylades from Cilicia and Bathyllus from Alexandria who both founded schools of pantomime which survived long after their deaths. The comic pantomime was much in vogue in the age of Augustus but faded away to be replaced by tragic pantomime as first practised by Pylades: Ath. 1.20D; Suet. *Rel. Frag.* 3.

120 Livy *AUC* 7.2.

121 Lucian *Salt.* 37-61.

performed by a single actor, sometimes accompanied by a chorus who sang the part and provided the narrative, during which the actor presented all the characters, both male and female. Thus it required great skill to be able to depict the actions as well as the emotional state of the several characters simultaneously,¹²² but also presupposed a great deal on the part of the audiences to be able to read and understand the gestures correctly.

The actor in *pantomimus* was aided by masks and costumes appropriate to the scene, but conventions in movements ascribed to the various characters formed a sort of 'gestic vocabulary' which were set by tradition and from which the actor did not usually stray. The most important element was the complex and subtle movement of the hands and arms, which were likened to the creation of pictures as though using the letters of the alphabet.¹²³ The audiences were evidently familiar with the different myths and also the precise way in which they were to be performed. Of particular importance in relation to this is the comment of Demetrius the Cynic (recorded by Lucian) concerning his response at seeing a pantomime by Paris, the favourite actor in the time of Nero:

“‘Ακουω, ανθρωπε, α ποιεις. Ουχ αρω μονον, αλλα μοι δοκεις ταις χερσιν αυταις λαλειν.”¹²⁴
(Lucian, *De Saltatione* 63)

Earlier, Cicero relates how the actor had to depict his character not just with his head and voice but with the whole of his body; each word needed to be accompanied and underscored by an appropriate gesture or stance.¹²⁵ It is also recorded that Roscius (a well known actor) would contest with Cicero to see who could best express the same thought with greatest variety, Cicero through his language or Roscius through his movements.¹²⁶ Both Roscius and his younger contemporary, Clodius Aesopus, were said also to have attended the orations of Q. Hortensius Hortalus, who was renowned for his mannered delivery and the studied perfection of his gestures and movements. Indeed, Aesopus is said to have taught Cicero gesture.¹²⁷ This reveals, at least in respect of gesture, that there was an understood (although unadmitted) connection between the orator and the theatre and the use which both made of gesture and physical expression to convey meaning to the spectator (although with very

¹²² Beacham, *The Roman Theatre and Its Audience* 142.

¹²³ Cassiod. *Var.* 4.51.9. See most particularly Lucian *Salt.* 1-63.

¹²⁴ 'I hear the story you are acting man, I do not just see it; you seem to me to be talking with your very hands!'

¹²⁵ Cic. *Amic.* 2.25; Cic. *De or.* 2.46.193 and 3.50.196; Cic. *Fam.* 7.6; Cic. *Acad.* 2.20 and 2.86.

¹²⁶ Val. Max. *Mem.* 8.7.7; Macrobi. *Sat.* 3.14.12; Cic. *Fam.* 9.22.

¹²⁷ Val. Max. *Mem.* 8.10.2; *Rhet. ad Her.* 3.21.34; Cic. *Sest.* 56-58 (120-3).

different intentions).

From the period just outside the temporal scope of this discussion comes the Roman dramatist Seneca (Y) who utilised descriptive portraiture to reflect his interest in Stoicism and his belief in the relation of the physiognomy to the inner nature. This interest is also common to the peripatetic school – but Seneca combines it with a very Roman concept of the link between physical expression and character as seen in earlier Roman comedy.¹²⁸

In his letters,¹²⁹ Seneca analysed the rhetorical terms used for iconistic and physiognomic descriptions. To Seneca, ‘iconistic’ description (*eikonismos*)¹³⁰ was the portrayal of the pure physical form from which general character could be divined. ‘*Characterismos*’¹³¹ was a description of behaviour which delineated the ‘*εἰκὼν*’ in deeds – and it is therefore similar to the genre of characterology as established by Theophrastus.¹³² Seneca drew heavily on Greek physiognomic theory, particularly utilising the Stoic insistence on description of individuals by their physical marks, characteristics, likeness, or image (*εἰκὼν*) etc. It is from such description that personality could be revealed via a process known as ‘*ethologia*’.¹³³

Seneca believed that *incessus*,¹³⁴ *vultus*,¹³⁵ and *gestus*¹³⁶ reflect the true character of the soul, or might be said to do so in the man of wisdom – something which, as noted above, was a belief evident from the writings of Cicero.¹³⁷ An example is his *De Ira*, in which an angry man is described closely aligned with the portrait of a madman:

audax et minax, vultus, tristis frons, torva facies, citatus gradus, inquietae manus, color

¹²⁸ Evans, “Physiognomics in the Ancient World” 28.

¹²⁹ Sen. (Y) *Ep.* 95.65–69.

¹³⁰ *eikonismos* in Greek is a portrayal of physical likeness or image in general terms.

¹³¹ *descriptio* or *depictio* – representation, delineation, description of character: Cic. *Top.* 22.83; Cic. *De or.* 3.53.205; Quint. *Inst.* 9.1.31; *Rhet. ad Her.* 4.39.51; it is sometimes equated with ‘*eikonismos*’.

¹³² See Appendix 3 – Greek Physiognomic Principles.

¹³³ The art of depicting or imitating character: Quint. *Inst.* 1.9.3; Sen (Y) *Ep.* 95.66.

¹³⁴ ‘Gait’: Cic. *Off.* 1.35.128: *status, incessus, sessio, accubitio, vultus, oculi manuum motus teneant illud decorum*; also Cic. *Or.* 18, 59.

¹³⁵ ‘the face, expression, looks etc’: Cic. *Leg.* 1.9.27: *nam et oculi nimis arguti, quemadmodum animo affecti sumus, loquuntur, et is qui appellatur vultus, qui nullo in animante esse praeter hominem potest, indicat: cuius vim Graeci norunt, nomen omnino non habent*; Cic. *De or.* 3.221: *imago animi vultus est, indices oculi*; Cic. *De or.* 1.127: *ea, quae nobis non possumus fingere, facies, vultus, sonus*; Cic. *Pis.* 1.1: *oculi, supercilia, frons, vultus denique totus, qui sermo quidam tacitus mentis est, hic in fraudem homines impulit*; Cic. *Fam.* 12.30.3: *vultus mehercule tuos mihi expressit omnes*; Cic. *Clu.* 26.72: *ficti simulatique vultus*.

¹³⁶ gesture, motion, posture, e.g., Quint. *Inst.* 6.1: *gestus histrionis* [‘gesture of the actor’]; *Rhet. ad Her.* 3.15.26: *convenit igitur in gestu nec venustatem conspiciendam nec turpitudinem esse, ne aut histriones aut operarii videamur esse*.

¹³⁷ Evans, “Physiognomics in the Ancient World” 29.

*versus, crebra et vehementius acta suspiria.*¹³⁸ (Sen. (Y) *De Ira* 1.1.3.)

Such physical descriptions have more in common with the *παθος* or iconistic descriptions found in traditional Greek physiognomics, such as Theophrastus' writings, rather than in the specific descriptions revealing the *motus animi* evident in the Roman physiognomic tradition.¹³⁹

However, despite the influence of Greek philosophy and drama, Seneca did still utilise facial and bodily description as indicators of the *motus animi* - thus connecting them with the earlier physiognomic tradition of the Roman comedies. Excellent examples can be found in his play, *Medea*. The play concentrates on the fury and revenge of the heroine, and so provides an excellent example of the detailed physical description that an emotion like intense anger has as on the face and body. In this sense, Seneca's portrayal of Medea herself is an 'iconistic' description of an angry person. However, Medea's description goes beyond mere pathos description or iconism, references are made explicitly to her momentary facial expressions or gestures, which are much more individualised and more revealing of her *motus animi*.¹⁴⁰ For instance, Creon can immediately recognise Medea's anger from her face and what dangers this portends:

fert gradum contra ferox

*minaxque nostros propius affatus petit.*¹⁴¹ (Sen. (Y) *Med.* 186-187)

The words *ferox* and *minax* reveal Medea's state of mind, and it is obvious that the spectator could readily identify (or understand) the physical manifestations, particularly in the facial expression, which would communicate this underlying emotion (which Creon himself has noticed). The nurse also plainly sees Medea's intentions from her facial expression: [40] Sen. (Y) *Med.* 380-396. Later, when Medea bursts in upon Jason, he can plainly see the anguish on her face and remarks upon it: [41] Sen. (Y) *Med.* 445-446. Medea's *ira* is also plainly evident to the chorus: [42] Sen. (Y) *Med.* 849-861.

138 'Her face, bold and threatening, sad forehead, tortured facial expression, agitated gait, nervous hands changed colour, her strange movements and breathing more rapidly'

139 Seneca's material conforms most closely to the third theory of physiognomics described in the Aristotelian handbook, the *Physiognomonica*: i.e., that precise facial expressions are determined by different emotions of the mind. This appears to have been most consonant with traditional Roman physiognomic beliefs and perhaps explains why this aspect of physiognomic theory was most readily taken up in philosophical terms by the Romans in the Imperial period.

140 As Evans, would describe it: Evans, "Physiognomics in the Ancient World" 30.

141 'Ferocity and threat conveys her gait and breathing quickly she seeks our council'

In another play, the *Phaedra*, the physical effect of Phaedra's disordered mind on her appearance is conveyed to the chorus via the nurse who remarks that her face is *tacito aestu*¹⁴² i.e., with silent seething. Furthermore, Phaedra is explicitly described as walking with faltering steps, all brightness has fallen from her face, and her eyes are dulled. It is a detailed portrait of the *motus animi* reflected in her physique, gait, and facial expression.¹⁴³

The facial expressions commented upon by the other characters and the chorus in Seneca's plays are clearly danger signs which any reader or viewer would be able to recognise, or would be able to envisage from the verbal statements made by the other characters. The fact that the actor would be wearing a mask may have done much to create and communicate the drama of the moment, but also to reinforce in the viewers' mind the physiognomic messages communicated by a precise formulation of facial expression.

Physiognomic description was especially employed in drama when a new character arrives on the scene – usually requiring a character already on stage to comment on the new arrival's physical appearance. Such descriptions are designed to give the audience a very clear idea of what was about to unfold in the plot. For instance, Megara, in *Hercules furens*, watches the approach of Lycus bearing the sceptre of Creon, whom he has usurped:

sed ecce saevus ac minas vultu gerens

*et qualis animo est talis incessu venit*¹⁴⁴ (Sen. (Y) *Her. Fur.* 329-330)

Another example is in *Hercules Oetaeus*, wherein the distress of Deianira is reflected in the statement of the chorus who, at the sight of the woman, ask:

sed qui pavido territa vultu...

fertur dubio regina gradu ?¹⁴⁵ (Sen. (Y) *Her. Oet.* 700-702)

142 Sen. (Y) *Phaed.* 362-383: *torretur aestu tacito et inclusus quoque/ quamvis tegatur, proditur uultu furor / erumpit oculis ignis et lassae genae / lucem recusant; nil idem dubiae placet/ artusque uarie iactat incertus dolor: / nunc ut soluto labitur marcens gradu / et uix labante sustinet collo caput, / nunc se quieti reddit et, somni immemor, / noctem querelis ducit; attolli iubet / iterumque poni corpus et solui comas / rursusque fingi: semper impatiens sui / mutatur habitus. nulla iam Cereris subit / cura aut salutis; uadit incerto pede, / iam uiribus defecta: non idem uigor, / non ora tinguens nitida purpureus rubor; / [populatur artus cura, iam gressus tremunt, / tenerque nitidi corporis cecidit decor.] / et qui ferebant signa Phoebeae facis / oculi nihil gentile nec patrium micant./ lacrimae cadunt per ora et assiduo genae / rore irrigantur, qualiter Tauri iugis / tepido madescent imbre percussae niues.*

143 Evans, "Physiognomics in the Ancient World" 31.

144 'But lo ! she comes seething, bearing threats on her face, and with such things in her mind so such things by her unstable face are revealed !'

A further example from the same play is provided by the chorus who remarks on the appearance of another of the characters:

*vultus furore torvus atque oculi truces*¹⁴⁶ (Sen. (Y) *Her. Oet.* 702)

In the final scene a similar device is used when the messenger Philoctetes returns and relates to the chorus a description of the face of Hercules at the moment of his apotheosis.¹⁴⁷ Evans stated that the description of Hercules' momentary facial expression was designed to "intensify the glorious triumph of the man, the *vir bonus*, over the struggle of life and death."¹⁴⁸ To me, it exemplifies Seneca's acquaintance with, and utilisation of, physiognomic principles as a tool to communicate his philosophical viewpoint. Underlying this, however, is the fact that, without physiognomic understanding on the part of the audience, such description would have been pointless.

It may be that the Roman writers, although employing masks derived from Greek theatre, felt the need to dwell more on the *motus animi* of the character in order to personalise and 'Romanise' the effect, giving vent to the Roman emphasis on personal psychology and motivation communicated through the physical appearance, gait, facial expressions and the fluctuations evident in a person's features but not communicable through a static mask.¹⁴⁹ In any event, such physiognomic descriptions reveal the sophistication of the Roman audience or reader and attests to their experience in understanding emotional and psychological messages that could be conveyed physiognomically.¹⁵⁰

There is also another literary device employed primarily in drama (but also in poetry and other literary genres) known as 'resemblance' which has very ancient roots.¹⁵¹ It can be found in Homer in his portrait of Odysseus in the comparison with his son Telemachus.

145 'But is it the Queen who comes here terrified with fearful face and with hesitating step?'

146 'A face seething with anger and ferocious eyes'

147 Sen. (Y) *Her. Oet.* 1645-1647: *vultus petentis astra, non ignes erat/ ut pressit Oeten ac suis oculis rogam / lustravit omnem, fregit impositus trabes.*

148 Evans, "Physiognomics in the Ancient World" 33.

149 Wiles argues that while there was no separate system of masks for Roman performances, Roman masks may have been even more exaggerated than their Greek counterparts: D. Wiles, *The Masks of Menander: Sign and Meaning in Greek and Roman Performance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991) 133. See also N. Slater, "Nero's Masks," *CW* 90 (1996) n.5.

150 In relation to Seneca's use of physiognomic description in his plays, it may be pertinent that he emphasised verbal description because his plays were written as literary productions and were not intended to be performed. Hence, the effect of the masks would have been irrelevant to convey meaning, requiring verbalisation of emotion through reference to physical description.

151 Evans, "Physiognomics in the Ancient World" 32.

'Resemblance' operates by transferring the character traits of one individual to another through a comment on the similarity of physical appearance – this usually evokes the same emotional response in a third person upon seeing the individual concerned. In the *Phaedra*, Seneca uses the device to great effect when Phaedra looks at Hippolytus and recognises the features of Theseus as a young man.¹⁵² This heightens the anguish of the queen – for in her stepson she senses the same depth of love that she feels for her husband. The utilisation of resemblance is an effective means of transferring the personality or character from one individual to another – since the implicit message in the comparison is that the one (exemplified by the physiognomy) stands in the place of the other and so possesses their personality and character. Since it is often used in parent-child contexts, this suggests that it was believed that one's character or disposition could be inherited. The device is also used in Virgil's *Aeneidae* where Dido embraces Iulus because of his resemblance to his father, Aeneas: [43] Verg. *Aen.* 4.80-85. Seneca also uses the device in his *Troades* where Astyanax brings a painful reminder of Hector to Andromache: [44] Sen. (Y) *Troad.* 464-468. See also Ov. *Ep.* 12.189.

The use of resemblance in such a way indicates the belief that not only could physical appearance be passed down through the generations, but so too could character and personality traits – and this is particularly important when thinking about Roman family structure and the emphasis placed upon the *paterfamilias* and the deeds of the ancestors which are brought to mind by the physical device of the *imagines maiorum*.¹⁵³ In this sense, the *imagines* themselves could be said to be a physical manifestation of 'resemblance' that a Roman experienced in everyday life. The ability to inherit morality and character from one's forebears was undoubted by a Roman audience and explains why the opposing portraits of Germanicus and his son Caligula as painted by Suetonius (as discussed above) would have been all the more shocking to the reader.

3.5 Physiognomics and Roman theatrical masks

The long theatrical tradition of Rome and the emphasis on physiognomic principles as a tool

152 Sen. (Y) *Phaed.* 646-660: *Hippolyte, sic est: Thesei vultus amo / illos priores, quos tulit quondam puer, / cum prima puras barba signaret genas / monstrique caecam Gnosii uidit domum / et longa curua fila collegit uia. / quis tum ille fulsit! presserant vittae comam / ei ora flauus tenera tinguebat pudor; / inerant lacertis mollibus fortes tori, / tuaeque Phoebes vultus aut Phoebi mei, / tuusue potius-talis, en talis fuit / cum placuit hosti, sic tulit celsum caput. / in te magis refulget incomptus decor: / est genitor in te totus et torvae tamen / pars aliqua matris miscet ex aequo decus: / in ore Graio Scythicus apparet rigor.*

153 For further discussion, see Chapter 9, 257-258 *infra*.

of communication requires that the use of masks be addressed. The use of masks in the Roman theatre is a much debated subject. Certainly the *Phylakes* of the Greek cities of South Italy and Sicily used masks as did the performers in the *Atellanae*. Greek actors appear to have worn them also from the earliest time in their productions of Tragedy and Comedy. There are contradictory comments in the Latin writers themselves, but some scholars believe that they were worn from an early date.¹⁵⁴ This is confirmed by the appearance of a figure in an Etruscan tomb painting which dates to the late sixth century B.C. The figure, named 'Phersu', is obviously wearing a mask (Ill. 3). Just how this was related to Greek theatrical masks of the period is uncertain - even whether Phersu's mask is similar to masks used in Greek theatre at all. In relation to the Latin tradition, Vergil claimed (rather poetically) that it was the practice of ancient times to make masks when reciting poems or musical dance.¹⁵⁵ If this was the case it would not be unique to the early Romans - as it appears to be a common phenomenon in many cultures in many different places at different times.

The Latin word for a mask as used in the theatre was *persona*.¹⁵⁶ This word specifically contrasts with *imago*, which was not perceived to be an artificial representation of a character, but a more studied reflection of true *motus animi* of an individual. It is to be noted that the Greek term *προσωπον* to describe theatrical masks, was also the word the Greeks used for a 'face' generally; but in Latin this later meaning is conveyed by the words *vultus* or *os*. This indicates a clear distinction in the Roman mind between the artificiality of a theatrical mask (*persona*) and the actual face of an individual (*vultus*), and the latter's representation in the form of an *imago*.

That the characters in later Roman drama wore masks derived from Greek theatre and represented generic or iconistic emotional states would appear to be beyond doubt. That they still had currency at the end of the first century A.D. is attested to by the character types and masks mentioned by Quintilian and defined by adjectives - the '*atrox Medea*', '*attonitus Ajax*', '*truculentus Hercules*' etc.¹⁵⁷ He also tells us that certain characters would have a particular gait descriptive of their character: [45] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.112; and that the masks

154 Beacham, *The Roman Theatre and Its Audience* 185.

155 Verg. *G.* 2.387: *versibus incompitis ludunt risuque soluto/ oraque corticibus sumunt horrenda cavatis / et te, Bacche, vocant per carmina laeta tibi que* ['[The Ausonian farmers]...make sport with rude verses and with unbridled laughter and they put on frightful (worthy of reverence?) masks from hollowed bark, and you, Bacchus, they call through joyful songs and for you...'].

156 See n. 34.

157 Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.65.

themselves could be manipulated to convey more momentary emotional states – by having one half of the mask showing one facial expression, with the other half depicting its opposite. The actor thus possessed ‘two faces’, choosing to display a particular side of the mask to the audience according to which emotion was relevant at that point in the plot. Whether this manipulation of the masks to convey contrasting messages physiognomically was a Greek borrowing is less clear.

The most complete list of masks is provided by the writer, Julius Pollux, in the second century A.D.¹⁵⁸ Lucian mentions the masks used in Pantomime which were deemed fitting for the character in question: they are to be as handsome as possible with the mouth closed (not open) etc.¹⁵⁹ The fact that the mouth was closed for Pantomime masks should not be surprising, since the actors relied solely on physical gesture (not spoken words) to convey meaning. In this sense it is a pure form of physiognomic art. That masks could be individualised is undoubted – the Old Comedy of Aristophanes proves it, as does Suetonius’ regarding Nero.¹⁶⁰ But there is also evidence of this occurring from Roman New Comedy as well.¹⁶¹

It is evident that for the ‘grand’ emotions, such as anger, despair, sadness etc., there was a process of eventual acculturation from the fourth to the first century B.C. which seems to have standardised how these were physically manifested by the masks. However, from the abundant examples of the *minutiae* of physical description and the underlying psychology and *motus animi* which appear in Roman drama as mentioned above, it would seem that there was a wide difference between the precise nuances of what precise facial expressions communicated to the Roman, as opposed to the Greek audience. The use of masks did not prevent the Roman dramatist from verbalising the incipient facial features, as well as transitory or fleeting changes in the physical ‘appearance’ of the character to convey the fluctuating *motus animi* of that character directly to the audience. While the masks would have greatly facilitated the reception of Greek physiognomic precepts by the Roman audience it should not be assumed that these generic Greek physiognomic concepts supplanted the

158 A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968) 175-76. 175-176. Lucian *Salt.* 27; Philostr. *VA* 5.91 – for the frightening effect of the tragic actors costume and masks of the imperial period.

159 Lucian *Salt.* 30.

160 Suet. *Ner.* 21. Tac. *Ann.* 16.4; Cass. Dio 63.9.5 and 63.10.2. Slater, “Nero’s Masks,” 313.

161 Plautus’ *Amphitruo* where Sosia meets Hermes disguised as himself: *nam hic quidem omnem imaginem meam, quae antehac fuerat, possidet. vivo fit quod numquam quisquam mortuo faciet mihi*: Plaut. *Amph.* 458-9. The whole idea of a baker having an *imago* fashioned of himself for use in a funeral procession is absurd, since he would have hardly had the position and reputation within Roman society to warrant such an honour. See discussion of Roman *imagines*, Chapter 8, 224-228, and 234-240.

popular physiognomic forms that is evidenced in the Latin plays. The fact that the plays were written by 'Hellenised' Romans or even Greeks should not obscure the fact that the audience was at Rome, not Athens: hence the meaning being conveyed must have been culturally relevant for them. There is no point making reference to cultural values communicated by either the actors' masks or by the dialogue of a play if those values are not comprehensible to the audience.

In the first two centuries B.C. it appears that in contrast to Greek physiognomic theory the Romans utilised physical description in a highly personalised way, to communicate messages concerning the personal *motus animi* of the individual concerned. These messages on the whole, reflected specific Roman moral and cultural values.

3.6 The face as a tool of communication

The evidence discussed above shows that the Romans believed in the capacity of gestures, the gait and facial expression to communicate the *motus animi*. Before attempting to analyse the link between precise states of mind and facial expression or gesture, it is important to first identify the parts of the face and body which they believed played an important role in physical communication.

As previously observed from Cicero (Cic. *De Or.* 3.221-222) the Romans perceived that all movements, gestures and facial expressions conveyed meaning to the viewer as a reflection of the spirit, while the face itself was the *imago* of the mind. Everything concerning a person's *motus animi* could be read from the countenance: [46] Plin. (E) *HN* 11.55. Within the face itself, the most important features were the eyes and eyebrows.

3.6.1 Caput - the head

That the head [in Latin *caput* (n. sing), *-itis* (gen. sing)] should be capable of communication through facial expression is self evident. It seems that the precise angle of the head and other movements made by it communicated much about the general mental state of the individual: [47] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.68-71.

3.6.2 Vultus/facies/os - the face

One of the most commonly found words denoting the 'face' in Latin is *vultus* (m. sing.), *ûs*

(gen. sing.). Generally it means “an expression of the countenance, the countenance, visage, features and expression”; hence, often it is translated by the English words ‘features’, ‘looks’, ‘air’, ‘mien’, ‘expression’, ‘aspect’ (syn. *aspectus*).¹⁶² Synonymous words include *facies* (-ei) (f) and *os, oris* (n)¹⁶³ - although the latter can simply refer to the ‘mouth’. The *vultus* itself was of paramount importance to the Romans for communication As Cicero remarked:

[3] *O hominem semper illum quidem mihi aptum, nunc vero etiam suavem! vultus me hercule tuos mihi expressit omnis, non solum animum ac verba pertulit.*¹⁶⁴ (Cic. *Fam.* 12.30.3)

See also [48] Cic. *De Leg.* 1.9.27. As already noted, he specifically tells us that the *vultus* is the *imago animi*, and that its communicative capacity is most apparent from the eyes and forehead: Cic. *De Or.* 3.59.221. Pliny (E) confirms this – particularly for emotional states: [49] Plin. (E) *HN* 11.58. The sources also tell us that the eyes were capable of more precise emotional communication, such as ‘fear’ (Serv. *Comment.* 5.505). Equally, the sources indicate that the *motus animi* could be communicated from an *imago* of an individual just as readily as from the living *vultus*.¹⁶⁵

Such statements are crucial, not only because they confirm the communicative aspect of the face but because they describe the face in terms of being an *imago* - the exact word (as already noted in Chapter Two) that the Romans utilised to describe their portraits. The *vultus* is the silent interlocutor in a conversation, whereby it expresses by its appearance and expression what a person may not be expressing in words.

In general terms, Cicero tells us that all the features of the face (the eyes, eyebrows, forehead and indeed the entire aspect of the face), conveyed precise details about the character of an individual. This is confirmed in the opening of his attack against Piso: [50] Cic. *Pis.* 1.1. Cicero here tells us that the first impression of the general features of an individual are important in divining their character - such as the colour of the skin, whether the face is shaven, unshaven or too closely shaven, and then whether the teeth are in good order or not. He then gives us a catalogue of the elements of the face (and their disposition) which reveal

162 C. T. Lewis and C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980).

163 Ibid. While this word basically means the ‘mouth’, it is also used to signify the whole face or countenance of a person or persons: the mouth. In general: the face, countenance (synonymous with *vultus*, *facies*).

164 ‘O that man always indeed devoted to me, but now also delightful ! Your face (countenance), by my Hercules, conveys everything about you to me, it bears forth not only your soul but your words.

165 Cic. *Leg.* 1.9: *vultus indicat mores*.

the precise *motus animi* of the individual - the eyes, eyebrows, forehead and then the whole face. In this particular instance Cicero decries the fact that Piso has adopted a false facial expression by which he hopes to deceive men as to his true character. Interestingly, Piso's false facial expression is suggestive of his *imagines maiorum*, a pretence which Cicero 'unmasks' by stating that the only thing Piso has in common with these is the smoky pallor of his skin. The concept of *fraus* by manipulating the facial expression and the analogies that are drawn with the theatre are particularly revealing for understanding the concept of Roman physiognomics and how this may have impacted upon portrait art.

With regards to the eyes and their communicational capacity, Quintilian states (following on from similar comments made earlier by Cicero) that they can spontaneously indicate joy or sadness, and that through their motion they can communicate a range of emotional or moral states including lust, torpor, desire, arrogance or defiance etc.: [51] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.75-77.

There are many references in Republican Latin literature revealing the link between physical appearance and individual emotional or ethical states. For instance, when accused before the law-courts it was customary for the person concerned to assume the garb and countenance of a suppliant. In such circumstances the countenance should be characterised by a 'darker' or more 'gloomy' expression - as befitting such circumstances: [52] Cic. *Mur.* 49. In this passage, Cicero contrasts the proper expression of his client Sulla, with the face of Sulla's accuser, the latter of which he characterised by its arrogance (*adrogantia*), anger (*furor*) and wickedness (*scelus*). Cicero suggests that these character traits are clearly visible from the man's countenance, and particularly from his eyes.

Indeed, Cicero explicitly says in another passage that an individual's wicked designs or mal-intentions are clearly communicated by his facial expression - *motus animi* that are more reprehensible and more brazen when the person concerned makes no attempt to hide them from obvious display: [53] Cic. *Sest.* 17. In this passage Cicero accuses two Consuls before the senate who, contrary to their expected role of protectors of the state, have actively engaged in its overthrow. Instead of *dignitas*, *gravitas*, and *severitas* (which are expected of a senator and magistrates), the facial expressions and gait of these men communicate a *motus animi* which proves they are bent on destroying the customary *dignitas* of the senate and of their own office. See also [54] Cic. *Verr.* 5.161.

However, it was not just immorality or shamelessness which could be read from an

individual's facial expression, but also positive virtues, such as the honoured bonds of friendship (*amicitia*) and kindness (*benignitas*): [55] Q. Cic. *Comment. Pet.* 44. Here, Q. Cicero says that the face and the forehead are the true doorways to the mind (*animi ianua*).

Hence, the countenance of a person was important for gaining some insight into his *motus animi* –especially so with regards to a man involved in public affairs whose facial expression and gestures should always be consonant with his rank: [56] Verg. *Aen.* 8.152. also : [57] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.72-74. However, as noted, the Romans fully understood that the face could be a means of miscommunication, or even *fraus*, depending on the circumstances.¹⁶⁶

3.6.3 Supercilia - the eyebrows/frons - the forehead/os - the mouth/oculi - eyes

The eyebrows (and hence the forehead) play a crucial role in forming the physical expressions of the face. This should not be surprising, since apart from the mouth, the eyebrows and forehead are the most easily moved part of the face. The eyebrows and forehead are thus an essential part of the expressive countenance, which can amply attest to the true *motus animi* of an individual, or be purposely manipulated to conceal it.

The Latin word for forehead is *frons* (f.), *frontis* (gen. sing.) - the word most commonly referring to the eyebrows was *supercilium* (n. sing.), -ii (gen. sing.) - and in its plural form *supercilia* (nom. pl.) -orum (gen. pl.).¹⁶⁷ *Supercilium* literally means 'above the eyelid', or *cilium*.

Indeed, the Latin word for eyebrows, *supercilia*, came to be used as a simile in Latin for *superbia*, *arrogantia*, *insolens* – 'arrogance', 'haughtiness' - in that one raised eyebrow was believed to be the distinguishing mark of arrogant rulers such as tyrants and kings, and indeed of Roman citizens who got above themselves or were known for their haughtiness.¹⁶⁸

From at least the early second century B.C. in popular culture at least, the eyebrows and their twitching were believed to be portents of the future:

¹⁶⁶ See Chapter 4, 117-121 *infra*.

¹⁶⁷ Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary*.

¹⁶⁸ Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 2.34.93 ; Cic. *Sest.* 8.19; Cic. *Red. in Sen.* 7.14; Sen. (Y) *Ben.* 2.4.1; Juv. *Sat.* 6.169; Juv. *Sat.* 5.62

*flagitiumst, si nil mittetur quae supercilio spicit;*¹⁶⁹ (Plaut. *Mil.*694)

See also [58] Plaut. *Pseud.* 106-107. It also seems that from the time of Plautus there was a general understanding of what was precisely communicated by particular arrangements of the forehead and eyebrows:

*erile imperium ediscat, ut quod frons velit oculi sciant;*¹⁷⁰ (Plaut. *Aul.*599)

Generally, though, the positioning of the eyebrows and forehead were clearly understood to communicate the *motus animi*. It was also recognised that the position of the eyebrows could be manipulated to give greater effect, or to hide the *motus animi*, or, when viewed as a spontaneous reaction, as conveying a person's true *motus animi* with regards to a particular situation:

*supercilia maxime indicant factum*¹⁷¹ (*Phaed.* 1.15.3)

Of paramount importance in relation to this is a quote from Cicero who stated that it is essential to carefully scrutinize the appearance of the face, in particular the position of the eyebrows, in order to judge the *motus animi* of an individual, and whether such a person is fit for the office or position they hold: [59] Cic. *Off.* 1.146. From this passage, it is evident that a great deal of attention was paid to whether the eyebrows were drawn or relaxed (and hence, also, whether the forehead was contracted or not). It is implicit from what Cicero says that either of these must have conveyed precise messages to the viewer. Other elements were also important, and these included the gleam of the eyes, the shape of the mouth, the colour or complexion of the skin, and the timbre of the voice.

That the eyebrows were considered particularly expressive is several times reiterated in the poems of Ovid: [60] Ov. *Am.* 2.5.15-20; [61] Ov. *Am.* 1.4.19; and [62] Ov. *Ep.* 17.81.¹⁷² Quintilian also agrees that the eyebrows serve an important role in non-verbal communication, especially in speech delivery – which implies that in the various contexts in which speeches were delivered, the audience must have been close enough to see the facial expression, including the positioning of the eyebrows: [63] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.78-79.

169 'It is a shame, if nothing is sent to she who tells your fortune by watching your eyebrow.'

170 'He learns the master's orders, so that the eyes may know what the brow wishes.'

171 'Her eyebrows reveal to me the fact the most'

172 Particularly in relation to *severitas*: Ov. *Tr.* 2.309: *supercilii matrona severi*.

3.6.4 Other parts of the body: lips, nostrils, neck, shoulders and hands

Quintilian confirms that messages could be communicated to the audience by the lips and nostrils, particularly disdain, sneering, or annoyance. To bare the teeth and to flare the nostrils could convey diverse *motus animi* from the indecent to the hostile. Such facial expressions were considered most inappropriate, particularly for an orator: [64] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.80-81.

Similar to the parts of the face so, too, could the position of the neck, shoulders and arms have important implications for the audience, conveying such notions as servility, humility, and, on occasion, dishonesty or deceit: [65] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.82-84.

Lastly, one of the most important parts of the body utilised for non-verbal, physical communication were the hands. This has already been noted in relation to theatre, especially the mime and pantomime, and by the emphasis on the positioning of the hands in oratory. Quintilian states that a great range of emotions or emphasis could be adduced simply from the motion of the hands, including: supplication, fear, abomination, inquiry, denial, joy, sadness, doubt, admission, shame, regret. He even goes so far to say that hand gestures are the common language between peoples of all races and nations: [66] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.85-87.

3.7 Summary

The value placed by the Romans upon the communicative capacity of the face and gestures, has important ramifications for the study of Roman portraits. It implies that to the Romans, portraiture had the possibility not merely to be a static representation which engendered purely emotional or aesthetic responses, but had the potential to be a dynamic and active means of communication concerning the morals, character or motives of the portrayed as befitting their role or position within society.¹⁷³ When one considers that general literacy may not have been high, visual and verbal images, including portraits, would have been essential in everyday communication, rather than reliance solely on the written word.¹⁷⁴

¹⁷³ For the Latin term *imago* and its meaning (as ancestral mask) and the signification of *images* within Roman culture see H.I. Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996) 16-31. Also, J. Elsner, *Art and Context in Roman Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) 32-53; P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, trans. A. Shapiro (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998) 5-31.

¹⁷⁴ The issue of the level of literacy is a complex and highly disputed matter. See M. Beard, ed., *Literacy in the Roman World*, *JRA, Supplementary Series, No. 3* (Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1991); W.V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989).

It now remains to consider whether there was a precise formulation of facial expressions and gesture linked with defined *motus animi*, and then whether Roman portraits may have communicated these same *motus animi* through their facial composition.

CHAPTER FOUR

PHYSIOGNOMIC EXPRESSION OF THE *MOTUS ANIMI*

The Latin literature of the Republican period reveals a highly nuanced conception concerning the face and body and its power to communicate the *motus animi*. Explicit in this complex physical messaging system, the Romans were aware that the facial expression could be manipulated to deceive the viewer as to the true *motus animi* - and there are many references to *fraus* in relation to facial expression. The concepts which could be communicated physically ranged from what might be classed as positive emotions (such as joy, happiness, friendship and love), to more negative ones (such as anger, ferocity, grief, treachery).

4.1 Emotions, character traits, and states of mind (*motus animi*) communicated physiognomically

4.1.1 Good character

In ascribing good emotional and moral states as well as benign motivations to an individual, a cursory physiognomic description is often utilised. This strongly suggests that the Roman audience was already well aware of which precise facial expressions constituted or communicated particular states of mind. Because of this familiarity, it appears that it was not always considered necessary to describe in detail what precise arrangement of facial expressions constituted which particular *motus animi*. An example is the epitaph from the tomb of Lucius Cornelius Scipio Barbatus (Cos 298 B.C).¹ Another example is Cicero's description of a brave man whom he states is known for his *pulchritudo* - which is similar to the inscription from Barbatus' tomb almost one hundred and fifty years previously: [1] Cic. *Pis.* 81.

Cicero also utilises ethnic physiognomics to claim that certain facial expressions and elements of physiognomy are regarded as characteristic of specific peoples from a defined geographic area - thereby revealing their generic character and disposition. For instance, he believed that the facial expressions and gait of the people of Cures² communicated their honesty and reliability: [2] Cic. *Fam.* 15.20.1. This suggests, in the manner of the Hippocratic School in

¹ CIL i².6-7; ILLRP 309; See Chapter Three, 73 *supra*; Appendix 2, Chapter 3 [17].

² A town on the Aventine Hill inhabited by Sabines - it is supposedly from this town that the noun 'Quirites' came to describe Roman citizens when acting in their civic and political role in the *comitia centuriata*.

the *Airs, Waters and Places*, that geography, climate and even 'genetic' background/social environment produced dominant character qualities evident in individuals within the same group which would be communicated by physical appearance.³

In describing someone of good character, it is common in oratory simply to call on one's listeners to recall the face, voice and eyes or general bearing of the person being extolled. Cicero frequently uses this device in the course of his speeches before the senate and in the law courts: [3] *Cic. Balb.* 49. This underlies the commonly held belief (in political and social terms), that it was possible to recognise a good person from an untrustworthy one merely from the general appearance of their face:

*quid ais tu? tibi credere certum est, nam esse bonum ex voltu cognosco.*⁴ (*Plaut. Aul.* 719)

4.1.2 Happiness, Joy, Love, Devotion – 'Amicitia'

The Latin literature shows that a face can be described as generally 'happy', 'gleeful' or 'joyous': *laetus* or *gaudens*:

*dona ferunt prae se, declarant gaudia vultu.*⁵ (*Catull.* 64.34)

or as *hilaris* ('laughing'):

*tum appellat hilari vultu hominem Bulbus ut blandissime potest: 'quid tu' inquit 'Paete?'*⁶ (*Cic. Clu.* 72)

The facial expression may also indicate true affection or love directed at another person: [4] *Cic. Att.* 14.13b.1.

In Quintus Cicero's advice to his brother on running for office, he tells us that it is good for a candidate to display his kind-heartedness and liberality via his facial expression: [5] *Q. Cic. Comment. Pet.* 11.44.

It is also clear that the right combination of height, good complexion, and comely features inspires not only esteem, but on occasion even erotic passions: [6] *Cic. Cael.* 36.

³ See *Appendix Two: Physiognomic and the Greeks.*

⁴ 'What are you saying? It is sure I believe you, for I recognise you are good from your face.'

⁵ 'For they bear gifts before them, making obvious the joy from their face'

⁶ 'Then Balbus called the man with a joyful countenance and as flatteringly as he could he said, 'Why Paetus?''

4.1.3 Anger, threat, sadness, ferocity etc.

The belief that a person of good character could be divined from the facial expression, meant that the contrary was also held to be true. Compare an example of Cicero's invective, where he dwells upon the bad character of the individual by constant verbal reference to his physical appearance, with the descriptions of good character mentioned above: [7] Cic. *Red. Sen.* 6.13-15. This attack is all the more powerful because it happen to have directed at the Consuls, Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus and Aulus Gabinius. Interestingly, Cicero claims that Piso attempted to conceal his vices by assuming a certain facial expression in public. Another example is provided by Cicero's description of Catiline. In this case the evil intent of Catiline was clearly revealed by his facial expression, eyes, and bearing – and was confirmed by his words: [8] Cic. *Mur.* 49.

There is also references to the fact that bad character was plainly evident from general facial expressions and gait, particularly the eyes. In this instance Cicero accuses two consuls of conspiring to overthrow the *res publica*: [9] Cic. *Sest.* 17. Another example is where Cicero introduces an individual to the court with a physical description – which is enough to cast doubts on the integrity of the individual's character. In one instance he emphasises the person's curly hair and dark complexion and the general demeanour of his facial expression which indicates his smugness and dishonesty: [10] Cic. *Verr.* 2.108.

Apart from a generally bad moral condition evidenced by the facial expression, appearance and gait, more specific emotions and moral traits could be communicated physically. For example, the face can be described as *torvus* from grief or anger: [11] Cic. *Planc.* 34. See also [12] Hor. *Ep.* 1.19.12; [13] Ov. *Met.* 13. 543; [14] Ov. *Met.* 13.4.

A face can display *ira* (anger):

os iratorum, (Cic. *Off.* 1.29.102)

or can be described as being *furens* or *ardens* (blazing, seething): [15] Verg. *Aen.* 8.229. See also [16] Verg. *Aen.* 12.101; [17] Cic. *Mil.* 61. Passion in the heat of battle generally is also described as visible from a person's complexion, face, gait, gestures and general bearing: [18] Cic. *Lig.* 9.

Indeed, these more negative “general” emotional states are often expressed in

anthropomorphised forms as deities. Given that a particular deity is the embodiment of an emotional state, it follows that the physical appearance of such deities could be easily imagined, since even their names suggest a defined facial appearance which is reinforced by the Latin adjectives in apposition to the over-riding quality. An example is provided by Vergil's reference to the goddesses 'Dread', 'Anger' and 'Treachery', the description of who is reinforced by use of the adjective *atrox*: [19] Verg. *Aen.* 12.335. Another example is where Vergil describes the face/mouth of one of the Furies as *rabidus* (fierce/cruel): [20] Verg. *Aen.* 7.451.

By analogy, in the heat of battle, a man's face could be characterised as *acer*:

acer et Marsi peditis cruentum

vultus in hostem; (Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.40)

See also [21] Livy *AUC* 7.33.17; [22] Livy *AUC* 6.13.2.

Interestingly, Caesar himself stated in reference to fierceness (*acies*) that it was difficult to look at the faces and eyes of persons characterised by this state: [23] Caes. *B.Gall.* 1.39.1.

Apart from being *acer/atrox* and *acies*, faces are also described as being 'threatening': [24] Ov. *Met.* 13.443. The eyes are particularly potent in communicating hostility generally: [25] Cic. *Mil.* 33; or the expression of the face can induce terror in those who see it: [26] Ov. *Met.* 12.258.

The face and eyes can display criminality or malicious intent:

[49] *vultus erat ipsius plenus furoris, oculi sceleris, sermo adrogantiae, sic ut ei iam exploratus et domi conditus consulatus videretur.* (Cic. *Mur.* 49)

A face can be described as being *durus* (hard, brazen):

*os durum!*⁷ (Ter. *Eun.* 4.7.36)

See also [27] Cic. *Quinct.* 24.77.

A face can communicate a lack of modesty:

⁷ 'you brazen face!'

*os impudens*⁸ (Ter. Eun. 3.5.49)

Or a face can be described as *maestus* or *tristis* (sorrowful, dejected):

vultus maestus (Hor. Ars P. 106)

See also [28] Plaut. *Merc.* 599-600; [29] Plaut. *Mostell.* 811.

When a person was suffering from misfortune, it was expected that this would be reflected in a suitable facial expression and general bearing. Cicero describes Antony when he was almost defeated following the assassination of Caesar; his reversal of fortune plainly evident from the facial expressions and gait of his followers and family members: [30] Cic. *Phil.* 12.2.

Other emotional states could also be conveyed by the facial expressions, such as 'indignity' or 'shame': [31] Livy *AUC* 9.6.2. Likewise, a military leader defeated by Rome's enemies would be expected to communicate this humiliation in his facial expression and bearing: [32] Livy *AUC* 9.8.2. Hence, a lowered face can also indicate submission or acceptance of defeat, sadness and dejection: [33] Verg. *Aen.* 6.862. See also [34] Verg. *Aen.* 12.807; [35] Verg. *Aen.* 8.520.

'Fear' or 'trembling' was easily seen on the face of an individual:

*Nescio edepol quid tu timidus es, trepidas, Epidice, ita voltum tuum*⁹ (Plaut. *Epid.* 61)

And the eyes particularly were believed to indicate fear: [36] Serv. *Comm.* 5.505. See also [37] Cic. *Mil.* 79; [38] Cic. *Sest.* 28.

General disturbances of the mind, fluctuations in the emotions, or things weighing heavily on the mind of a person could also be easily detected from a person's expression, even momentary facial expression could reveal much about the *motus animi* if observed:

*mulierem retines. Per. Quid est quod voltus turbatust tuos?*¹⁰ (Plaut. *Epid.* 560)

See also [39] Verg. *Aen.* 2.296.

⁸ 'Brazen face !'

⁹ 'I do not know, upon my word, why you are afraid and why your face is so full of fear ?'

¹⁰ 'You hold the woman. Per: what is that disturbs your face ?'

In some circumstances a visual description can sometimes be conjoined with a verbal reference in order to present a more graphic image of mental or emotional agony:

*tali vultu gemens*¹¹ (Ov. Tr. 3.4.37)

4.1.4 Superbia

The facial expression was also capable of conveying more precise *motus animi*. One trait frequently described in Latin literature as reflected in a person's facial expression is *superbia* or *adrogantia*: 'arrogance' or 'haughtiness'. Such a facial expression was so unbecoming of a Roman, that good Romans might find it intolerable to look at. This was particularly the case since *superbia* or *adrogantia* were more commonly associated with kings, tyrants and parvenus. Because of this association, *superbus* or *adrogans* stood directly opposed to the Roman concept of *libertas* – and hence of good Roman *mores*.¹²

Cicero vividly describes the facial expression of a man who had assumed a facial expression typical of what he calls 'Campanian contempt'¹³ (*Campano fastidio*) and a 'kingly spirit' (*regio spiritus*), which is plainly visible from his facial expression and is insufferable to those who saw it: [40] Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 2..93. See also [41] Cic. *Verr.* 3.5. In the military context, Cicero tells us how humiliating it was to be forced into suppliance by an enemy, and to have to bear the arrogant expression of one's conqueror: [42] Cic. *Quinct.* 31.97.

As mentioned above, a favourite device of Cicero in the course of forensic oratory was to draw a direct comparison between the facial expression (and hence the *motus animi*) of his client and that of the adversary. In such cases Cicero usually characterises his opponent's facial expression as indicative of his *superbia* or *adrogantia*. He even alleges in one incident that a man's facial expression shows he has become the most steadfast enemy of the *res publica* and of all *vires boni*.¹⁴ He then draws a direct contrast with face of Sulla (his client)

11 'groaning with such a face'

12 It would be interesting from this to know precisely what facial expression the mask of a king or tyrant bore in Roman theatre.

13 Indeed, Cicero tells us in another speech that Capua was the very 'abode of arrogance': *Capuaene te putabas, in qua urbe domicilium quondam superbiae fuit, consulem esse, sicut eras eo tempore, an Romae, in qua civitate omnes ante vos consules senatui paruerunt?* (Cic. *Red.Sen.* 7.17) ['Did you think that you were consul at Capua, a city where there was once the abode of arrogance, or at Rome, where all the consuls that ever existed before you were obedient to the senate?']

14 Interestingly, by drawing a physical image of an adversary in 'un-Roman' terms, Cicero is suggesting that the man has become a *hostis* (public enemy), thus denying him his rights as a citizen, including his right to accuse a good Roman citizen, such as his client, before the courts.

whom he characterises as expressing the utmost *dignitas* and *modestia*: [43] Cic. *Sull.* 15. In another example, Cicero calls upon the judges to merely look at the face of the man he is accusing as his *superbia* is sufficient to prove his bad character: [44] Cic. *Verr.* 3.22. Similarly, in another passage, Cicero attacks a political adversary by drawing the attention of his audience to the man's facial expression and demeanour, which he alleges amply indicates his *adrogantia*. In this instance the man happens to have been a Tribune of the People: [45] Cic. *Clu.* 111. Another example is Cicero's description of the followers of Marcus Antonius, who he alleges comport themselves and bear facial expressions expressive of the same arrogance as their leader: [46] Cic. *Phil.* 13.4.

Such statements clearly indicate that *superbia* or *adrogantia* were communicated not only by the facial expression itself, but by an individual's general demeanour and gait.

In emphasising and in proving a person's *superbia* or *adrogantia*, Cicero often does little more than draw the attention of the audience to the face of the individual concerned or to recall it if the person is not present. The mere sight of the face, or recollection of it, is enough for his listeners to understand the *superbia* inherently communicated by it.

Drawing on the ability to discern the character or *motus animi* of an individual from the facial expressions, and similar to that employed in forensic oratory, Cicero frequently makes the comparison between an *amicus* ('political ally' who exhibits all the best customs and morals) and one of his political enemies: [47] Cic. *Phil.* 3.18. In characterising a person in terms of *superbia*, *adrogantia* or *audacia*, Cicero describes that person as a personification of it:

*nostis os hominis, nostis audaciam,*¹⁵ (Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.20 §48)

Thus Cicero often simply refers his audience to the face of an individual since *superbia* or *audacia* is clearly manifest from it: [48] Cic. *Att.* 9.5.1. Similarly, when Cicero refers to someone (in)famous for their *superbia* and the acerbity of their character (in this case Appius Claudius), he suggests that to remember the face alone is sufficient to recall his character. This also suggests that the addressee of the letter is familiar with the face of Appius Claudius and his characteristic facial expression or appearance:

*si Appii os haberem*¹⁶ (Cic. *Fam.* 5.10.a.2)

¹⁵ 'You know the face of the man, you know his audacity'; see also Cic. *Rab.Post.* 12.34.

It is noteworthy that the sources do not often feel the need to describe in detail how *superbia* was constituted as a precise facial expression. This is not remarkable, since it must have been commonly understood by the audience just what precise facial expression communicated *superbia*, and therefore it did not require minute description. The following passage is an example:

*idemque postea, cum innumerabilis multitudo bonorum de Capitolio supplex ad eum sordidata venisset, cumque adulescentes nobilissimi cunctique equites Romani se ad lenonis impudicissimi pedes abiecissent, quo vultu cincinnatus ganeo non solum civium lacrimas verum etiam patriae preces repudiavit!*¹⁷ (Cic. Red. Sen. 12)

When Cicero is adducing proof of Catiline's conspiracy he is more specific. He links the *adrogantia* of Catiline's speech as being directly reflected in his facial expression – particularly from his forehead and eyes, which clearly convey *furor* and *scelus*: [49] Cic. Mur. 49.

Some sources do, however, indicate that the facial expression communicating *superbia* or *adrogantia* was constituted by raising one eyebrow – and where the other eyebrow was lowered, it could be equated as 'kingly' arrogance. As Cicero himself says, *adrogantia/superbia* is an attitude considered unbecoming of a member of the ruling senatorial élite, let alone someone whose rank or misfortunes required of them a more humble demeanour. Since it was a facial expression deemed particularly to be characteristic of kings, it was considered to be unfit for a Roman of any rank or standing to adopt such an expression: [50] Cic. Pis. 14.

It would appear, however, that one being was entitled to bear a facial expression which typified *superbia*, and that was the face of Jupiter himself – as King of the gods, it appears he was exempt from the criticism that a mortal Roman would accrue by bearing such an expression: [51] Hor. Carm. 3.1.8.

4.1.5 Shock, surprise, disapproval

Interestingly, while one eyebrow raised could communicate *superbia*, 'raised eyebrows' could

16 Also Cic. Fam. 9.8.1.

17 'And likewise afterwards, when a countless crowd of good men had come as suppliant and wearing mourning to him, and when the most noble youth and all the Roman knights cast themselves at the feet of this most shameless pimp, with what facial expression did this curly haired debauchee reject not only the tears of the citizens but indeed the prayers of his country !'

convey disapproval or disapprobation to some degree, or simply surprise or shock. In fact we still have the notion expressed in English when it is said that a certain mode of behaviour ‘raised eyebrows’

:praeterea addebat quendam, quem dicere nolo

*nomine ne tollat rubra supercilia.*¹⁸ (Catull. 67.46)

Furthermore, raised eyebrows combined with a shrug of the shoulders could be an indication of quizzicalness, innocence or of ignorance: [52] Cic. *Rab. Post.* 36.

In another passage, Cicero suggests that a raised eyebrow signified censoriousness, (sometimes to the point of haughtiness). However, he is aware that such an expression can be a mask, assumed in order to conceal the real *motus animi* of the person concerned: [53] Cic. *Pis.* 20.

It also appears that the eyebrows and forehead when drawn together could communicate more traditional and expected Roman virtues of *gravitas* and *severitas* – and this will be discussed more fully below in Chapter Five. Suffice here to say that there was a close association between the gestures and movement of the eyebrows and forehead generally: one eyebrow raised signifying *superbia/adrogantia*, one or two eyebrows raised signifying surprise, shock or quizzicalness, whereas eyebrows and forehead drawn together or contracted communicated *severitas/gravitas*.

4.1.6 Reproach

Since the proper *motus animi* expected of a Roman should be clearly communicated by the facial expression, this meant that a suitably composed face could be used for a didactic purpose: such as exemplifying proper ethical or moral behaviour, or as a means to rebuke an individual who has failed to behave according to the accepted moral or ethical standards: [54] Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 37. For instance, the sources indicate that a dutiful son could customarily be rebuked with a censorious look by his father – and given the power attributed to the *imagines* by the sources to rebuke errant behaviour in the living descendants, it can be inferred that

¹⁸ ‘Furthermore he adds a certain person, whom I do not wish to state by name lest it raise angry eyebrows...’

imagines bore a similar facial expression.¹⁹ The sources in fact clearly indicate that the *imagines* communicated via their appearance the *motus animi* considered appropriate for a person of rank and standing in Roman society. This is confirmed from the countless references in Latin literature where the *imagines maiorum* are used for just such a didactic, exhortative and judicial effect: Cic. *Arch.* 14; Cic. *Cael.* 34; Cic. *Planc.* 51; Cic. *Vat.* 28, etc.

Appropriate behaviour and a suitable facial expression were especially demanded from members of the senate - who were expected to bring to bear *severitas* or *gravitas* in their general dealings as befitting the *dignitas* of their rank. It was expected that good values such as *severitas* and *gravitas* would be communicated clearly by the facial expressions. Cicero suggests that a look from a senator or magistrate bearing a facial expression expressing *severitas* or *gravitas* should be enough to rebuke a Tribune of the Plebs when acting inappropriately: [55] Cic. *Sest.* 20. He indicates that the consul 'with a look' which was *fortis* and *gravis* simultaneously could check licentious behaviour. Cicero also refers to the appropriate facial expression considered to characterise the senate collectively, as a means of censuring a wayward member of that order. Note particularly in the first speech delivered in the senate against Catiline: he draws specific attention to the faces of the senators as a means to rebuke and shame Catiline: [56] Cic. *Cat.* 1.1.

This capacity of the facial expression to rebuke and to educate, particularly linked as it is with *gravitas* and *severitas*, has important ramifications for our understanding of Roman portraiture – which will be discussed in subsequent chapters.²⁰

4.1.7 Guilt or Innocence

Cicero often exhorted judges or senators to examine the faces of his clients or opponents – particularly in the in the course of criminal trials. This implies that the facial expression and general demeanour could be very important in such proceedings as they could effectively communicate innocence or guilt, or involvement in criminality or inappropriate behaviour. For instance, furtive glances and eyes cast to the ground indicate guilt when one is confronted with proof of treachery. In this context Cicero claims that the facial expressions speak more eloquently than any hard proof – an assertion which must have been influential in the minds

¹⁹ Cic. *Cael.* 33-34; Cic. *Mur.* 88; Cic. *Planc.* 51; Cic. *Vat.* 28; Cic. *De or.* 2.225-226; Ps. Quint. *Decl. min.* 388.35.

²⁰ See Chapter 9, 261, 266-268 *infra*.

of the jurors: [57] Cic. *Cat.* 3.13.

No greater sign of guilt could be evoked than that described by Cicero in his speech in defence of Aulus Cluentius Habitus. In this passage the judges suspect that the accused is guilty from the fact that he clearly displayed signs of fear, trepidation, and a doubting, unsure face (*suspensus incertusque voltus*), which, when combined with sudden changes in facial colour, Cicero states indicates guilt and can only arouse suspicion: [58] Cic. *Clu.* 54. Another example is provided by Cicero in *Verr.* 2.108. Facial expressions such as these are clearly evidence of mal-intentions - which is in contrast to the expression that an innocent person should bear when placed in such a situation.

It is not only the faces of the accused or accuser in criminal trials that expresses much about their respective characters. Cicero contends that the attitude of the judge could also be discerned from his facial features and expression. In this example, Cicero pleads by referring directly to the facial expression of Caesar who was presiding over the case: [59] Cic. *Deiot.* 2.5. Later he wrote that he felt the appeal to Caesar went particularly well for his client, not only from the words that Caesar used, but from his general facial expression and other signs: [60] Cic. *Fam.* 6.14.2.

Similarly, as was noted above with regards to judges during a trial, one could rely on facial expression to discern what intentions a magistrate or the senators may have had towards a particular issue:

*circumspectare tum patriciorum voltus plebeii et inde libertatis captare auram, unde servitutem timendo in eum statum rem publicam adduxerant.*²¹ (Liv. *AUC* 3.37.1)

4.1.8 Politics/propaganda

It is perhaps obvious that, given the frequent references to facial expression in legal proceedings and debates before the senate, the facial expression was a powerful tool exploited in the conduct of political affairs. In relation to the violent breakdown of the political and social processes during the late Republic, political confrontations were often characterised as battles – and menacing facial expressions from an opponent could easily be adduced as an

²¹ 'The plebeians now began to study the faces of the patricians, to catch thence some glint of liberty from the men from whom they had dreaded slavery and through that dread had brought the commonwealth into its present condition.'

omen of physical violence to come: [61] Livy *AUC* 3.59.1.

In more benign practice, the general appearance of an individual, his bearing and facial expression were essential tools for the aspiring politician – and these were no less important for those who had reached the apogee of political life in the *res publica*. Cicero makes it clear from his speeches that facial expression particularly could be used by, or against, a politician given the circumstances. In one passage he contrasts the Gracchan *populares* who were well liked by the people for their deeds, their gait and physical appearance, compared with the members of the senatorial party (*optimates*) who were no less distinguished and were widely respected for their *auctoritas*, but were not well liked, primarily due to their stern facial expressions: [62] Cic. *Sest.* 105.

Cicero frequently characterises opponents by their facial expressions which are evidence of their shameful or wicked characters or of their reckless *motus animi*: [63] Cic. *Sest.* 106. Earlier in the same speech, Cicero refers to the facial expression of a Tribune, thus making it clear to the audience this man's bad character and malicious motivations: [64] Cic. *Sest.* 17

A particularly ferocious attack is made by Cicero on the Tribune Publius Rullius in his speech against the Agrarian law. There he draws on a wide range of physical and physiognomic aspects of Rullius to prove his bad character and hence to add credence to his claim that the proposed law is reckless: [65] Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 2.13.

4.2 Hand gestures

Hand gestures were also regarded as highly communicative. Gestures played an important part of the proper training of the orator, and there were some form of stage performance, such as the Mimes and Pantomimes which relied heavily on a mixture of facial and hand gestures.²²

4.2.1 Giving credibility to a statement of facts, reproaching an adversary

In delivering a speech, Quintilian tells us that a common gesture was to place the right hand's middle finger against the tip of the thumb while holding the remaining three fingers extended. He tells us that the gesture could be varied with more emphatic movement to affirm a

²² G. S. Aldrete, *Gestures and Acclamations in Ancient Rome* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999) 3-43.

statement of facts or with a very emphatic movement to reproach or refute an adversary: [66] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.92.

He also tells us that to move this gesture to the left or towards the left shoulder, or to put the arm across the chest and to make a gesticulation with the elbow are grave errors which a speaker should never commit as to do so was considered vulgar. A similar, related gesture employed to reinforce an argument is to grip the top joint of the thumb with the index and middle fingers, leaving the ring and little finger slightly curved. This is made more emphatic by placing the middle joint of the thumb between the index and middle finger and curving the ring and little finger under the middle finger: [67] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.95.

4.2.2 Interrogation/approval/reinforce statement of facts

Another gesture is used to delineate separate points that one wants to make during the course of a speech. This gesture is formed by pointing the right hand to touch the top tip of the inside of the thumb, while the other fingers are held extended or relaxed: [68] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.101.

A more emphatic form of this gesture occurs when the remaining three fingers of the left hand are folded into a fist shape. A gesture which Quintilian tells us was much favoured in Greek Rhetoric: [69] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.102.

4.2.3 Modesty

There is also a gesture to express modesty, which Quintilian says consisted of drawing the first three fingers of the right hand to a point formed with the thumb, and then bringing the hand towards the mouth or chest with the palm facing downwards: [70] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.96-97.

This gesture may be that represented in the wall paintings from Pompeii depicting Penelope: Odysseus and Penelope, Pompeii VI.10.2 (House of the Five Skeletons) dating between A.D. 25-50 (Ill. 4);²³ and a similar painting from Pompeii VII.9.7 (Macellum) north wall dating to between A.D. 50-75, also depicting Odysseus and Penelope (Ill. 5).

A variant of the gesture is when the hand is brought towards the body with the palm facing

23 No. 9107, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Naples.

initially downwards and in a circular motion the hand is inverted so that the palm faces upward, at the same time opening the fingers and moving the hand towards the listener. This was a gesture particularly designed to give the impression of conveying the words being spoken to the audience.

4.2.4 Timidity

An expression of timidity can be conveyed by slightly hollowing the hand and motioning similar to when one was making a vow: [71] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.100.

4.2.5 Exhortation

A gesture used for exhorting one's listeners involved raising the slightly hollowed hand above the shoulder with a motion 'like that of an exhorter': [72] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.103.

Interestingly, Quintilian strictly advises against a more tremulous motion of the hand in using this gesture as such a movement is only fit for stage actors. One can also think of bronze statue of the *Arringatore* – and the gesture employed (Ill. 6). There the speaker has his right hand raised above the shoulder to the fore of the body with the hand slightly cupped. It may well be that the gesture Quintilian describes was a common one used by orators over a long period of time – at least during the late Republican period.

4.2.6 Wonder

Wonder can be expressed by a simple gesture of turning the palms (of either or both hands simultaneously) upwards and rolling the fingers from the little finger first into the palm and releasing them in reverse order: [73] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.100.

4.2.7 Surprise/indignation

A gesture that is aligned with the expression of wonder is that which conveys surprise or sudden indignation. This gesture is made by converging the fingers of the hand to a point and moving them suddenly towards the mouth. It is a more rapid movement than that expressing modesty mentioned above: [74] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.101.

The gesture may be that depicted in a painting from the House of the Vettii (Pompeii VI.15.1), *Triclinium n*, north wall (picture of infant Hercules strangling snakes) dating to

around A.D. 62 (Ill. 7).

A different gesture which expressed surprise or indignation was to slap the thigh with the hand, or to strike one's forehead: [75] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.123.

Quintilian tells us that this gesture was an old one, first being introduced by Cleon at Athens, and presumably was used by Cicero. However, diverging from Cicero, he admonishes the speaker not to use the gesture of slapping the forehead or of beating the breast as this gesture is one from stagecraft and unsuited for the orator.

4.2.8 Aversion to something

Aversion or horror to something was communicated by extending the left hand towards the left while simultaneously moving the left shoulder to the right: [76] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.113.

This gesture is well illustrated in the wall painting from the Villa of the Mysteries in Pompeii – where a woman is shown with her left hand extended while her left shoulder is turning to the right – her eyes still fixed on the flagellation scene which is the subject of her aversion: Pompeii, Villa of the Mysteries, *Oecus* 5, east and south wall, dating to around 60-50 B.C. (Ill. 8)

Quintilian also tells us in relation to this that the left hand will frequently conform to the movement of the right hand in making gestures. This is particularly the case, he says, in relation to expressing horror or aversion to something, where both palms may be extended to the left of the body: [77] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.114.

4.2.9 Denunciation and indication/ affirmation

A gesture capable of various meaning depending on the movement involved extending the index finger while the other fingers were bent under the thumb. This gesture was used to communicate denunciation, indication, affirmation or insistence: [78] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.94.

4.2.10 Regret/anger

A clenched fist pressed to the breast is a gesture which Quintilian tells us expressed regret or anger: [79] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.104.

Interestingly, this is a gesture which can still be seen during the mass or Eucharist of the Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches when the priest performs the *mea culpa*; it is customary for the priest to form a fist and beat his chest with it symbolically three times to communicate his *culpa*.

4.2.11 Apology or supplication

To express apology or supplication or invocation, it was customary to raise both arms with palms thrust out to the right and to the left: [80] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.115.

This gesture is depicted in a wall painting from Pompeii depicting the sacrifice of Iphigenia (from Pompeii VI 8, 3 (House of the Tragic Poet) dating to between A.D. 50-75 and now in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Naples (Ill. 9).²⁴

4.2.12 Effeminacy/ homosexuality

Regarding precise physical gestures as an act of communication, there are curious references to the gesture of adjusting the hair with one finger or scratching the head with one finger - which apparently was a signal used between homosexuals or signified effeminacy. This precise gesture appears to have remained current for well over one hundred years; Sen. (E) *Contr.* 7.4.7, quoting Calvus:

...digito caput uno

scalpit. quid credas hunc sibi velle? virum.²⁵

Compare with this the way Clodius is supposed to have jeered at Pompey in public gatherings: [81] Plut. *Pomp.* 48.7; and note the comment of Cicero regarding Caesar: [82] Plut. *Caes.* 4. A similar gesture is reported by Juvenal: [83] Juv. *Sat.* 9.130-133.

4.2.13 Mimicry

Another form of physical communication – which is perhaps the most obvious – is that of mimicry. This is where a person mimics or mimes the actions considered significant for a particular emotion or physical state. An example is when the speaker imitates the movements

²⁴ No. 9112, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Naples.

²⁵ ‘..he who scratches his head with one finger. What do you believe this man wants for himself? a man’

of an old man about whom he is speaking, or a sick person etc. However, Quintilian advises that great care had to be taken when employing mimicry in the course of a speech, as such a device was considered quintessentially that of the stage actor: [84] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.88-91.

4.3 'Fraus' and facial expression

Given the sophisticated understanding of the Romans concerning the communicative power of the face and gesture, there are numerous references to the fact that the facial expression could be manipulated ('fabricated' or 'contrived') in order to deceive or mislead the viewer. This was considered to be 'un'-Roman, since it was a conscious attempt to conceal the true *motus animi* by adopting a facial expression akin to a mask, and this drew parallels with actors and the theatre.

In political and forensic oratory, it is a commonplace to accuse an adversary or opponent of having an artificial or contrived facial expression as a means to dissimulate their true *motus animi*:

*ficti simulatique vultus*²⁶ (Cic. *Clu.* 26.72)

In some instances the attempt to contrive the facial expression for whatever reasons is not successful, due to the overwhelming power of the emotion of the moment. In an example mentioned by Caesar, the attempt to conceal the true emotions was not successful:

*Hi neque vultum fingere neque interdum lacrimas tenere poterant*²⁷ (Caes. *B. Gall.* 1.39.4)

Another example is provided by Cicero: [85] Cic. *Planc.* 34.

Of particular concern to Cicero is the ability of a person to fabricate or purposely compose the facial features in order to conceal the true *motus animi* or to hide one's true character or emotional state. This is of particular concern as the *fraus* perpetrated is often an attempt to imitate the facial expression of a man of good character or moral standing. In one particularly noteworthy instance, Cicero characterises the face of his antagonist as entirely artificial and dissimulating (*illos eius fictos simulatosque vultus*). Specifically, Cicero alleges that Oppianicus, in order to convince the audience of a 'bald-faced' lie, contracts his forehead

²⁶ 'a contrived and composed face'

²⁷ 'These men were not able to compose their faces nor even to hold back their tears'

(*contrahit frontem*) so as to give the appearance of *severitas* and *gravitas*: honesty and proper ethical behaviour. The fact that subject has made a study of practising deceit and mendacity - and has learned the ability to carefully compose his facial features to suit the occasion, makes him particularly despicable in Cicero's view: [86] Cic. *Clu.* 26.72. This is similar to Cicero's attack on a foe in the *De Provincia Consulare* where he draws attention to the fact that he clouds his lusts and bad character with a facial expression constituted by contracting his eyebrows and forehead in a way to fraudulently communicate *severitas* and *gravitas*: [87] Cic. *Prov. cons.* 4.8.

In another notable passage, Cicero carefully dwells on the facial features of his antagonist (in this case Piso) to great effect: [88] Cic. *Pis.* 1. This is particularly clever, because he accuses Piso of attempting to deceive others by adopting the facial expression typical of his *imagines maiorum*, but twists this around by stating that the only thing that Piso in fact has in common with his *imagines* is the smoky pallor of his skin; which in the case of a living person merely confirms his untrustworthiness.²⁸ Piso in fact bears his facial expression like an actor's mask, a *persona* - but Cicero recognises the *fraus* that Piso is perpetrating and tears away the actor's mask to reveal his true character.²⁹

As noted, Cicero draws a precise analogy between Piso's feigned expression and that of his *imagines maiorum* - of which Piso apparently has many - and one is led to believe that the *imagines* were depicted with a similar facial expression. Cicero cleverly exploits the morals and ethics represented and communicated by the features of the *imagines* as standing in direct contrast to the *fraus* that Piso is attempting to perpetrate through his facial expression. He strongly suggests that Piso obtained his public offices merely through the false manipulation of his *imagines* to commend himself to the *populus* and to his peers in the senate. Piso's *fraus* is even more reprehensible, because in the process he is mocking his own *imagines*.

There is a certain amount of irony contained in such an attack against a member of the élite class, which lay in the fact that Piso had to manipulate his facial expression so as to convince other members of the élite class that he retained the moral values of the class to which he undoubtedly belongs. However, his appalling moral condition means he has to hide his true

28 That is, someone who lurks in the shadows and has no proper blood flow due to their fetid minds: perhaps this reflects a Roman understanding of the Greek Hippocratic Theory of the Humors.

29 A fuller discussion of proper facial expression compared with actors' masks can be found in Chapter 3, 69-69 supra.

motus animi by feigning a facial expression consonant with members of that class, lest his true *motus animi* should be recognised by his peers, and by the *populus* at large.

Cicero continues his attack against Piso in another speech – and it is here that we get a more precise view of how the facial expression conveyed (or concealed) the *motus animi*: [89] Cic. *Red. Sen.* 16. Cicero reiterates the importance of the eyes and the forehead in communicating the true *motus animi* – of paramount importance are the attitude of the eyes, and the contraction or otherwise of the forehead and the eyebrows. Again, Piso stands accused of hiding his true *motus animi* with a contracted forehead – which, as discussed below, normally denoted *severitas* or *gravitas* to a Roman viewer, values which were considered appropriate for a member of the senatorial and *nobiles* class. Yet simultaneously, Cicero notes that there are other physical signs by which Piso's true *motus animi* can be divined.

To Cicero, Piso has become so adept and deceiving others with his facial expression that he exculpates a foreigner for 'falling in' with Piso. Again there is an irony in this – primarily because the foreigner in question was a Greek, and Greeks were notorious for their mendacity and duplicity. This implies that Piso has become worse than an actor or Greek in the depths of his capacity to commit *fraus*. Because of this, the foreigner could not be blamed for being deceived by Piso's facial expression, since it was one specifically associated with members of the senatorial class and because he had similarly deceived so many Romans:

*Devenit autem seu potius incidit in istum eodem deceptus supercilio, Graecus atque advena, quo tot sapientes et tanta civitas.*³⁰ (Cic. *Piso*.70)

Even Cicero himself recounts how he was taken in by such a countenance: [90] Cic. *Sest.* 22.

This precise list of facial features and ethics are repeated in one of Cicero's most vicious attacks – where he again likens the physiognomic appearance of the individual directly with

³⁰ 'When he came upon that man, or rather when he fell in with him, the Greek, as a newly arrived stranger, was taken in by that eyebrow, by which so many wise men and so much of the state have also been taken in.'

an actor on the stage.³¹ By so doing Cicero ascribes to this man the same morality and failures of the stage character he is referring to: [91] Cic. *Q. Rosc.* 20.

Cicero makes similar descriptions when witnesses are called to give evidence in court. In one passage, he draws an analogy between the witnesses in the case and actors on the stage, maintaining that like actors the witnesses are 'putting on an act' for the benefit of the jurors - and part of this deceit is perpetrated through carefully composed facial expressions just like the mask of an actor in the mimes.³² Indeed, the analogy is taken even further by the fact that the witness in this instance has a connection with Alexandria which is where Cicero alleges the Mime originated: [92] Cic. *Rab. Post.* 35. Note here the use of the adjective *severa* in connection with the forehead (*frons*). Cicero plainly notes a facial expression communicating *severitas* is being utilised by the witness specifically to deceive the judges into believing the contrary concerning his character, and by inference the truth of his evidence. However, Cicero 'unmasks' these men by providing the audience with a description of their true faces, and by extension, their real *motus animi*. This passage clearly indicates that a contracted forehead (*severa frons*) was associated with the countenance considered appropriate when an honest witness and citizen was giving evidence concerning a serious matter.

It seems that *fraus* perpetrated in relation to the facial expression was not just merely reserved for concealment of one's character flaws, but also for more political objectives; for instance, to arouse pity when this was considered expedient. Cicero would appear to have been well aware of such devices: [93] Cic. *Prov. cons.* 12. More dangerous, however, was when *fraus* was perpetrated not just to deceive the viewer as to the *motus animi* of the

31 T. J. Moore, *The Theater of Plautus: Playing to the Audience* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998), 10: "The actor's position was still more precarious because of their own low status in society: many, if not most actors were foreigners, slaves, or freedman, and those who were freeborn lacked many of the rights of citizens". See E. S. Gruen, "Plautus and the Public Stage," in *Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy* (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 89-90; S. M. Goldberg, "Improvisation, Plot, and Plautus' Curculio," in *Plautus und die Tradition des Stegreifspiels*, ed. L. Benz and e. al. (Tübingen: 1995), 31-34. On the social class of actors: E. Rawson, "Theatrical Life in Republican Rome and Italy," *PBSR* 53 (1985): 112.; J.-C. Dumont, *Servus: Rome et l'esclavage sous la République* (Paris: Ecole française de Rome, 1987), 517-24. On *infamia* if a freeborn person acted: F. Dupont, *L'acteur-roi: le théâtre à Rome*, *Collection Realia* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1985), 95-98; E. J. Jory, "Ars Ludicra and the Ludus Talaris," in *Stage Directions: Essays in Ancient Drama in honour of E.W. Handley*, ed. A. Griffiths (London: 1995), 139-45. On general attitude to actors: C. Edwards, *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 123-31; E. Csapo and W. J. Slater, *The Context of Ancient Drama* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995), 276-79. On the use of 'pergracari' in Plaut. *Mostell.* 22-23: *dies noctesque bibite, pregraecamini, amicas emite liberate*. See Chapter Three, n.40 and 104.

32 See Chapter Three, n.34.

individual concerned, but in order to entice others into erroneous behaviour.³³

It was hence generally understood that the facial expression could be contrived to conceal the true *motus animi*. Vergil indicates that is possible for people to conceal their true *motus animi* by carefully arranging and composing the facial features: [94] Verg. *Aen.* 4.477. In some instances, an individual's character has sunk so low that all pretence at propriety through a carefully arranged facial expression is dispensed with. Such is the case with Verres, whom Cicero claims has become so arrogant that his wicked plans are clearly readable from the countenance of his face and that he makes no attempt to conceal it: [95] Cic. *Verr.* 1.141.

On a more positive note, Quintus Cicero remarks that is acceptable to do so provided it is accompanied by a sincere attempt to actually alter the character to match the acquired facial expression: [96] Q. Cic. *Comment. Pet.* 42.

These sources again make it clear that the face to the Roman mind was very much like a mask that could be assumed, changed or adapted to suit the occasion - but it is also plain that there was an accepted facial expression deemed suitable for the worthy man which should be natural to him and entailed no effort, and which communicated his true moral worth and *motus animi*.

4.4 Summary

Thus far I have dealt with facial expression and how it communicates generalised emotions, character traits and states of mind. More specifically, I have discussed those that convey arrogance, rebuke, guilt or innocence, a good character from bad, and how references to facial expression can be utilised in political discourse, forensic oratory, or for political purposes. I now turn to those virtues which members of the senatorial and *nobiles* class believed characterised their *ordo* – *severitas* and *gravitas*, and examine whether these (as already suggested by the sources cited above) were believed to have been communicated via a precise form of facial expression.

33 Cic. *Pis.* 1.1: *oculi, supercilia, frons, vultus denique totus, qui sermo quidam tacitus mentis est, hic in fraudem homines impulit* ['The eyes, eyebrows, forehead, indeed the whole face, which is the silent communicator of the mind, this leads men into deceit.']

CHAPTER FIVE

SEVERITAS AND GRAVITAS

5.1 Importance of *severitas/gravitas*

The importance of *severitas* and *gravitas* to the élite class (i.e., *nobiles*) during the middle and late Republic cannot be underestimated. As already discussed, these were the two values commonly used to characterise male members of that class when involved both in the affairs of state and in conducting their own private *negotium*. *Severitas* and *gravitas* were expected in carrying out one's role as a magistrate or office bearer, expressing an opinion as a senator, deliberating on affairs of state in the senate, acting as a judge or juror, addressing the popular assemblies, giving a public address or eulogy, or acting as a *paterfamilias* in the affairs of one's *familia*. In the context of forensic or political speeches, it is important to note that when Cicero wishes to praise an individual for embodying proper Roman virtues he frequently does so by reference to their *gravitas* or *severitas* - as these were the values properly befitting a man involved in the business of the *res publica*, which justified his holding public office and thereby made him *dignus* (worthy).¹ Many of the sources cited in the previous chapters have clearly suggested the link between the facial expression and the values of *severitas* and *gravitas*, or make it clear that these values should be manifest in the facial expression of those involved in the affairs of state.

Given the importance of *gravitas* and *severitas* it is these qualities above all that perhaps one would expect to see communicated by the facial expression of portraits of members of that class. It remains to discuss whether there is a precise facial expression communicating *severitas* and *gravitas*, and whether a precise formulation for the expression of these values can be identified and defined.

5.2 Physiognomic indicators of *severitas* and *gravitas*

Sources indicate that *gravitas* could be evident from a man's facial expression: *maiestas quam vultus gravitasque prae se ferebat* (Livy AUC 5.41.8).² See also [1] Cicero *Leg. Agr.* 2.87. Similarly, *severitas* could also be seen expressed by the face:

¹ See Chapter 2, 53-57.

² Also Caes. *B. Gall.* 4.3.4 and 5.16.1.

*tristis severitas inest in vultu*³ (Ter. An. 5.2.16)

More specifically:

*severa fronte curas cogitans...*⁴ (Plaut. Mil. 2.2.46)

And:

*vultus severior et tristior*⁵ (Cic. De Or. 2.71.289)

Most importantly, the sources make it clear that *gravitas* and *severitas* were qualities that should be seen expressed on the faces of men of affairs, senators and others acting in public life (who were most often of the senatorial or *equites* class). Such men were required not only to possess *gravitas* but to express it in their voices, demeanour and in their deeds and actions, particularly when adjudicating on some weighty issue or when delivering a speech: [2] Cic. Att. 1.14.5. Also [3] Cic. Att. 1.16.8; [4] Cic. Att. 2.1.4.⁶

Regarding *severitas*, Cicero says, implicitly and explicitly, that it is a quality which is clearly evident from a man's countenance: [5] Cic. Brut. 2.5.2. See also [6] Cic. Vat. 8. In the opening of his first speech against Catiline delivered in the senate, he poses a series of rhetorical questions as to how far the brazenness, arrogance and insolence of Catiline will take him. He thus sets the scene with Catiline's *audacia* (and by implication with the guilt of Catiline in relation to the alleged conspiracy) which he then contrasts directly with the stern countenances of the senators (the *boni*), who Cicero says are sitting in judgement upon him. As the passages cited above indicate, the facial expressions of judges and senators as a body were characterised by their *severitas* and *gravitas*. By explicit reference to the senators' faces, Cicero suggests that the sight of these alone should be enough to reproach and to shame Catiline: [7] Cic. Cat. 1.1. Importantly, references such as these confirm that senators and judges could indicate their disapproval just as effectively through their facial expression as they could through the spoken word: [8] Cic. Mil. 4. As indicated, this capacity of the facial expression to reprimand and to shame those who commit crimes or breach the accepted

³ 'gloomy *severitas* is present on his face'

⁴ 'with severe forehead turning over cares'

⁵ 'a face more severe and gloomy'

⁶ Also Cic. Att. 9.9.1; 9.19.4; 10.1.3; 11.21.2; 11.22.2; 12.4.2; 13.41.2; 16.15.2; Cic. Balb. 2; 13; 49; 50; Cic. Cael. 11; 29; 35; Cic. Clu. 196; Cic. Deiot. 16; 37; Cic. Div. Caec. 8; 27; 37; Cic. Dom. 4; 39; 87; 104; 130; Cic. Fam. 1.1.2; 1.5a.4; 1.9.16; 2.6.4; 3.10.1; 3.10.10; 5.13.3; 5.16.5; 6.2.1; 11.27.6; 13.55.1; 7.32.3; 9.12.2; 10.12.1.

moral and ethical code expected of Roman citizens was particularly associated with judges and magistrates, and this particularly included the senators who could be called upon to sit in judgement on their own members. In such a capacity a man was required to act with *severitas* in enforcing the law – the implication being that there would be no leniency for an individual who was convicted and that a guilty man would be shamed by their facial expressions.⁷ Indeed Cicero tells us that the shame invoked by the facial expressions of judges was such that the guilty and innocent alike can scarcely be looked at:

*tribulibus enim iudicibus non modo severitatem illorum, si ista vera sunt, sed ne voltus quidem ferre possemus.*⁸ (Cic. Planc. 18.45)

In response to the *severitas* expressed by the faces of the judges, Cicero also tells us that in a trial it is ideal for the (innocent) accused to keep a composed and measured facial expression in order to reinforce *pietas* – devotion to proper behaviour and an appropriate sense of modesty and shame – which hopefully the judges will take note of and which may possibly impress them enough regarding the innocence of the accused as to sway the outcome: [9] Cic. Font. 13.28-29.

Likewise, when giving evidence in a trial, a truthful, honest and forthright witness would maintain an expression of *severitas* and *gravitas* in order to impress upon the judges the honesty and reliability of the testimony. However, it is apparent that unscrupulous persons would feign such an expression as a means of deceiving the judges: [10] Cic. Rab. Post. 35.

Typically, Cicero compares the *severitas* and *gravitas* of the *senatores* and judges, with the *pietas* and probity of his client, and the deceitfulness of his antagonists evident from their physical appearance. For instance, Cicero defends a client, Quintus Roscius the actor, by cleverly inverting the usual bias against actors that they are dishonest (without *fides*) in suggesting to the jurors that his client should be trusted because his *pietas* is plainly evident from his facial expression.⁹ Cicero then proves the innocence of his client by proving the

7 For instance, the suicide of Gn. Piso is specifically referred to by the senate in its decree of 20 A.D. as an attempt by Piso to avoid the *severitas* and *pietas* of his judges (the senators themselves): “*Quas ob res arbitrari senatum non obtulisse eum se debita poenae, sed maiori et quam imminere sibi ab pietate et severitate iudicantium intellegebant...*”

8 ‘For with judges taken from the men of our own tribe, I need not say we could not if those things were true, bear their severity, but we could not even look them in the face.’

9 In other words, Roscius is not wearing an actor’s mask in the court and his true facial expression (indicating his piety and honesty) are on plain view.

dishonesty of the man bringing the accusation, Caius Fannius, through a detailed facial description. Cicero says that Fannius' immorality and dishonesty is plainly evident from the fact that he has removed all hair from his head and eyebrows - so that there may be nothing of the good man left communicable from his features. Cicero says he is not fooled, by Fannius' charade, because he claims that the absence of his eyebrows bespeaks his untrustworthiness: [11] Cic. *Q. Rosc.* 20. Furthermore, Cicero suggests that when his client is acting the role of 'Ballio' on the stage (a 'pimp'/'brothel keeper' character who was notorious for his dishonest behaviour) he is in fact playing the role of Caius Fannius - because (Cicero suggests) the character of Ballio and Fannius share certain physiognomic, and hence, moral characteristics. In this case, Cicero infers that Fannius' lack of eyebrows (by which a proper Roman would normally convey honesty and integrity by displaying *severitas* and *gravitas*) proclaims aloud a sly nature; clearly someone not to be trusted.

As noted, the Romans were aware that a person could hide or conceal their true character and intentions by aping or imitating the facial expressions expected of the *boni* - in other words, by adopting the typical facial expression connected with *severitas* and *gravitas* by carefully arranging the expression of their forehead and eyebrows: [12] Cic. *Prov. cons.* 8. Here, Cicero tells us that Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus (Cos. 58 B.C.), could dissimulate his lusts by constructing his facial expression (*fronte et supercilio*) to communicate the opposite of his true character. It would seem that the phrase *fronte et supercilio* is in fact shorthand for the contracted forehead and drawn together eyebrows which communicated *severitas* and *gravitas*.

In another passage, Cicero bewails the fact that by his time true *severitas* was becoming increasingly neglected as a quality by the *boni* due to the decline in morality associated with the collapsing state of political and social affairs. He remarks that not only is true *severitas* not admired, but it has in fact become dangerous, given the parlous state of the *res publica* - deceit or *fraus* being the order of the day. He specifically remarks that people bear friendly foreheads (*frons...familiaris*), despite the fact that their minds are angry (*iratus*) and their *iracundia* remains hidden: [13] Cic. *Flac.* 87.

There is often a 'romanticised' contrast in poetry between a tonsured look (to the extreme as the passage directly above indicates) and the unkempt appearance of the farmer or the rustic shepherd, with his shaggy brows, lined forehead and un-tonsured facial stubble. This image

indicates a traditional view of a person of honesty and integrity and represents those rustic virtues that Romans liked to believe characterised themselves: [14] Verg. *Ecl.* 8.34.

5.3 Contracted forehead and drawn together eyebrows = *severitas/gravitas*

The sources above have indicated that *severitas* and *gravitas* could be indicated by the facial expression or countenance, gait and bearing. They have also indicated that the expression of these values is linked with the eyebrow and forehead. Other sources confirm that a certain arrangement of the eyebrows and the forehead were synonymous with *severitas* and *gravitas* in the Roman mind. This expression is described most often as a conjunction of drawn together forehead and contracted eyebrows, or, in some instances of a stern judge hearing the evidence in a court-case or a senator considering a course of action in a debate, one eyebrow raised and the other lowered. Of paramount importance in this regard, is a quote from Cicero who stated that it is possible to judge the character from whether the eyebrows are relaxed or drawn together:

[146] *Itaque ut in fidibus musicorum aures vel minima sentiunt, sic nos, si acres ac diligentes iudices esse volumus animadversores[que] vitiorum, magna saepe intellegemus ex parvis. Ex oculorum optutu, superciliorum aut remissione aut contractione, ex maestitia, ex hilaritate, ex risu, ex locutione, ex reticentia, ex contentione vocis, ex summissione, ex ceteris similibus facile iudicabimus, quid eorum apte fiat, quid ab officio naturaque discrepet.*¹⁰ (Cic Off. 1. 146)

This implies that drawn eyebrows signify severity (*severitas*) and sternness (*gravitas*), while relaxed imply leniency, flippancy or an unconcerned or carefree attitude, or no attitude whatsoever.

Cicero tells us that where the eyebrows are drawn together, this demonstrates that the individual was communicating the appropriate *motus animi* of *severitas* and *gravitas* in carrying out his actions – something he considers particularly appropriate for a man involved in the affairs of state: [15] Cic. *Sest.* 19. In this passage we are told that it is the eyebrows, contracted forehead, and eyes themselves which directly communicate *gravitas*.

¹⁰ 'therefore just as the ears understand the least in the stringed lyres of musicians, thus we, if we wish to be fierce and attentive judges and observers of vices, we shall understand the big things from the small. From the desire of the eyes, or from the relaxation or contraction of the eyebrows, from the sadness, from the gaiety, from the laughter, from the pronunciation, from the silence, from the striving of the voice, or from the lowering of the voice, from the rest of such similar things we shall easily judge, what may be made suitable of them, what is not in accordance with official duty and their nature.'

It would appear that given the familiarity of the Roman audience with this precise facial expression as communicating *severitas* and *gravitas*, that it was felt unnecessary to spell out in every instance a detailed physical description, being adequate to convey the notion to the audience by a shorthand method of referring to the 'eyebrow' or 'forehead' or both (*frons et supercilia*) without elaboration. As already noted, there is frequent reference to an individual's forehead and eyebrows linked with *severitas* and *gravitas* - particularly when such an individual is delivering a *sententia* (judgement or opinion), act as judge in a case, whenever one was expected to act in an official capacity or when one was involved in the affairs of state generally.

In relation to this, one is reminded of Cicero's description of Paetus, who replies to a question with a contracted brow so as to fraudulently convey his (pretend) *severitas* and *gravitas* via his facial expression: [16] Cic. *Clu.* 72. Cicero here alleges that the intention of Paetus was to deceive his listener as to the truth of his words, by directly imitating the facial expression characteristic of *severitas* and *gravitas*. Cicero feels the need to state that Paetus 'contracted his forehead' (*contrahit frontem*) before preparing to respond to his interlocutor so as to reinforce the veracity of what he was about to say. However, Cicero immediately disabuses his audience as to any misinterpretation that may flow from his physical description of Paetus' 'contracted forehead' by calling on the audience to recall Paetus' face and artificially composed facial expression as proof of his assertion that Paetus' character can be wholly characterised in terms of mendacity, lies and vice.

This, and other passages already cited, confirm that a certain arrangement of the eyebrows and the forehead were synonymous with old fashioned *severitas* and *gravitas* - this being a conjunction of contracted forehead and contracted eyebrows. This precise formulation of facial expression linked with *severitas* and *gravitas* remained the case at the end of the first century A.D. This is evidenced by the poet Martial, who describes old Cato (who was synonymous with *austeritas*, *severitas* and *gravitas*¹¹) and men who have similarly 'stern' composition of their features in terms of the position of the eyebrow (which Martial describes as *triste* - in this context meaning 'severe' or 'stern') and the forehead (which Martial describes by the adjective *severa* - 'stern' or 'harsh'): [17] Mart. *Ep.* 11.2.1-4. Like Cicero,

11 He was known as a rigid judge of morals, hence his appellation 'Censorius'; his literary works were *Origines* and *De Re Rustica* - see Cic. *De or.* 3, 33, 135; Livy *AUC* 31.1; Plin. (E) *HN* 7.27.28§100; 7.30.31§112.

Martial confirms that both eyebrows drawn together and the forehead contracted signified *gravitas* and *severitas* directly. As with prose sources cited already, there are references in poetry that the eyebrows drawn together accompanied by a lined or contracted forehead generally indicate that the individual has the requisite *severitas* and *gravitas* of mind when burdened by weighty matters, or at the least a certain sternness or hardness: [18] Ov. *Her.* 17.16-19.

It must be noted (as discussed in the previous chapter) that a similar facial expression could also convey *superbia* (i.e., one eyebrow raised and the other lowered) - and in some instances there must have been a fine line between whether a person's facial expression indicated one or the other: [19] *Pis.* 19. In this example, Cicero comments that his antagonist, Piso, responding to a matter of grave public concern (the accusation that Cicero had unlawfully executed Roman citizens while suppressing the conspiracy of Catiline in 63 B.C), had replied in a manner that superficially appears to communicate the seriousness with which he regarded the charge. Cicero tells us that Piso had replied with one eyebrow pushed so high on his forehead (*altero ad frontem sublato ... supercilio*) while the other was pushed so low (*altero ad mentum depresso supercilio*)(in a parody of the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression - as this is the facial expression more consonant with what one would expect from a person of rank delivering an opinion or *sententia* on an important matter) - that it only goes to communicate and confirm Piso's *superbia* and *adrogantia*.

Indeed, the term *supercilium* in certain contexts came to mean *superbia* - especially the *superbia* typically associated with kings and rulers who were believed to exercise their power and to disport themselves with one eyebrow constantly raised as an indication of their mighty authority and overbearing attitude. However, while there is some indication that one eyebrow raised and the other lowered could be considered acceptable when one was deliberating on a matter of public concern or when hearing evidence in the courtroom, to disport oneself with such an expression showed a want of modesty (*Cic. Pis.* 20; *Cic. Leg. Agr.* 2.93). The difference as to whether the facial expression in this form communicated *superbia*, or proper *severitas* and *gravitas*, would depend on the circumstances in which it was used. The physical difference between the two appears to have been the context of whether one or both eyebrows were contracted, or one was raised. Also pertinent appears to have been the angle of the head - a head held high (whereby one did not look directly at the faces of one's equals, but above them) suggested *adrogantia* rather than *gravitas* or *severitas*. This is confirmed to

a degree by Quintilian: a *caput rectum* is *secundum naturam*; a *deiectum caput* is a sign of humility; a rigid and stiffly held head is a reflection of a *barbaria mentis*.¹² With regard to the *superbia* facial expression, the greatest example of its use was by the King of the Gods, Jove himself:

*regum timendorum in proprios greges
reges in ipsos imperium est Iovis
clari Giganteo triumpho,
cuncta supercilio moventis.*¹³ (Hor. Carm. 3.1.8)

However, this was not so much *superbia* on Jupiter's part, but was reflective of his supreme power as king and judge over all mortals.

Whether the contracted eyebrows, or raised eyebrow and down-turned mouth signified *gravitas/severitas* or *adrogantia/superbia* would depend on the context in which the facial expression is used and referred to, and the station within Roman society that the individual bore. It is apparent from the sources cited above that *severitas* and *gravitas* were expected to be conveyed by the faces of individuals concerned with the affairs of state - and was a particular hallmark of the *nobiles* class who dominated public offices. Such a facial expression from a person of more lowly stature would be risible, or risk marking that person as being of a contemptuous or arrogant character.

The belief that the face of a judge, senator or even a *paterfamilias* could convey *severitas* and *gravitas* is evident from written sources from the beginning of the middle Republic. There are references in Plautus' plays from which it is apparent that the eyebrows played an important part in the communication of *severitas* and *gravitas*; thereby attesting to the consistency of the meaning attributed to this particular composition of the eyebrows and forehead for at least three centuries.

*quid illuc est quod illi caperrat frons severitudine?*¹⁴ (Plaut. Epid. 609)

In *Rudens*, the slave Trachalio comically describes an old man (his master). To the Roman audience the description of the old man superficially appears to communicate all the physical

¹² Quint. Inst. 11.3.69.

¹³ 'Dreaded Kings rule over their own flocks, / among the Kings themselves, it is the power of Jove, / famous for the triumph over the Giants / rules all by the movement of an eyebrow'

¹⁴ 'What is it there that his brow wrinkles with sternness [*severitudo*]?'

features (and hence moral characteristics) of a *paterfamilias*. This is built up by Trachalio's use of the Latin noun for an 'old man' (*senex* - from whence the noun *senator* was etymologically related). However, Trachalio does not use it simply in apposition to the old man's name, but applies it instead to the noun *Silanus* - the drunken character found in Satyr plays. Trachalio thus uses a term that normally signifies the respectability of an old man and twists it by applying it to the personality and character of Silanus (the opposite of what a *senex* should be). Trachalio concludes that from the old man's features alone, it is apparent he must be accursed and hated by men and gods alike - as his facial features clearly reveal his lecherous character. Trachalio does this by emphasising the old man's 'contracted forehead' and 'contorted eyebrows' - something which would normally be expected by the audience to communicate respectable values consonant with an old man. However, the key to understanding this description is the use of the word *fraudentum* in apposition to *senem* (i.e., a 'deceptive old man'), but placed immediately after the description of the old man's facial expression "...*tortis superciliis, contracte fronte*....": [20] Plaut. *Rud.* 317-320.

Superficially, this facial expression is what one would normally expect to see on the face of a respectable old man and *paterfamilias*: contracted forehead and eyebrows drawn together, thereby communicating his *severitas* and *gravitas*. However, in this instance the old man (and by extension his facial expression) is unmasked as *fraudentum*. The surprise in Trachalio's description is that the old man is a deceiver: he is in fact the opposite of what he superficially appears to be. This is an extremely clever manipulation of verbal and physical description communicating values which were peculiarly Roman - and attests to the sophistication of the audience in appreciating the joke.

Upon hearing such a description, the Roman audience may have been shocked (but no doubt amused as well) by the fact that the slave (and slaves in comedy are notoriously deceitful and artful with their words) is twisting the appearance of the old man to make out he is the opposite of what he is - that he has more in common with a *Silanus* than a *senex*. The proof of the old man's *fraus* comes from Trachalio's observation that he is accompanied by two pretty young slave girls - thereby confirming that the old man is in fact a *Silanus*, since *Silanus* and the satyrs were notoriously lecherous. This is, in essence, a peculiarly Roman description and a peculiarly Roman joke, as it deliberately blurs the traditional image of a venerable old man with that of the lecherous *Silanus*.

Importantly, the passage also confirms that even in Plautus' time, contracted eyebrows and drawn forehead communicated values considered appropriate to a *senex*, *paterfamilias* and a person involved in the affairs of the *res publica*. Later, during the time of Augustus, Livy avers (retrospectively) that *gravitas* was a quality that could clearly be seen on the faces of the senators as they awaited the Gauls during the sack of Rome in 390 B.C.: [21] Livy *AUC* 5.41.8.

As already noted in the discussion on the meaning of *gravitas* and *severitas*, the contracted eyebrows and forehead, or one eyebrow raised and the other lowered, indicated that a man was seriously weighing up an important matter of state, i.e., he possessed *gravitas* and *severitas* and was bringing these qualities to bear on the question or issue at hand. The features of the eyebrows drawn together indicated a mind concerned with important questions, the more so when it is coupled with a lined and contracted forehead - indicative particularly of a mature man engaged in the duties of a magistrate or senator. Interestingly, as is evident from the discussion of Roman concepts of physiognomic communication from the previous chapters, one had to be aware that these features could be feigned in order to conceal the true character of the individual concerned and to deceive the viewer: Cic. *Pis.* 1.

Interestingly, Cicero draws a direct comparison between the antique statues of the ancestors (the *imagines maiorum*) to the appearance and facial expression of the subject - in other words, the subject is deliberately imitating the appearance of an antique *imago* in order to convey the fact he is full of proper weighty concern, *gravitas* and *severitas*, in his undertaking of his public duties. This suggests that the *facial expression* one would expect to see from a portrait bust or statue of a Roman of such a rank, and particularly of a *maior*, would be the same as that borne by their descendants: a physical communication of their *gravitas* and *severitas*. Later in the same speech, Cicero again refers to the fact that Piso bears a facial expression feigning *severitas* and *gravitas* by which he deceives people as to his true character: [22] Cic. *Pis.* 12.

Similarly, in another speech, Cicero refers to the fact that his antagonist has hidden his true criminal character by the use of his 'forehead', although in this instance there are other physical signals (the burn marks from the curling wand) which indicate the truth concerning his character: [23] Cic. *Red. Sen.* 16. See also Cic. *Clu.* 72; Cic. *Rab Post.* 35; Cic. *Q. Rosc.* 20; Cic. *Prov. Cons.* 8.

5.4 The *severitas/gravitas* expression

The above-cited sources indicate that to the Roman mind there was a defined facial expression which was directly communicative of the ethical and moral notions of *severitas* and *gravitas*. This facial expression consisted of a contracted forehead, contracted eyebrows (or one eyebrow raised and one lowered) sometimes accompanied by a general hardness of the facial expression, such as a down-turned or 'hard' mouth (*os durus*). This facial expression was required to convey the proper standards of ethical behaviour required of a Roman who was engaged in public affairs (as a senator, magistrate, governor, general, or priest) and was therefore a facial expression which was particularly communicative of the moral and ethical standards of the ruling élite at Rome: the *nobiles* class. As such, we thus have a catalogue of terms which represented Roman élite society as it perceived itself and as it wanted itself to be perceived. The 'propagandistic' ramifications for art, and hence portraiture, are clearly evident, particularly when one keeps in mind the Roman utilisation of physiognomic beliefs in conveying information physically about an individual.

Given the importance of *severitas* and *gravitas* as values central to the identity of the senatorial élite, it seems that these values were expected to be the motivating *motus animi* of a person involved in the affairs of state. Thus, not only were *senators* expected to bring these values to bear in the conduct of their public and private affairs, they were also expected to be seen to be the embodiment of these values via their facial expression, gait and general bearing.

Clearly there was a blurring of the division between a senator's public role and private life – and he was very much expected to live his role in both the public and private sphere. This has important ramifications for the context of where a *nobilis* would display his portrait images and those of his ancestors and what facial expression would be expected to characterise them. It is thus the values of the *nobiles* that we see reflected in the literature of the Republic, and these that we should expect to see communicated through their portrait images.

5.5 Facial expression and *imagines*

Some sources already cited indicate that the *imagines* as well as the faces of living senators could be characterised as conveying *severitas* and *gravitas*. See, for instance, Cicero's speech in defence of Aulus Cluentius whom he states is a man of such upstanding character that he

equals the *gravitas* of his ancestors: [24] Cic. *Clu.* 196.

Elsewhere Cicero states that old *imagines* of illustrious Romans were animated by their virtues among which was *gravitas* and this is linked directly with a living person whose facial expression (of contracted eyebrow and forehead) are said to convey *gravitas* and all the best morals: [25] Cic. *Sest.* 19.

Livy confirms this in relating the story about the senators who remained seated on their chairs (*solia*) before their homes during the time of the sack of Rome by the Gauls in 390/386 B.C. He comments that the senators bore such expressions of *gravitas* upon their faces that they seemed to the Gauls *as though they were statues of the gods*: [21] Livy *AUC* 5.41.8.

This is confirmed in another passage taken from Cicero's speech in defence of Milo, where he not only characterises the *imagines* of illustrious Romans by their *gravitas*, but he clearly shows that by the appearance of these statues alone they were (or should be) capable of rebuking, admonishing or shaming contemporary Romans into proper, ethical behaviour. In this instance the animated *imago* was none other than the Censor, Appius Claudius Caecus, who was famous for his *gravitas* and *severitas*: [26] Cic. *Mil.* 33-34. Cicero here not only animates the *imago* of Appius Claudius Caecus, but he makes Caecus draw attention to his other illustrious descendants as if indicating an ancestor gallery of *imagines maiorum* in order to shame and rebuke his wayward great-great-great-great-granddaughter, Clodia, for her discreditable behaviour. Later in the same speech he justifies bringing so severe and grave an individual as Appius 'from the dead' – even knowing that such a person might turn and rebuke his own client – by making comparisons between the *gravitas* and *severitas* of Appius (via his *imago*) with the *severitas* of the judges in the present case. This was no doubt intended to flatter the judges by reference to the virtues of *gravitas* and *severitas* deemed appropriate for their role, and to link these with the ancient virtues displayed by illustrious Romans from the past - which Cicero suggests was clearly communicated by their facial expression: [27] Cic. *Mil.* 35.

In another speech, Cicero makes reference as to how the facial expression of Piso, while attempting to mimic the facial expression of his *imagines maiorum*, is nothing but evidence of his fraudulence. Cicero does this damningly by stating that Piso has nothing in common with his *imagines* (which he has used to convince his peers of his worthiness for election to high

office) other than the smoky pallor of his skin: [28] Cic. *Pis.* 1.1.

In light of the importance of portraiture to the Roman ruling élite, the strong association between the *imagines maiorum* and the proper values of the élite, and the continuing role that these *imagines* played in social and political terms as embodying and communicating these values, it should not be surprising that the facial expression of *imagines* of members of the ruling élite should also embody and communicate the values of *severitas* and *gravitas*. Just how important portrait statues were in terms of communicating the values of the *nobiles* class is summed up by Cicero: [29] Cic. *Phil.* 9.10-12.

5.6 Summary

Thus far the textual evidence shows that the Romans believed in basic physiognomic principles: that physical features, gait, gestures and facial expression conveyed precise messages concerning the character, morality and emotions of an individual. More precisely, that the facial expression was a reflection of the inner workings of the mind: the *motus animi*. However, the Romans adduced not only general emotional states from physiognomy but precise emotional ethical and moral values as well. Of particular importance in this context were the concepts of *gravitas* and *severitas*, which were not only utilised as special value terms by and for the *nobiles* themselves, but were used to describe the communicative effect of the facial expressions and countenance of the living members of the *nobilitas* and their *imagines*.

A survey of Latin literary evidence of the Republican period reveals that *severitas* and *gravitas* were communicated precisely by a contracted brow or forehead and contracted eyebrows. In light of the link between *imagines* as embodying and communicating the values of *severitas* and *gravitas*, and the fact that these values were communicated by a precise facial expression, it is this facial expression (the '*severitas/gravitas* facial expression') which I would expect to see on surviving portraits, and it is this issue which I shall examine in the following chapter.

CHAPTER SIX

SEVERITAS/GRAVITAS AND SURVIVING PORTRAITS

6.1 Introduction

There are a vast number of portraits scattered throughout various museums which portray what appear to be mature, middle aged or older males, all bearing contracted foreheads and eyebrows, down-turned mouths, etc. These portraits are frequently made of stone, such as tufa, travertine and marble (although there are one or two bronze and terracotta examples), and they originate from diverse contexts such as tombs, private houses, public spaces, etc., although in many cases their exact provenance is now unknown.

The facial patterning of these portrait heads are entirely consistent with the *severitas* and *gravitas* facial expression, which, as shown in Chapter Five, was composed primarily of contracted forehead and eyebrows.

The fact that the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression appears on hundreds, if not thousands of examples means that it is impossible to provide an exhaustive or comprehensive catalogue. For this reason I have chosen a selection of heads at random for analysis and discussion – the exception being the portrait heads from Delos which have been seen as crucial evidence in terms of the debate on the origins of the Roman Republican portrait style. For an in-depth description of the pieces discussed below see the catalogue in Appendix 4.

6.2 Portraits of Julius Caesar

Exemplifying the *severitas/gravitas* facial patterning is the portrait of Julius Caesar now in the Braccio Nuovo (formerly, Museo Chiaramonti) of the Vatican Museums (Ill. 10).¹ This portrait has features similar to many of the portraits from Delos, especially in its facial patterning: the large rectangular area delineating the forehead framed by the hair, the dissection of the forehead surface by three or four crease lines indicating the contraction of the forehead, the contraction of the eyebrows, indicated by their arching over the corners of

¹ F. S. Johansen, "Antichi ritratti di Caio Giulio Cesare nella cultura," *AnRom* 4 (1967): 25-6, pl. 1; R. Herbig, "Neue Studien zur Ikonographie des Gaius Julius Caesar," *KJhr* 4 (1959): pl. 5 fig 2; J.C.M. Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1978) 34, ill. 33. Toynbee, based on the treatment of the hair, classifies it as an Augustan copy of a bronze original, possibly made during the last years of Caesar's lifetime. Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* 34.

the eyes then diagonal inward sloping to almost converge on either side of the nose bridge, and the two short carved vertical lines on either side of the nose bridge which end just below the first wrinkle mark of the forehead. Typical, also, are the crows-feet at the corners of the eyes which emphasise the maturity of the individual portrayed and which heighten the impression of frowning. Adding to the effect of age and of the severity of expression, the line of the mouth is concave down at the corners and there is dimpling of the skin at the corners of the mouth which gives the effect that it is slightly down-turned.²

A similar basic facial patterning can be identified in another portrait of Julius Caesar from Tusculum in Turin, Castello di Aglie (Ill. 11),³ which depicts the Dictator as balding. Due to its resemblance to the portrait on the Mettius denarius (Ill. 12), it has been dated to Caesar's lifetime.⁴ The details of the facial features are worn, and the application of facial patterning is more linear and schematic, but still discernable is the basic patterning reinforcing the overall effect that Caesar's eyebrows are slightly contracted and the mouth is down-turned.

Again this same facial patterning is evident on the portrait of Julius Caesar in Pisa, Campo Santo (Ill. 13).⁵ It has a full head of hair and appears more 'classicizing' in the general treatment of the face – as a result of which it has been dated to the Augustan period.⁶ While the forehead wrinkles are present, they do not curve downwards to dip over the nose. However, the two short outwardly rising lines that mark the beginning of the eyebrows are present, which is complemented by more softly modelled fold lines above the eyebrows – thus giving the effect that Caesar is slightly 'squinting', or more simply, that his eyebrows are slightly contracted.

2 Also, the lips are drawn shut, and the bottom lip is fleshy and protruding. The head is turned slightly to the left, indicated by the tense vertically rising left tendon opposite the direction of the head turn, while the neck tendon on the portrait's left side is relaxed, diagonally drawn and is more softly modelled.

3 Museo di Antichità, Torino. D.E.E. Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992) 45, ill.26; M. Borda, "Il ritratto tuscolano di Giulio Cesare," *RPAA* 20.3 (1943/1945); E. Simon, "Das Caesarporträt Im Castello Di Aglie," *AA* (1952).

4 Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* 37. The denarius minted in 44 B.C by Marcus Mettius; see O. Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik*, 2 vols. (Lund, Leipzig: C. W. K. Gleerup, O. Harrassowitz, 1941) pl. 6, nos. 1 and 4; pl. 7, no. 5; E. Sydenham, *The Coinage of the Roman Republic* (London: Spink, 1952) 176-7, nos. 1055 and 57, pl. 28; D. Michel, *Alexander als Vorbild für Pompeius, Caesar und Marcus Antonius*, vol. 94 (Brussels: Collection Latomus, 1967) pl. 23 fig 1; M. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974) no. 480, 2, 17 pl. 57.

5 Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* 46, ill. 28.; P.E. Arias, "Problemi attuali della iconografia di Cesare alla luce del ritratto di camposanto monumentale di Pisa," in *Ufficiale E Ritratto Privato, Atti Della Ii Conferenza Internazionale Sul Ritratto Romano, Roma, 26-30 Settembre 1984*, ed. N. Bonacasa and G. Rizza (Rome: Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Quaderni de "La Ricerca Scientifica", 1988).

6 Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* 34.

If the piece dates to the Augustan period then it exemplifies well the combination of the typical facial expression communicating *severitas* and *gravitas* with the classicising style of portraiture favoured by Augustus. While the facial expression is more relaxed, it is interesting to note that even in portraiture which is heavily classicising, there is still some regard paid to the traditional norms of Roman Republican portraiture.

References to the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression are also detectable in the early portraits of Octavian (previous to him becoming 'Augustus'), such as the portrait in the Stanza degli Imperatori, Palazzo Nuovo, Musei Capitolini, Rome (Ill. 83.1).⁷ Despite Octavian's young age his portrait incorporates the basic elements of the *severitas/gravitas* expression, a slight contraction of the eyebrows and forehead (although much more softly modelled) combined with certain classicising elements. This fusion of portrait styles may have resulted from a combination of factors, such as Octavian's young age (meaning that he may not physically have had the wrinkles of a more mature man that would have permitted an easier, more credible rendition of the *severitas/gravitas* expression) and his need for political legitimacy. His choice of portrait style also evidences that at an early period in his career, Octavian was willing to exploit the visual language of the *nobiles* class but adapted to his own personal style of portraiture based on Classical antecedents. Once his political position was secure he was free to abandon the use of elements of the *severitas/gravitas* expression in his portraiture to establish his own portrait style based on classicising antecedents. This style better expressed his political programme and served as a counterpoint to the traditional style of portraiture used by the *nobiles* class which he had surpassed. This shift in portrait convention set in train by Augustus is also evident in the images of those in Augustus' immediate circle, such as Marcus Agrippa (discussed below, (Ill.93 and 94)). His portraiture, too, combines elements of the *severitas/gravitas* expression (but much more softly modelled) combined with heavily classicising elements.

An interesting contrast to the above portraits is that of Julius Caesar in green diabase, originally from Egypt and now in the Staatliche Museen, Berlin (Ill. 14).⁸ This portrait appears to have a much more 'distant', or even 'sadly serene' expression. This, as well as the

7 Fittschen, K. and P. Zanker, *Katalog der römischen Porträts in den Capitolinischen Museen und den anderen kommunalen Sammlungen der Stadt Rom I. Kaiser- und Prinzenbildnisse* (Mainz 1985) pl.2.

8 Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* 46, ill. 27. Johansen rejects this work claiming it is a modern forgery: Johansen, "Antichi Ritratti Di Caio Giulio Cesare Nella Cultura." Balty, however, accepts it as ancient: J. C. Balty *Festoen* 1976, 52-53, pl. 2 fig. 2.

convention of carving the pupils of the eyes and the fact it is a full bust depicting the upper chest and folds of the clothes, suggests that this piece is a work of the imperial period. The artist has attempted to incorporate elements of the conventions of Republican portraiture: crows feet, forehead wrinkles, the two short, vertical lines on either side of the nose bridge that terminate just at the line of the first forehead wrinkle, etc., however not entirely successfully; either because the artist was not entirely conversant with the technical aspects of depicting the *severitas/gravitas* expression or due to technical difficulties in carving the stone due to its hardness. The presence of elements of the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression possibly indicates that it was modelled on a portrait of Caesar that exemplified the style, possibly even one dating to the Dictator's lifetime.

6.3 Portraits of unknown men

Similar observations concerning the facial patterning can be made in relation to the head found originally near Otricoli, once in the Museo Torlonia (Ill. 15) (now not on display).⁹ The head portrays an old man –bearing a multitude of wrinkles and facial lines cut into its surface. On superficial inspection the head represents an ‘individuated’ or possibly even an ‘individualised’ old man. He appears to be ‘scowling’ with heavily contracted eyebrows and forehead.

Another head in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Cagliari (Ill. 16) shares this basic facial patterning in its expression.¹⁰ This piece has a lined forehead, contracted eyebrows, downturned mouth, etc. Interestingly, while its hair is short, it is more flamboyant, being reminiscent of the ‘anastole’ hair-do of Pompey’s portrait in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek in Copenhagen (Ill. 17).¹¹

Also worthy of comment is the head from Geneva (originally from Italy) (Ill. 18)¹² and another in the private collection of Richard Hueck, Murnau Germany (Ill. 19).¹³ Noticeable

9 Illustrated in F. Abbate, *Roman Art*, trans. A. J. Sutton (London: 1972) 17; Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* 38, ill. 16.

10 P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, trans. A. Shapiro, Rep. ed. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998) 11, fig. 7.

11 B. Schweitzer, *Die Bildniskunst der römischen Republik* (Leipzig-Weimar: Koehler & Amelang, 1948) figs. 117, 24, 25; Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* 25, ill 18, 19. Johansen, F.S. *Roman Portraits I. Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek* (Copenhagen: 1994) kat. 1.

12 No.13180, Musée d'Art et d'Histoire, Geneva, (H.28cm); H. von Heintze, ed., *Römische Porträts* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1974) ill. 162.

13 von Heintze, H. *Römische Kunst* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1990) ill. 163.

from the Geneva head is fact that the hair is longer and wavier than is usual for such portraits. Apart from this, the basic drawing of the faces is highly schematic and linear, nevertheless effectively presenting the basic *severitas/gravitas* facial expression evidenced by the contracted forehead and eyebrows. This same composition of the facial expression is evident on a head in Dresden (Ill. 20).¹⁴

A highly linear and abstract form of facial patterning is found on a head from the *Agora Museum Athens* (Ill. 21).¹⁵ Harrison suggests that, given the semblance to a fragment from the Forum of Trajan in Rome, it could be a portrait of Trajan's father – thus providing a date at the end of the first century A.D. While some elements such as the treatment of the hair lend credence to the dating proposed by Harrison, the method of depicting the facial expression is clearly in conformity with the pattern for conveying *severitas/gravitas*. If it is Trajan's father, the head attests to the longevity of the application of the Republican *severitas/gravitas* facial expression to portraiture well into the Imperial period.

An excellent example of the *severitas/gravitas* facial patterning is the marble group consisting of a man holding busts of his ancestors, now in the Museo Centrale Montemartini of the

14 H 329, Skulpturensammlung, Dresden: F. Brommer, "Zu den römischen Ahnenbildern," *MDAI-R* 60/61 (1953/4); R. West, *Römische Porträtplastik*, 2 vols., vol. 2 (Munich: 1933-1941) 33, taf. 11 and 42; Schweitzer, *Die Bildniskunst der römischen Republik* 43-51, Abb. 12 and 14; Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik* Taf. 68, 3.4; reproduced in von Heintze, ed., *Römische Porträts* Taf. 42; A. N. Zadoks-Josephus Jitta, *Ancestral Portraiture in Rome and the Art of the Last of the Republic* (Amsterdam: N. v. Noord Hollandische uitgevers-mij., 1932) 226, Taf. 8c. The hair is short cropped to the skull, while the rectangular plane of the forehead is traversed by three to four crease marks which dip down at the centre of the forehead over the nose bridge. There are small crows feet carved at the corners of the eyes, and there are two short upward strokes on either side of the nose bridge which terminate at the first forehead crease to give the effect that the eyebrows are contracted. Heightening the severity of the expression is the fact that the lower sinus line curves downwards to bracket the mouth, and there is the usual dimpling at the corners of the mouth to indicate it is down-turned.

15 No. S.1182, *Agora Museum*: von Heintze, ed., *Römische Porträts* Taf. 38; E. B. Harrison, *Ancient Portraits from the Athenian Agora*, vol. 5, *Excavations of the Athenian Agora Picture Book* (Princeton, New Jersey: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1960) ill. 10.

Musei Capitolini, Rome (Ill. 22.1) ('Barberini *togatus*').¹⁶ The group consists of a full-figured man, clad in a toga in the Augustan style, who is holding two busts. Unfortunately, while the head of the man is ancient, it was restored incorrectly to this statue,¹⁷ thus depriving the group of any family resemblance that may have been evident.

Despite this, all the faces share a similar patterning of the facial expression (Ill. 22.1-3).¹⁸ The other elements of age are also present: slightly sunken eyes, crows-feet, deeply cut lower sinus lines which curve down to bracket the mouth. The mouth lines are drawn closed and the corners are slightly down-turned, emphasised by dimpling marks at either corner of the mouths. These features give emphasis to the contraction of the eyebrows and forehead, and magnify the seriousness of the facial expressions.

An interesting piece said to be of 'Marius' is in the München Glyptothek (Ill. 23.1-2).¹⁹ Evident in the overall composition of the piece are certain Hellenistic stylistic components (such as the parted lips, the polished skin surfaces, etc.). Despite these Hellenising elements in its overall form, the facial expression is still heavily patterned in the *severitas/gravitas* manner: the forehead is creased (indicated by several wrinkle lines, although these do not dip in the centre as noted with many of the examples cited above) and the eyebrows are heavily drawn. The space between the eyebrows is deeply marked and the short upward lines that demarcate the beginning of the eyebrows are accompanied by softer, diagonal lines which echo and reinforce the crease and contraction of the eyebrows.

16 W. Altmann, *Die Römischen Grabaltäre der Kaiserzeit* (Berlin: 1905) 204; A.N. Zadoks-Josephus Jitta, *Ancestral Portraiture in Rome and the Art of the Last Century of the Republic*, Archaeologisch-Historische Bijdragen I (Amsterdam: Allard Pierson Stichting, 1932) 45-46; A. Boethius, "On the Ancestral Masks of the Romans," *Aarch* 13 (1942) 234; Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* 36, ill.13; G. Lahusen, "Zum römischen Bildnisrecht," *Labeo* 31 (1985) 281; J. M. C. Toynbee, *Death and Burial in the Roman World* (London: 1971) 48, no.192; W. Helbig, *Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom*, 4 Aufl. ed., IV vols. (Tübingen: 1966-1972) Vol. II, 1615; Erich S. Gruen, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1992) 155; H.I. Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996) 5-6. It has been suggested based on stylistic analysis that the statue group does not come from Rome but from an Italian municipal context: P. Zanker, "Zur Bildnisrepräsentation führender Männer in mittellitalischen und campanischen Städten zur Zeit der späten Republik und der julisch-claudischen Kaiser," in *Les 'Bourgeoisies' municipales italiennes aux I^{er} et II^e siècles av. J.C.* (Naples: 1983).

17 Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* 36-37.

18 Each has short cropped hair, receding hairlines, a large rectangular plane traversed by wrinkles, eyebrows which arch over the corners of the eyes that end at two short inwardly and upwardly short sloping lines which thereby mark the contraction of the eyebrows.

19 Nr 319, München Glyptothek: Schweitzer, *Die Bildniskunst der römischen Republik* 43-51; von Heintze, ed., *Römische Porträts* Taf. 28; L. Giuliani, *Bildnis und Botschaft* 176-82 Abb. 48. 50; R. Wünsche, "Marius und Sulla. Untersuchungen zu republikanischen Porträts und deren neuzeitlichen Nachahmungen," *MJBK* 33 (1982) 7-38 Abb. 1, 33, 38, 44, 46.

Similar observations can be made regarding the so-called 'Sulla', also in the München Glyptothek (Ill. 24.1-2)²⁰ and possibly representing the same person is a head now in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen (Ill. 25).²¹ Regarding the Munich head, the locks of the hair fall 'wildly' about the forehead, neck and temples and is carved in deeper, more exuberant locks, similar in styling to the hair of the heads from Delos A2136 and A4187 (Ills. 52 and 56), and highly reminiscent of the head of Flaminius on a stater minted in Greece (Ill. 26). Despite the Hellenistic conventions regarding the hair, the soft modelling of the skin of the face, the parting of the lips, and the polishing of the surfaces, the portrait still bears the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression. The forehead and eyebrows are heavily contracted, similar to the Marius noted above.

The 'Sulla' and the 'Marius' present well the amalgam of the Hellenistic 'pathos' sculptural style (similar to the style favoured by the Hellenistic kings) with the typical facial expression denoting *severitas* and *gravitas*. Whoever these portraits actually represent, they are powerful examples of the blending of Hellenistic artistic traditions with Roman physiognomic patterning.

Similarities of certain stylistic elements with the Munich 'Sulla' just mentioned are to be found in two heads, one in the Vatican Museum, Braccio Nuovo (Ill. 27.1-2)²² and another identified as 'Albinus' in the Louvre (Ill. 28.1-2).²³ These portraits are similar in appearance and may be of the same person. The Louvre portrait has similarities to the portrait of 'Sulla' in the Munich Glyptothek (Ill. 24.1-2), such as the plastic rendering of the features, the folds of flesh about the cheeks, chin and neck, etc. The head itself is turned to its right. The hair is cut in deeper, wavy curls – resembling also the carving of the hair on the palaestra head at Delos, A2136, and A4187 (Ills. 52 and 56). The head also has frown lines that cut across the forehead, crows-feet at the corners of the eyes, and eyebrows which slant in towards the nose bridge at a steep angle, thereby signifying (in conjunction with the frown lines on the forehead) the contraction of the forehead and eyebrows. Interestingly, the mouth is slightly down-turned, but the lips, as with the Munich Sulla and Marius, are drawn slightly apart.

20 F. Poulsen, *Catalogue of Ancient Sculpture in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek* (Copenhagen: 1951) 408. Nr. 589; Vagn Poulsen and Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, *Les Portraits Romains*, vol. I (Copenhagen: En commission chez E. Munksgaard, 1962) 138, Nr. 22 Taf. 96-97.

21 IN 1575, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek. Johansen, F.S. *Roman Portraits I. Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek* (Copenhagen: 1994) kat. 125.

22 Inv 2261, Musei Vaticani, Braccio Nuovo: Helbig, *Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom* Vol. I, 331, no. 429.

23 MA 919, Musée du Louvre.

The head in the Braccio Nuovo has been restored from the top of the neck down (Ill. 27). It, too, has a similar facial patterning to the Louvre head just mentioned.²⁴ The hair is formed from multiple curls that are on occasion grooved – with less exuberance than the Munich Glyptothek 'Sulla', but similar to that of A2136 and A7258 (Ill. 52 and 62) from Delos.

Another example (if it is not a modern forgery) of the *severitas/gravitas* facial patterning can be found on the head in the *Metropolitan Museum of Art*, New York (Ill. 29).²⁵ A head in Boston shares the same schematic rendering or patterning of the facial expression (Ill. 30).²⁶

In a similar vein stands the 'Crassus' head in the *Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek*, Copenhagen (Ill. 31).²⁷ This portrait is known in another copy in the Louvre (Ill. 32).²⁸ As with the 'Sulla' and 'Marius' and 'Albinus' already discussed, the face is more softly modelled and plastic. However, it still maintains the basic facial patterning indicating *severitas* and *gravitas*.²⁹

24 Frown-lines more clearly delineated across its forehead (although the left hand side of the portrait's forehead and hair was damaged and has been restored). There are two defined notches on either side of the nose bridge at the beginning of the eyebrows, which in conjunction with the forehead frown-lines suggests the contraction of the forehead and eyebrows. There are crows-feet at the corner of the eyes and the mouth is turned downwards – although again, the line of the lips is drawn slightly parted.

25 Rogers Fund, 1912 (12.233), Metropolitan Museum of Art, NY: Marble; H. 14.37 in. (36.5 cm). The authenticity of this piece has been disputed. It has short cropped hair, formed by finely incised lines, which frames the forehead as a large rectangular space. The forehead itself is traversed by several wrinkle lines, there are crows-feet at the corners of the eyes and the eyebrows are drawn together. The line of the lips (which is drawn shut) also curves downwards, there being a slight dimpling mark at the corners of the mouth to heighten the effect. There are manifold wrinkle lines on the face, the lower sinus line from the edge of the nostrils curving down to bracket the face. All these elements are constitutive of the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression.

26 Marble (Carrara ?) Museum of Fine Arts, Boston: Bequest of Benjamin Rowland, Jr., by exchange, and Frank B. Bemis Fund, John H. and Ernestine A. Payne Fund, and Mary S. and Edward J. Holmes Fund 1991.534.

27 IN 749, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, H. 45cm, marble. Found in 1887 supposedly in the Tomb of the Licinii near Rome. Poulsen, *Catalogue of Ancient Sculpture in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek* Nr. 655; Poulsen and Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, *Les Portraits Romains* 106, Nr. 67, ill. 13-14; Giuliani, *Bildnis und Botschaft* 223, Abb. 62-63. Johansen, F.S. *Roman Portraits I. Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek* (Copenhagen: 1994) kat. 69.

28 MA 1220, Musée du Louvre. The identity give by the Louvre varies from a portrait of the Emperor Galba, to the Pontifex. L. Calpurnius Piso: <http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/cartelfr/visite?srv=car_not_frame&idNotice=2752>; Giuliani, *Bildnis und Botschaft* 223-25, Abb. 60; D. Boschung, "Überlegungen zum Liciniergrab," *JDAI* 100 (1986) Abb. 27, 28.

29 The forehead is traversed by several wrinkle lines which curve downwards over the nose bridge, the eyebrows gently curve into either side of the nose bridge, and there are two short upward and inwardly sloping lines signifying the contraction of the eyebrows. The planes of the cheeks are slightly hollowed, the lower sinus lines are pronounced and curve down to bracket the mouth, while the line of the mouth also curves downwards.

6.4 Capitoline "Brutus"

Much about the bronze head in the Capitoline Museum, popularly called "Brutus",³⁰ is highly controversial – not least its date, being variously placed from the fourth century B.C. to the mid-first century B.C. (Ill. 33.1-3).³¹ The piece itself is described as being 'larger than life'.³² The head is turned slightly to its right side and appears to be slightly tilting downwards. Because of this and the portrait's overall dimensions, it has been suggested that it may have come from an equestrian statue. There is nothing else that indicates that this is so; if it were a free-standing statue set on a high plinth or pillar, then the head may have been slightly tilted down so the viewer could see it. The piece may well have come from a public portrait statue (*statua ac imago*) – but whether it was an equestrian statue, or some other free standing statue (say, on a 'trophy' or martial monument at the door of the house of a triumphant general) or some other public votive or honorary statue set up in another context is now impossible to tell.³³

As noted the dating of the "Brutus" is controversial.³⁴ It has been described as a good example of the 'mid-Italic' style or as representative of an Hellenised form of local Italian art produced in the fourth and third centuries B.C.³⁵ Whatever the dating of this piece (discussed more fully in Chapter Seven) its facial patterning is indicative of *severitas/gravitas*.³⁶ If it dates to the beginning of the third century B.C. as I believe, it shows that the facial patterning

30 MC1183, Palazzo dei Conservatori, Musei Capitolini. Helbig, *Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom* vol. II, 268-70, no. 1449; F. Haskell and N. Penny, *Taste and the Antique: The Lure of Classical Sculpture, 1500-1900* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1981) 163; H. Stuart-Jones, British School at Rome, and Palazzo dei Conservatori (Rome Italy), *A Catalogue of the Ancient Sculptures Preserved in the Municipal Collections of Rome* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926) 43, pl. 60. Fittschen, K. and P. Zanker, *Katalog der römischen Porträts in den Capitolinischen Museen und den anderen kommunalen Sammlungen der Stadt Rom I. Kaiser- und Prinzenbildnisse*, Vol. II (Mainz: Von Zabern, 1983-85; 2nd edition, 1994) Nr. 1.

31 See n 33 *infra*. For more in depth analysis of the literature on this point, see M. Papini, *Antichi olti della Repubblica* (Rome: 2004), 73-74.

32 Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* 24.

33 See Chapter Seven, p.212-214 *infra*.

34 For instance, Pollitt dates the piece to around 300B.C.: J. J. Pollitt, "Rome, the Republic and Early Empire," in *The Oxford History of Classical Art*, ed. J. Boardman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 225-26; as does Robertson: M. Robertson, *A History of Greek Art* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975) pl. 190a. However, Kilmer suggests a date between 125 and 75 B.C.: M. F. Kilmer, "Review of John Boardman, *Oxford History of Classical Art*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993," *BMCR* 94.10.09 (1994).

35 Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* 24-25.

36 The hair is composed of longer strands which sweep around the top and side of the head. The forehead is a large rectangular plane which is traversed by a crease line which dips down slightly at the centre, there are crows-feet at the corner of the eyes, while the eyebrows are drawn contracted downwards to the nose bridge which is demarcated by two vertical, short lines which are more deeply cut, thus giving emphasis to the contraction of the eyebrows and lower forehead. The lower line of the sinuses, indicating age, emphasises the seriousness of the demeanour. The mouth is drawn shut.

communicating *severitas* and *gravitas* may have been employed on portraiture at Rome for a period of three hundred years, if not longer. In any event, the Brutus amply illustrates so much of the public and private statuary that was to be seen at Rome in the Republican period and to which the sources attest, but which is now missing from the archaeological record.

6.5 L'Arringatore

The so-called 'arringatore' [the 'orator'] (Ill. 6.1-3)³⁷ was said to have been found in Lake Trasimene or to have come from the area of the town of Pila near Perugia. It is now in the Museo Archeologico, Florence.³⁸ It is a full bronze work, approximately 179cm high, representing a mature man who is about to deliver a speech. It was cast using the *cire perdu* method in seven parts which were then soldered together. The eyes were made from ivory, bone and glass paste inserts. His hair is carved in short cut locks which adhere to the shape of the skull. He is dressed in a short toga (*toga exigua*) *praetexta*, and under this he wears a short tunic bordered by a narrow band (*angustus clavus*) which can be seen on his right arm. He is wearing boots which have the typical laces and heels of senatorial boots (*calcei senatorii*), and he wears a ring on his left hand.



fig. 1: (from J. Heurgon, *Vita quotidiana degli etruschi*, (Milan 1965) fig. 13).

His right hand is raised as if in the act of silencing the crowd or beckoning his audience to hear him. There is an inscription written in three lines on the hem of the toga utilising letters

37 For published articles on the Arringatore, see: T. Dohrn, "L'Arringatore nato etrusco, cittadino romano," in *Problemi di storia e archeologia dell'Umbria. Atti del I convegno di studi Umbri. Gubbio 26-31 Maggio 1963* (1964); T. Dohrn, "L'Arringatore, Capolavoro del Museo Archeologico di Firenze," *BdA* 49 (1964); M. Pallottino, "Nota sull'iscrizione dell'Arringatore," *BdA* 49 (1964); G. Susini, "Sul luogo di rinvenimento dell'Arringatore," *ArchCl* 17 (1965); T. Dohrn, "Der Arringatore in Florenz. Technische Beobachtungen," *AAr* (1965); T. Dohrn, *Der Arringatore. Bronzestatue im Museo Archeologico von Florenz* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1968); K. Fittschen, "Der 'Arringatore', Ein römischer Bürger?" *MDAI-R* 77 (1970); R. Bianchi-Bandinelli and A. Giuliano, *Etrusker und Italiker vor der römischen Herrschaft* (1974) 319.51.73 Abb. 67.444; G. Colonna, "Il posto dell'Arringatore nell'arte etrusca di età ellenistica," *SE* 56 (1989/1990); G. Hafner, "Etruskische Togati," *AntPl* 9 (1969). See also Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* 33-34.

38 Published by Il Ministero per i beni culturali e ambientali, soprintendenza archeologica della toscana, sezione didattica No.5.

which are said to be typical of the late Etruscan period (Ill. 6.4). The inscription (transliterated) reads:

*aulesi . metelis . ve . vesial . clensi.
cen . fleres . tece . sansl . terine
tu ines . chisvlics*

The precise meaning of this text is unclear – although it has been interpreted to mean “for Aulus Metellus, son of Vel and (the woman) Vesi this (sacred object) to the God Tece Father has been placed by the [people of the] district of Chiusuli”.³⁹ What is relatively clear from the inscription is that this statue was set up to honour ‘Aulus Metellus’ by some community in a sanctuary near to Perugia or perhaps Lake Trasimene.

The face and gesture of the statue is extremely interesting in terms of Roman physiognomic understandings. The pose of the statue exactly corresponds to Quintilian’s statement (Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.103) that raising one’s hand above the line of the shoulder with a slightly hollowed palm facing out is used to exhort or to call for the attention of one’s audience. Also interesting in this respect is Quintilian’s advice concerning the proper stance an orator should employ when commencing a speech ([1] Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.159). The Arringatore almost exactly conforms to this advice: his head is held straight, his knees are straight but not stiff (the left one being slightly bent), his left arm is held nearby to his side, and his feet are slightly apart with the left one moved slightly forward (Ill. 6.1). The only addition is the gesture of exhortation in the manner already described.

More interesting (and more pertinent) still is the Arringatore’s facial expression (Ill. 6.2-3).⁴⁰ As noted with the other portraits already discussed, this facial expression, which presents a stern countenance formed by the slight contraction of the eyebrows, suggests the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression. That the facial patterning of the Arringatore is not a generic rendering of the face of a mature man, but a deliberate choice seems likely, especially

39 English translation by the author of Italian translation by G. Colonna, “Atti e memorie dell’Accademia Petrarca di Lettere,” *arti e scienze* 47 (1985) 182. “per Aule Meteli figlio di Vel e di una Vesi questo (oggetto sacro) al dio Tece Padre è posto (o simile) dal pago (o vico) di Chiusuli”. But see M. Cristofani, *Civiltà Degli Etruschi* (Milano: Regione toscana, 1985) 394.

40 His forehead is marked with several, pronounced lines that start near his temples and traverse the plane of his forehead. These wrinkles dip ever so slightly downwards at the centre of the forehead. The eyebrows are arched, but terminate at two short vertical lines which delineate either side of the nose bridge – thus giving the effect of frowning. There are crow’s-feet at the corners of the eyes. The lower sinus lines are pronounced and curve from the outer edge of the nostrils to bracket the mouth. The line of the mouth is drawn closed and is downward curved.

when one recalls Quintilian's advice that an orator, when commencing a speech, should have a strict facial expression, or *vultus severus* (Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.159); that is, a facial expression directly communicating *severitas*. For this reason, the Arringatore is a portrayal of a man *about* to deliver a speech, rather than a person in the course of delivering one, as I stated above.

It has been suggested that the individual portrayed by the Arringatore is 'Etruscan', based on the language of the inscription; however, his mode of dress, hair style, gesture and facial expression all suggest strongly Roman characteristics. The piece has been dated to around 90 B.C. based on the lettering of the inscription and the style of the toga⁴¹ and the fact that this was the time when Roman citizenship was granted to Italy following the social war by the *lex iulia* and *lex calpurnia de civitate*. However, more will be said concerning this in Chapter Seven.

6.6 Scipio Africanus

A bronze head said to represent Scipio Africanus which was found in Herculaneum in the *Villa of the Papyri* is now in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Naples (Ill. 34).⁴² While the overall features of the face are fine, it has a serious expression – which the slight contraction of the eyebrows indicates the *severitas/gravitas* form.⁴³

The sources indicate that there were several portraits of Scipio extant in the city of Rome which dated contemporaneously to his lifetime – and the existence of Scipio's bronze bust from the *Villa of the Papyri* indicates that there must have been a means of reproducing his

41 V. Kockel, *Porträtreiefs stadtrömischer Grabbauten: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und zum Verständnis des spätrepublikanisch-frühkaiserzeitlichen Privatporträts*, Beiträge zur Erschliessung hellenistischer und kaiserzeitlicher Skulptur und Architektur, Bd. 12 (Mainz: Zabern, 1993) 15-16, and 18-21.

42 D. Bassi and A. Ruesch, *Guida illustrata del Museo Nazionale di Napoli, Museo Nazionale di Napoli* (Napoli: Richter, 1908) 219, Nr. 883; M.R. Wojcik, *La Villa dei Papiri ad Ercolano: Contributo alla ricostruzione dell'ideologia della Nobilitas tardorepubblicana* (Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1986) 219, Nr. 883. There is some doubt that it represents Scipio Africanus as claimed.

43 The hair of the portrait is extremely close cropped to the skull, the forehead is lined by several wrinkle lines that traverse the forehead and dip down slightly in the centre of the forehead above the nose bridge. There are two short upward crease marks at the beginning of the eyebrows on either side of the nose bridge which indicate a slight frown or contraction of the eyebrows. The lower sinus lines commence at either side of the base of the nostrils and curve downwards to bracket the mouth. The lips are drawn closed and the line of the mouth is curved slightly downwards.

portrait for a home-grown Roman market.⁴⁴ The prevalence of his portrait also implies that his physiognomy was easily recognisable to a wide Roman audience and that portraits of him were fairly consistent in appearance.⁴⁵

6.7 Terracotta head of man from near Cumae

An interesting image is the terracotta bust of an older, mature man found near Cumae and now in the *Boston Museum of Fine Arts* (Ill. 36.1-2).⁴⁶ This portrait has been noted for its 'realistic' and 'vivid' appearance - including the intensity of its gaze. Some scholars have suggested that it was cast from a life-mask, however, it is also fairly evident that it has been worked up by the artists to include some of the details mentioned above.⁴⁷ These factors suggest that it is probably a terracotta bozzetto made for a final work in bronze,⁴⁸ or it may in fact be an *imago* that was once on display in the atrium of a house.⁴⁹

While the facial expression of the piece is not obviously one communicating *severitas* and *gravitas*, there are certainly elements of that expression present.⁵⁰ The crows feet, the down turn of the mouth, and the slightly contracted eyebrows are all present. It may be suggested that, if this were a model for a final work in bronze or marble, the artist may well have further

44 Cic. *Att* 6.1.19. Indeed, portraits were not merely occasionally reproduced but already replicated in great numbers in the late Republic, as we know from the case of M. Marius Gratidianus, tribune of the Plebs in 87 B.C., whose image was set up *in omnibus vicis* (in all the districts) of the city (Cicero, *De off.* 3.80; Plin. (E), *HN* 34.27).

45 There is bust in marble in the Capitoline museum (Ill. 35 - MC0562, Musei Capitolini, marble) which is inscribed with the name of Scipio. However, there are certain features of this portrait which indicate that it is a much later reproduction: the incising in the pupils of the eyes and the fact that it is a full bust including the lower chest - these suggest it is a later imperial copy (or recreation) or a renaissance forgery. See Helbig, *Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom* Vol. IV, S. 441 Nr. 827.

46 Schweitzer classified this piece as being in the 'painterly pathetic' style: see U. Heisinger, "Portraiture in the Roman Republic," *ANRW* 1.4 (1973) 811. Vermeule saw it as combining idealising and veristic attributes: C.C. Vermeule, *Roman Art: Early Republic to Late Empire, Art of Antiquity*, Vol. 3 (Boston Mass.: Department of Classical Art Museum of Fine Arts, 1979) 37. Stewart grouped it with the portraits from Delos and thought it might have been imported: A. F. Stewart, *Attika: Studies in Athenian Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age* (London: Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, 1979) 93, n.39; Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* 38; Jones, British School at Rome, and Palazzo dei Conservatori (Rome Italy), *A Catalogue of the ancient sculptures preserved in the municipal collections of Rome* 237-39, Nr. 49, pl. 54. Cornstock, M.B. and C.C. Vermeule, *Sculpture in Stone. The Greek, Roman and Etruscan Collections of the Museum of Fine Arts Boston* (Boston: 1976) 28.

47 Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* 38.

48 Heisinger, "Portraiture in the Roman Republic," 816. Also Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* ill. 14.

49 More will be said about this in subsequent chapters; esp. Chapter 8, 236-248 *supra*.

50 The hair is short and thinning, with locks falling about the top of the forehead. There are some wrinkle lines on the forehead, the eyebrows are slightly contracted, and there are two upward and inward short sloping lines at the point where the eyebrows commence at the nose bridge. The eyes have several crows-feet. The lower sinus lines are pronounced and curve down around the mouth, the lips are drawn shut and the mouth line is down-turned. The neck is flaccid, and the head is turned to its right. The eyes are slightly upwardly gazing and the irises are carved.

worked in the *severitas/gravitas* expression for the final product – however, this is pure speculation on my part. Overall, the head does confirm the capacity of Roman artisans for making fine portraiture in other, less durable materials, such as terracotta – and hints at what may actually be missing from the archaeological database that we now possess.⁵¹

6.8 Terracotta head – Rome

This curious head in the Louvre Museum (Ill. 37)⁵² is said to have come from Rome.⁵³ It is made from terracotta and it has been described by various scholars as having been modelled on a ‘death mask’. The neck of this piece is deeply lined, the eyes appear sunken, the mouth is a down-turned slit and appears sunken. Kleiner describes it so:

“The unopened eyes are ghoulishly sunken deep in their sockets, the cheekbones are high and accentuated, but the cheeks themselves have fallen in, the mouth appears like a toothless slit, the neck is sunken and deeply lined; in fact it is this head, more than any other surviving examples, that seems to exhibit actual characteristics of the human face after death.”⁵⁴

There are some observations in relation to this piece which impact on the assumption that it is in fact a head modelled on a death mask or on the face of a(n actual) dead person. Firstly, it is under life size – militating against it being modelled directly on the face of a deceased person. It is also quite exaggerated in terms of its physiognomic appearance. The ear is merely a geometric rendering of an ear, and the head is tilted to its left and is raised slightly – indicating that the context of the display of this head was that it was meant to appear ‘animated’. This also suggests that it may have been intended to have been set in some larger statuette. All these factors serve against it being in direct relation to a death mask that may or may not have been cast directly from the face of a deceased person.

Given the almost grotesque appearance of the facial expression, it should not be discounted that the head in fact served some other purpose, wholly unconnected with Roman portrait sculpture or *imagines maiorum*. For instance, it is known that grotesque heads were often placed in the *lararium* and suspended in the house during the festival of the goddess *Mania*

51 As for the date of this piece, live mould casting was known and practiced in Italy for several hundred years B.C. In essence, such a piece could date anywhere from 300 B.C. to the Augustan period.

52 CP 4789, usual catalogue number, S848, Louvre Museum, Terracotta head. Dated to the end of the second century B.C.

53 Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* 37.

54 Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik* 127-8, pl. 3 nos. 2 & 3.

(who was a chthonic goddess considered to be the mother of the *Lares*) as well as in certain rituals connected with the worship of the *Lemures*, *Di Penates*, *Lares* or *Di Manes* (Ill. 38).⁵⁵

6.9 Coin portraits

6.9.1 Marcus Claudius Marcellus

The first coin portrait from a metropolitan Roman mint is that of Marcus Claudius Marcellus, who is depicted on the obverse of a denarius minted by his descendent, Publius Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus in 50 B.C. (Ill. 39).⁵⁶ Marcellus, who was the hero of the Second Punic War, is identified from the coin's inscription and the fact that his image has a *triskele* behind it, the symbol of Sicilia - probably referring to his conquest of Syracuse in 211 B.C. during his successful campaign waged on the island from 214-211 B.C. He is known to have been consul for the first time in 222 B.C. (in which year he defeated the Insubres, a Gallic tribe). He was then consul four more times, in 215, 214, 210, and 208 B.C. - and this feat is referred to in the inscription on the reverse of the coin (MARCELLVS COS QVINQ).

Despite the fact that image on the coin is in profile, there are certain indications that, if it were frontal, it would bear a similar facial expression to that found on the portraits already discussed.⁵⁷ It is known that one portrait of Marcellus was erected at Rome during the first half of the second century B.C. because Asconius tells us that his grandson, Marcus Claudius Marcellus, erected statues of himself, his father and his grandfather in the Temple of Honos

55 Similarly, I do not accept that the four heads from *exedra* 25 from the *Casa del Menandro* at Pompeii are *imagines maiorum* as has been alleged: A. Maiuri, *La casa del Menandro*, 2 vols., vol. 1 (Roma: La Libreria dello stato, 1932) 98-106 and figs. 47-49; A. De Franciscis, *Il ritratto romano a Pompei* (Naples: 1951) 19-51, figs. 1, 7-9; Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture* 42-46, and Plate 2. These were not found in any location that the literary sources associated with the *imagines*, they were possibly made of wood or gypsum (not wax), and they are under life-size. While I would not rule out a provincial Italian practice parallel to that of the *imagines* at Rome (perhaps evidenced by some similar unpublished finds at Herculaneum (Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture* 43 and n.65.)(note that some of these are said to represent women- and the sources never attest to female *imagines maiorum*) the claim that the house in question belonged to a *nobilis* family, the *Poppaei* (the family of Nero's wife) would clearly suggest otherwise. Flower herself notes that this *exedra* is similar to a 'rustic sanctuary' (Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture* 43) and this would perhaps indicate that it was in fact a shrine to some household deities.

56 Sydenham, *The Coinage of the Roman Republic* 187, no. 1147, pl. 29; Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* no. 439, pl. 52.; Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* 17-18, pl.1; Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* 18-19.

57 Visible from Marcellus' image are the lines on the forehead, a mark of a contracted brow, prominent cheekbones, slightly sunken cheeks, prominent sinus line bracketing the mouth, and a dimple at the corner of the mouth indicated it is slightly down-turned. The hair is cropped short and recedes above the forehead. The tendon on the right side of the neck is tensed and prominent, as is the 'adam's apple'. The image gives the impression that if it were seen frontally, the image would clearly have borne the *severitas/gravitas* expression formed by a contracted forehead and eyebrows.

and Virtus.⁵⁸ There was also an inscribed statue of Marcellus at Lindos on Rhodes,⁵⁹ and Cicero remarks that there were to be found statues of him in Sicily itself.⁶⁰

Interestingly, this coin portrait of Marcellus has a sharply curved line delineating the base of the neck (Ill. 39). Added to this, the tensed neck tendon may indicate that the portrait on the coin is modelled from a three-dimensional bust cast from bronze or made of terracotta. In reality it is a strange convention to depict the head of a person in a two-dimensional profile portrait with these features – since they are largely redundant given the two dimensionality of the presentation. By contrast the coin portraits of Hellenistic Kings, while some possess the sharp delineation of the base neck line, very few (if any at all) are shown with a tensed neck tendon. The sharp undercut of the base of the neck line in Roman portrait coins make the head look almost as if it is hollow and three dimensional (like a mask or hollow bronze casting); while the neck tendon would only be tensed if the head were in fact turned in the opposite direction, as is the case with many of the Roman three dimensional portraits discussed above. These elements would not be necessary if the image on the coin were created free-hand by the die-cutter without a model. Since these elements become the common convention when depicting isolated heads in profile on Roman coins of the first century B.C., it would seem that these engravings were in fact modelled directly on extant portrait busts – the artist/die cutter merely transferring what he saw from his model to the die.

The fact that the artist in 50 B.C. could have used an extant bust of Marcellus as a model is suggested by several observations. As noted, it is known that portrait statues of Marcellus were set up in public. It is also highly possible that not only did members of the *familia* and *gens* possess a wax *imago* of him among their *imagines maiorum*, but that they may have had bronze or terracotta portrait busts of him housed in the displays in their *atria*. There may well still have been a bronze portrait bust of him at the door of his home (if it still stood in the mid-first century B.C.) forming part of the trophy set up there in celebration of his military triumphs. It could also be that there were other portraits of Marcellus in public and semi-public places throughout the city that still existed in 50 B.C. which the artist could easily have used as a model. It is also more than possible that any portrait of Marcellus (including the portrait on the coin series) manufactured after his death were in fact modelled on ones (either

58 Asc. Pis. 11.

59 Plut. Marc.30.5.

60 Cic. Verr. 2.4.40§86.

in private or semi public context) that may have dated to a time more or less contemporary with Marcellus himself.

There is nothing in the archaeological or written records that militates against this view. In fact, there is more than enough evidence that there were competent sculptors working in the city to commission works of such a kind even in Marcellus' lifetime.

Busts of Marcellus, in whatever media, set up in public or private contexts during or just after his lifetime could easily have served as the model for later portraits or even for the reduplication of the wax *imagines* in the event the originals were lost or damaged, or simply required duplication. This could account for the recognition factor by which later commentators, such as Cicero, seem to be able to identify portrait images of famous men, including Marcellus, from diverse portraits in diverse settings.

What can be stated with certainty is that the *coin* bearing the portrait of Marcellus dates to the mid-first century B.C. If the image on the coin was in fact based on a surviving bronze or three dimensional image of whatever medium, this original image could have dated anywhere from the date of Marcellus himself until the time the coin was minted – a period of over 160 years.

6.9.2 Publius Cornelius Scipio

Following the taking of Carthago Nova by Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus in 209 B.C. a series of portraits of Scipio appeared on silver and bronze coins issued by the city in a style different from those of their former Carthaginian rulers (Ill. 40).⁶¹ The head is clean shaven with a close cropped hairline over the brow. His ears are prominent and his nose is large, with a deep-set eye under a brow line which is thick and drawn straight. His mouth has dimpling at the corner which indicates that it is turned down. The fact of the down-turned mouth, the heavily drawn brow-line and deep-set eyes also indicates that this was an attempt to depict the *severitas/gravitas* expression in profile, and strongly suggests it depicts a Roman or someone aping accepted Roman portrait conventions. Its provenance suggests strongly that the coin depicts Scipio Africanus, as Toynbee has suggested. There is also a similar portrait from

⁶¹ The coin portrait is markedly different when compared with the Hellenistic images of the preceding rulers, Hamilcar and Hannibal Barba, also minted in Carthago Nova from the period 229 to approximately 215 B.C.: see Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* 97-98, ill.157-59.

Canusium in Apulia - where Scipio allegedly withdrew following the defeat at Cannae and where he rallied the Roman troops.⁶²

There are similarities between this coin portrait and the portrait of a man on a gold signet ring from Capua signed by Herakleides, now in the Museo Nazionale Archeologico, Naples (Ill. 41)⁶³ - although the figure on the signet ring would appear to be somewhat older. It has been dated by the letters of the inscription to the late third/early second century B.C.⁶⁴ There are ancient literary references to the fact that Scipio's son, Lucius, had a portrait of his father on a signet ring.⁶⁵ If in fact this signet ring is the one belonging to Lucius Scipio, then it would present a date of the early second century B.C.

There are also literary references to the fact that there were many portraits of Scipio dating to a time contemporary with him - for instance, there is said to have been a statue of him in the Capitol as well as an *imago* of him there.⁶⁶ An interesting point about the images of Scipio from the coin and from the signet ring is that both have a prominent, tensed neck tendon - which indicates that the head depicted was not in fact looking straight ahead in the manner in which it would have appeared had the face been in true profile, but indicates that it was turned to the side. As noted above, this would not be necessary if the figure was in fact modelled purely as a coin portrait (or from memory or from a living person). This suggests that the portraits in both instances were modelled from a statue or bust of Scipio - the engraver merely transferring to the die the image he was viewing as the model.

The fact that two coins depicting Scipio bear similar portraits suggests that both were closely modelled on a common source image - and thence on an extant statue. The *imago* or *statua* of him kept in the Capitol could well have served as the model (after all, a bronze statue could

62 R.A.G. Carson and C. H.V. Sutherland, eds., *Essays in Roman Coinage Presented to Harold Mattingly* (London: Oxford University Press, 1956) 41-44, and 52, pl. 3, nos 7(h), 7(l), 7(p); Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* 18, ill. 4.

63 Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* 19.

64 Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik* 132-3, pl. 4 nos. 8-10, pl. 5, nos. 1 and 2.

65 Val. Max. *Mem.* 3.5.1

66 App. *Rom. Hist.* 6.23; Val. Max. *Mem.* 7.15.1; Cic. *Somn.* 10.

serve as a prototype for years and even centuries if it survived).⁶⁷ This could explain why Cicero, in the *Somnium Scipionis*, has Scipio's grandson say that he knew Scipio's countenance in the dream better from his *imagines* than from his actual features in life.⁶⁸ This also strongly suggests that the physiognomic appearance of Roman portrait images or *imagines* was not necessarily a 'photographic' likeness of the person portrayed but an artistic one.

If both these examples date in fact to the early second century B.C. and are of Scipio - then they are powerful evidence that the Roman Republican portrait style with its characteristic facial expression was in vogue from an early date in the middle Republic.

As noted, there are many references in Plautus' plays which indicate that signet rings bearing portraits were popular in the period contemporary with Scipio himself, that wax *imagines* were used at this time, as well as other honorary statues in terracotta and bronze.⁶⁹ If signet rings were modelled from a portrait statue then this indicates that statues could also have served as models for the coin portraits - no matter when they were minted. This fact should not be surprising since if one is going to celebrate a famous ancestor it would have been pointless to 'invent' a portrait when there were still extant statues representing that person commonly known to exist in the city - as was the case with Scipio's *imago*. If a portrait image was simply a fiction, then the patron commissioning the work risked severe criticism from his peers - as was the case when Cicero criticised Metellus for not knowing the *cursus* or *likeness* of his own ancestor, when Cicero plainly knew of portraits existing in the city and could recognise them.⁷⁰

6.9.3 Aulus Postumius Albinus

There are two main types of coin portrait depicting Albinus (either the Consul of 180 and 151

67 Bronze casting technique was highly sophisticated by the sixth century B.C. utilising the *cire-perdue* (lost wax) hollow casting direct method. By the early fifth century the lost wax hollow casting indirect method was also being used, which permitted a master mold to be constructed which could be re-used: S.M. Malone, *Bronze: A 3000 Year Old Tradition* (2003 [cited 25 March 2004]); available from http://www.unc.edu/courses/rometech/publiccontent/arts_and_crafts/Sara_Malone/BRONZES. See also S.A. Hemingway, *How bronze statues were made in classical Antiquity*, *Harvard University Art Museums Gallery Series, No. 19* (Cambridge, MA: The Harvard Art Museum, 1996) 115-17; C.C. Mattusch, *The Fire of Hephaistos: Large Classical Bronzes from North American Collections* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Art Museums, 1996) 20-25.

68 Cic. *Somn.* 10.

69 Plaut. *Pseud.* 56-58, 649, 986, 1000, 1097, 1202; Plaut. *Amph.* 458.

70 Cic. *Att.* 6.1.17.

B.C.; or his great grandson, the Consul of 99 B.C.) issued around 49 B.C. by Decimus Postumius Albinus (Ill. 43.1-2).⁷¹ In both the figure has a heavily lined face with the typical *severitas/gravitas* expression presented in profile.⁷² Similar to the other coin portraits mentioned above, reference to such a physical attribute indicates that the portrait is modelled from a portrait statue or bust. It has been suggested that the person issuing this coin was the adopted son of Albinus, or that it was an earlier ancestor— and there is no reason to doubt he would have possessed an *imago* of this Albinus among his *imagines maiorum*. There is also a marble portrait in the Louvre which has been suggested represents Albinus (Cos 90 B.C.) or Albinus (Cos of 180 and 151 B.C.) (Ill. 28.1-2).⁷³ I do not accept, based on a comparison between the coin portraits and the Louvre portrait, that the bust actually represents Albinus as claimed.⁷⁴

The fact that there is a second variant of Albinus' coin portrait suggests that the two types were modelled on two separate portraits in bronze, marble, or terracotta, which contained slight variations. This, of course was highly possible, particularly if there may have been a bronze or other terracotta statue of Albinus among Decimus Postumius Albinus' *imagines*, or other permanent bronze dedications somewhere else in the city that may well have dated from the time of Albinus himself.

6.9.4 Caius Coelius Caldus

In 51 B.C. Caius Coelius Caldus issued a coin bearing the likeness of his grandfather of the same name (who was consul in 94 B.C.) (Ill. 43).⁷⁵ The image has tufts of hair in locks which are cut short and which expose the brow as a large rectangular space. There is dimpling at the corner of the mouth which indicates it is down-turned and there is a brow line on the forehead. The nose is prominent and the eyebrow ridge appears to slope into the nose - possibly indicating a contraction. The cheeks are hollowed and the cheekbones prominent

71 Sydenham, *The Coinage of the Roman Republic* 158, no. 943, pl.26; Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* no.450 a-c, pl.53.; Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* 21, ill. 7; Schweitzer, *Die Bildniskunst der römischen Republik* figs. 53, 55, 57.

72 A contracted forehead, contracted eyebrow, crows-feet, sunken cheeks, down-turned mouth with dimple mark at the corner of the mouth and a tense tendon in the neck (indicating that the neck is turned).

73 Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik* 128-9, Taf. 3, nos. 7, 8, Taf. 14 nos.7. But see Papini, *Antichi volti della Repubblica*, 2004, p. 459-467 for the argument that it represents Cator Censorinus and dates to the second quarter of the second century B.C..

74 See pp 142-143 *supra*.

75 Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* no. 437, 1a-4b, pl. 52; Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* 21, ill. 8; Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik* 129-31, pl. 4, nos. 2-4, pl. 14, no. 6.

while the eyes are deep set. The neck also possesses a tensed tendon, indicating the head is 'turned'. The features are more softly modelled than that of the Albinus coin cited above. The neck line of the bust portrait is also curved prominently, and this, along with the tensed neck tendon, indicate that it may have been modelled from an *imago* kept either by members of Calvus' family or appearing in some other public context.

6.9.5 Lucius Cornelius Sulla

Sulla, who was consul in 88 B.C. and then Dictator, was commemorated in a coin struck by Quintus Pompeius Rufus in 54 B.C. - whose ancestor, Q. Pompeius Rufus, was Sulla's colleague in the consulship. There are actually three main variants of Sulla's portrait on coins (Ill. 44.1-3) but all with similarities suggested the *severitas/gravitas* expression.⁷⁶ The same observations can be made about the portrait of Q. Pompeius Rufus on the obverse (Ill. 44.4).⁷⁷

As with the Albinus coin portraits, these slight variations in the image of Sulla's coin portraits suggests that there may have been different extant portraits in bronze, marble or some other material to be found at Rome which could have served as prototypes - and this is not implausible given Sulla's rather extraordinary career. It is more than probable that there were still many extant portraits of Sulla existing in the city at the time that this coin was minted. It could be suggested that the more lined face variant was modelled on a portrait which was made during his lifetime, while the other, more softly modelled face could have been modelled on a portrait made after he had died in 79 B.C (as a more Hellenising type), or possibly even during his lifetime, depending on the context in which such a portrait may have been commissioned, or on the taste of the person commissioning it, or the context in which it was displayed.

⁷⁶ Schweitzer, *Die Bildniskunst der römischen Republik* 67-68; Sydenham, *The Coinage of the Roman Republic* 150, no. 908, pl. 25; Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* no. 434, 1, pl. 52; Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* 22, ill.9; Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik* 131-2, pl. 4, nos 5-7. All three variants have hair with distinct locks - the first type possessing a heavily lined face with forehead lines, crows-feet, sunken cheeks with two lines, raised cheekbones and deep set eyes - features indicating that the eyebrows and forehead of the image (if viewed frontally) would be contracted in the *severitas/gravitas* expression. The mouth has down turned dimpling and the neck tendon is tensed indicating that the head is turned to the left. Again the tensed neck tendon indicates this image was modelled from an extant portrait bust. The other variant of Sulla's portrait is more softly modelled, although the lines are still present on the cheeks and on the forehead and at the mouth. Again the line delineating the termination of the neck line is drawn sharply and is curved in a manner which suggests a bronze cast bust - not a marble statue or a free standing statue portrait.

⁷⁷ Sydenham, *The Coinage of the Roman Republic* 150, no. 908 pl. 25; Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* no. 434, pl. 52; Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* 23, ill. 12; Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* 28-29, ill. 22 & 23.

6.9.6 Caius Antius Restio

This coin bears a portrait of Restio who was Tribune of the plebs in 72 B.C. and was minted by his descendant in approximately 47 B.C. (Ill. 45). This portrait maximises the effect of the *severitas/gravitas* expression in profile.⁷⁸

6.10 Portraits of other 'identified' individuals

6.10.1 Cicero

Similar observations to those made in relation to the portraits already discussed can be made in reference to the portrait of Cicero from the Uffizi Museum in Florence⁷⁹ (Ill. 46) which also exists in several other copies, such as the one in the *Sala dei filosofi* of the Capitoline Museum (Ill. 47)⁸⁰ and in the Museo Chiaramonti in the Vatican (Ill. 48).⁸¹ Despite the Hellenising style found in Augustan portraits of Cicero, even the faces of these portraits still bear the characteristic *severitas/gravitas* expression: down-turned mouth, contracted eyebrows, lined and contracted forehead, crows-feet, etc., – although overlaid with the 'pathos' formula familiar from Hellenistic portraiture, such as slightly parted lips. This shows that even when there was a conscious application of Hellenising style at the time of Augustus and the early principate, the old style of Republican *severitas/gravitas* facial expression had not disappeared, but was adapted to, or was applied to this Hellenistic style.

Portraits like those of Cicero have important ramifications for the development of Roman Republican portrait style - because they indicate that the form of Republican portraiture characterised by the *severitas/gravitas* expression did not disappear at the end of the Republic, but was adapted to meet new social and political circumstances. Even some portraits of Augustus himself show hints of the *severitas/gravitas* expression, despite the

78 He has short cropped receding hair over a large square forehead, contracted eyebrow marks at the nose bridge and at the corner of the eye, and contracted forehead marked by forehead lines. The cheeks are hollowed and the cheekbones are prominent. The mouth has a definite down turn at the corner and there is dimpling in the skin to heighten this effect. The hair is created by individuated locks cut in longer strands.

79 Inv. 1914 n.393, Uffizi Museum, Florence; Schweitzer, *Die Bildniskunst der römischen Republik* figs. 143 and 47; F. P. Arata, *Il Ritratto romano nelle collezioni dei Musei Capitolini - età repubblicana* (Roma: Fratelli Palombi Srl, 1991) 19, fig. 7.

80 Capilone Museum, Inv. 589, H.36 cm; Schweitzer, *Die Bildniskunst der römischen Republik* ills. 138 & 39; Giuliani, *Bildnis Und Botschaft* 230 and 328, Abb. 64.

81 Schweitzer, *Die Bildniskunst der römischen Republik* figs. 117, 24, 25.

overwhelming Classicising elements contained therein (Ill. 89.2-3).

6.10.2 Pompey

The most obvious use of the *severitas/gravitas* expression while utilising Hellenistic stylistic elements can be found in the stone and coin portraits of Pompey the Great. Of particular interest is the marble head in the *Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek*, Copenhagen (Ill. 17).⁸² Pompey's features are modelled softly and the surface is polished, although not highly so. Pompey's hair is drawn by large triangular locks with a central dividing line and while some of the locks expose the forehead, he bears the characteristic anastole 'crest' which is drawn from the imagery of Alexander the Great (Ills. 49-50).⁸³ Of course Pompey had conquered Syria and the Seleukid kingdom and so in this sense he claimed to have emulated Alexander - and this may be why he drew on typical Alexandrian imagery.⁸⁴ However, the forehead still bears the crease marks typical of the *severitas/gravitas* facial patterning - the forehead being drawn inwards as if contracted. There is a similar treatment of the eyebrows, the two inward sloping lines where the eyebrows end over the nose bridge being almost imperceptible - although still present - and there are crows feet at the corners of the eyes. Because the features are much softer and there is a less severe drawing of the contraction of the forehead and eyebrows, the portrait has (*to us*) rather a 'surprised' look, as opposed to the strict *severitas/gravitas* expression typical of mainstream Roman Republican portraiture.

This piece has been dated to around the time of Marcus Licinius Crassus Frugi, since it was

82 Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, 733; Poulsen and Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, *Les Portraits Romains* Nr. 1, ill. 1.2; Giuliani, *Bildnis und Botschaft* 56 and 200, Abb. 1-3; Boschung, "Überlegungen zum Liciniergrab," 257; Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* 25, ill. 18, 19; F.E. Brown, "Magni Nominis Umbrae," in *Studies presented to David Moore Robinson on his seventieth birthday* (Saint Louis: Washington University, 1951) 761-64. See also the polychrome portrait of Pompey in Stuttgart: Württembergisches Landesmuseum 65/7.

83 D. Michel, *Alexander als Vorbild für Pompeius, Caesar und Marcus Antonius*, Archäologische Untersuchungen, vol. 94, Collection Latomus (Bruxelles: Latomus revue d'études latines, 1967); E. La Rocca, "Pompeo Magno 'Novus Neptunus'," *BCAR* 92 (1987-88); Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* 42. This identification with Alexander is also evident in his cognomen magnus. Paris, Louvre, MA 436, J.J. Bernoulli, *Die erhaltenen Darstellungen Alexanders des Großen* (1905) 21, Abb. 1 Taf. 1 a; K. Gebauer, *AM* 63/64 (1938/39) 96, K53; G.M.A. Richter, *Portraits* Vol. III, 255 Nr. 1 a Abb. 1733-1739. T. Hölscher, *Ideal und Wirklichkeit in den Bildnissen Alexanders des Großen*, Abh. Heidelberg (1971) 10.30 Taf. 3-4. Fittschen, *Griechisches Porträt* 24, 116 Taf. 65.

84 His conscious emulation of Alexander's traits - such as his hairstyle and melting gaze are referred to by Plutarch in his *Life of Pompey*: *Plut. Pomp.* 2. See Poulsen, *Catalogue of Ancient Sculpture in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek* 414, no. 597.

said to have been discovered in the tomb of the Licinii near Rome in 1885.⁸⁵ This man was Consul in A.D. 27 and he named his son Cnaeus Pompeius Magnus to show his descent from Pompey through his mother. Hence, the portrait combines stylistic features typical of the Augustan and Julio-Claudian periods, such as the classicising elements of the overall form and plastically rendered features - but at the same time incorporates the *severitas/gravitas* expression typical of Roman Republican portraiture. The mixing of Hellenistic style, Alexandrian imagery with *severitas/gravitas* facial expression means that Pompey's image communicates diverse messages on various conscious and subconscious levels to diverse audiences.

The portrait in Copenhagen is very close to the first series of coins minted in Spain by Pompey's eldest son, Gnaeus, in about 46-45 B.C. and then later by his other son, Sextus, minted in around 38 B.C. (Ill. 51.1-3).⁸⁶ This suggests the marble bust and the coins may well have been modelled on earlier portraits depicting Pompey that may still have existed in the city - although the marble bust is more heavily Hellenised in appearance due to its softer, polished surface treatment possibly stemming from the fashion of the early Principate.

Regarding coins bearing Pompey's portrait, Hellenising elements could well be expected due to his political involvement in the Eastern Mediterranean and his conquest of what was left of the Hellenistic kingdoms (except Egypt). This placed him in Greek eyes (and in his own propaganda terms) on a par with Alexander and this fact he was keen to emphasise to his equals back in Rome. This was especially so with the portraits introduced by his sons after his death where *severitas/gravitas* expression is grafted onto a style reminiscent of Hellenistic kings, and is in contrast to the portraits of Caesar, which in their earliest forms previous to his assassination, appear to eschew the use of overt Hellenistic elements in the portrayal, emphasising instead the Republican facial expression communicating *severitas/gravitas*. Politically, Caesar claimed to be restoring the constitution and *libertas* of the *res publica* after it had allegedly fallen to the *dominatio* of a *factio* led by Pompey. Thus, Caesar, by overtly using the *severitas/gravitas* expression for his portraits may have been highlighting his

85 Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* 25-6, nn. 11 & 12; Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* 42; Vessberg, *Studien zur kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik* pl. 5, no.3. See also Kragelund, P., M. Moltesen, and J.S. Ostergaard. *The Licinian Tomb. Fact or Fiction? Meddelelser fra Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek Copenhagen*. Copenhagen: Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, 2003.

86 Sydenham, *The Coinage of the Roman Republic* 173-4, nos 1036 -9, pl. 27; Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* no. 470, pl. 55; Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* 24-28, ill. 15; A.J.N Wilson, *Emigration from Italy in the Republican Age of Rome* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1966) 88-93, and 105-11.

Republican moral status (Ill.s 10-14)⁸⁷ as opposed to Pompey's image which evokes Hellenism and the portrait style of the last Hellenistic monarchs.

6.11 The portraits from Delos

The group of portrait heads from Delos have played an important role in the debate concerning the origins of Roman portrait style due to the island's history. The island was ceded by the Roman Senate to the Athenians in 166 B.C. who then established a colony on the island. It was sacked by Mithridates VI in 88 B.C. and later by pirates in 69 B.C. During this period (166-69 B.C.) Delos was a busy trading port and commercial centre with a fairly mixed population of various nationalities - although predominantly 'Greek' and 'Roman'. That the Romans had a large presence in Delos is confirmed by the fact they had their own market forum, which we call the 'Agora of the Italians' and from various inscriptions which show that Roman merchants and their families were well established on the island.⁸⁸ The fact that Delos lost commercial significance after 69 B.C. would also seem to offer the archaeologist a *terminus ante quem* in dating most of the sculptures of the island.

Somewhere in this period (166-69 B.C.) a style of portraiture, different from the 'Classical' and 'Hellenistic' style portraits, appeared in Delos - characterised by representations of mature or older men, short cropped hair, sometimes a receding hairline, with what has been

87 This may hint at the fact that on one level the harsh, more lineal *severitas/gravitas* expression was considered, at least in political terms during the mid-first century B.C., to constitute the truly Roman, traditional portrait form, communicating the true virtues of the Republic; whereas the more Hellenising (and perhaps 'cultured') forms blending the *severitas/gravitas* expression may have come to be perceived as more aristocratic, elitist, or as emulating the Hellenistic Kings too consciously. For successful generals who fought in the East, the adoption of such a blended style may well communicate their superiority to the Hellenistic Kings, but at Rome such stylistic elements may well have been perceived as slightly 'un-Roman' and 'un-Republican' given that such Hellenistic elements were undoubtedly Greek and undoubtedly royal in inspiration. This indicates that choice of overall style for a portrait may have come to serve a highly politicized purpose, used to distinguish between, perhaps, those who wished to portray themselves more as 'Republican traditionalists' from those that projected themselves as 'senatorial elitists'. The irony can only be remarked upon that a truly aristocratic patrician such as Caesar would choose to utilize a harsher *severitas/gravitas* expression for his portraiture that seemed to communicate and embody his Republican virtues despite his actions in the civil war. It may be, too, that the early portraits of Octavian reflect this to some degree (as the portrait in the Stanza degli Imperatori, Musei Capitolini) he not assuming a more classicizing style for his portraiture until he had become 'Augustus' and wished to elevate himself beyond, or distinguish himself from the Republican *nobiles* milieu through a political and social programme which included artistic regeneration.

88 It appears that the difference between 'Italians' and 'Romans' was not distinguished on Delos, both being called Romans; the '*rhomaioi*' were mostly Romans and Latins, not Italians from southern Italy as once thought: E.S. Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* (Berkeley, London: University of California Press, 1984) 303-04 and n.83; R.R.R. Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993) 126 and n. 9; Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits* 22-23. Of course after 90 B.C. when all Italians south of Cisalpine Gaul were granted Roman citizenship, this becomes of no consequence.

described as 'harsh-looking' or 'veristic' faces. Just who these portraits represented, where and how the style developed, and when they date precisely has become a matter of academic dispute.

It is noteworthy that inscriptions indicate that of the approximately 70 private, non-royal inscriptions evidencing statues set up in Delos throughout this period, almost one half were of people bearing Roman or Italian names. Of the approximately 24 actual surviving portraits from Delos, about half of these are in the style described immediately above. This in itself strongly suggests on the balance of probabilities that the images concerned were of Romans or Italians.⁸⁹ The earliest evidence of a dated statue depicting a Roman is that of Scipio Aemilianus dedicated by another Roman in 141/139 B.C.⁹⁰

Yet for only six of these portraits is there external evidence which supports the conclusion that they actually represented Romans: the first one, A4186 (Ill. 55.1-3)⁹¹ actually came from the *Agora of the Italians*; three more, A2912 (Ill. 53.1-3),⁹² A4189 (Ill. 58.1-3)⁹³ and NM1828 (Ill. 64.1-2),⁹⁴ came from the *House of the Diadoumenos* near to the harbour,⁹⁵ which is

89 P. Roussel and M. Launey, *Inscriptions de Délos*, vol. IV, *Délos* (Paris: Exploration de Délos Archéologique, 1934) no. 1842.

90 Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits* 126-27; C. Michalowski, ed., *Les portraits antiques: les portraits hellénistique et romaines*, vol. XIII, *Délos* (Paris: Exploration Archéologique de Délos, 1932) 39, fig. 23-24 pls XXVII-XXVIII.

91 A.F. Stewart, *Greek Sculpture: An Exploration*, 2 vols. (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1990) 228, pl. 841; Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits* 127, n.15; Φ. Ζαφειροπούλου, *Δηλός: Μαρτυρίες από τα μουσειακά εκθέματα* (Αθήνα: Εκδόσεις Αδάμ., 1998) 165, 27, cat. no. 164; J. Chamonard, *Le Quartier du Théâtre: Étude sur l'habitation délienne à l'époque hellénistique*, 3 vols., *Exploration Archéologique de Délos*, Fasc. 8 (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1924) 426.

92 J. Marcadé, *Au Musée de Délos, Étude sur la sculpture hellénistique en ronde bosse découverte dans l'île, Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome; Fasc. 215* (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1969) 273, 308, 12, 72, 73; P. Moreno and Libreria dello Stato di Italia, *Scultura Ellenistica* (Roma: Istituto poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato Libreria dello Stato, 1994) 679; M. Kreeb, *Untersuchungen zur figürlichen Ausstattung delischer Privathäuser* (Chicago: Ares Publishers, 1988) 160, nos. S7.9; E. Buschor, *Το ελληνιστικό πορτραίτο* (Αθήνα: μτφρ. Γ. Δοντάς, 1995) 237; Φ. Ζαφειροπούλου, *Δηλός: Μαρτυρίες από τα μουσειακά εκθέματα* (Αθήνα: Εκδόσεις Αδάμ., 1998) 167, 277-278; Cat. no. 169; Michalowski, ed., *Les portraits antiques: les portraits hellénistique et romaines* 14-17, esp. n.4, and pls.XII-XIII.

93 Marcadé, *Au Musée de Délos, Étude sur la sculpture hellénistique en ronde bosse découverte dans l'île* 104 and fn.1-2, 273 fn.3, 372-73; Kreeb, *Untersuchungen zur figürlichen Ausstattung delischer Privathäuser* 1590-160, nos. S7.4-5; Michalowski, ed., *Les portraits antiques: les portraits hellénistique et romaines* 17-32, pls XIV-XIX.

94 Marcadé, *Au Musée de Délos, Étude sur la sculpture hellénistique en ronde bosse découverte dans l'île* 279, 86, 308, 12 n. 4, 13, 16, 18 n. 2, 23, and pl. LXXII; Michalowski, ed., *Les portraits antiques: les portraits hellénistique et romaines* 46-49, fig 32, and pls XXXIII-XXXV.

95 The house is known for its size (see Kreeb, *Untersuchungen zur figürlichen Ausstattung delischer Privathäuser* 155.) and for the extensive use of marble decoration and the number of statues found there: B. Lundgreen, "A Female Portrait from Delos," in *Ancient Portraiture: Image and Message*, ed. Tobias Fischer-Hansen and John Lund, *ActHyp 4* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculum Press, 1992) 61; See also Michalowski, ed., *Les portraits antiques: les portraits hellénistique et romaines* 11, fig. 6, and pls. X-XI.

suspected to have been owned by a Roman merchant.⁹⁶ Two more, A7258 (Ill. 62.1-3) and A7259 (Ill. 63.1-3), were found in a house in the Skardhana quarter in which there was a clay seal of the Roman, C. Aufidius, who was known to have been resident in Delos.⁹⁷

What is remarkable about this group of the portraits is that they all have a similarity in their facial expression no matter what the precise deconstruction of their stylistic elements: they represent older, mature men, with short cropped hair and receding hairlines, contracted lined foreheads (except in the case of one or two where this is not entirely clear since the foreheads have been damaged), contracted eyebrows and down-turned mouths. Generally the faces have manifold crease marks, frown lines and wrinkles. The facial patterning of these pieces (discussed below) are all in accordance with the characteristics noted above for communicating the precise Roman values of *severitas* and *gravitas*.

The provenances of A7258, A7259, NM1828, A2912 and A4189 and A4186, as stated above, are sites which have been connected with the presence of Romans and this further supports the conclusion that these pieces in fact were portraits of Roman citizens. This, combined with the facts that they are among the twelve portraits bearing the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression and they are dated within the period of Roman involvement in the island, suggests that they are in fact representative of a Roman style of portraiture introduced to the island. It can further be concluded that where a portrait image bears such a facial expression it is highly likely that it represents an individual who, if not a Roman citizen, was someone aspiring to communicate Romanised values to their intended audience.

In order to support the above hypothesis, it is first necessary to present detailed descriptions of each piece - which are listed in Appendix 4.

A2136 is a portrait of a mature man; the contraction of the forehead and the eyebrows, and the slight downward curve of the mouth, replicate the patterning of what I have termed the *severitas* and *gravitas* expression (Ill. 52.1-3). As noted in Appendix 4, the eyebrow contraction lines over the nose base are clumsily drawn and are un-anatomical - appearing as though they were inserted as an after-thought. This could indicate that the piece is an early

⁹⁶ Also found in the house was the head of a woman, A4196; see Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits* 127, esp. n. 15.

⁹⁷ Michalowski, ed., *Les portraits antiques: les portraits hellénistique et romaines* 11-14.

one and that the artist was not accustomed to producing such a facial expression in terms of portraiture - or by contrast, it could merely indicate that the artist was not absolutely skilled or that the portrait is a reworking of an earlier piece.

A2912 is undoubtedly of a 'middle aged' man. In modern terms the effect is of a concerned and serious look - in terms of Roman physiognomy he has the contracted eyebrows and forehead as well as down-turned mouth which communicate *gravitas* and *severitas* (Ill. 53.1-3). As noted above, the house where this piece was found (the cistern of the *House of the Diadoumenos*) is suspected to have been owned by a Roman merchant. It is possible that the portrait represented someone connected with the owner of the house or his family.⁹⁸

A4142 is more perfunctory and less organic in its structure (Ill. 54). The portrait is of a younger man, possibly in his mid-to late thirties. The down-turned mouth, the lined forehead and the contracted eyebrows again indicate *severitas* and *gravitas* - although not as markedly as in the portraits of the more mature men noted above. It is curious piece because the head is associated with a himation clad torso - which if so, strongly suggests that it is a portrait of a Greek. It could be that the person presented was a Greek member of the community who wished to portray himself with the facial expression associated with the Romans (for political or social reasons) or that it is a portrait of a Roman married to a traditional Greek form of presentation - not unlike the nude athlete statues with Roman portrait heads also found on Delos and elsewhere (e.g. NM1828). The third possibility is that the head has been wrongly attributed to the torso.

A4186 appears (on a subjective level) to represent a man of very early middle age - possibly in his early forties (Ill. 55.1-3). The contracted forehead and eyebrows and down-turned mouth indicating *severitas* and *gravitas*. The piece is softly modelled and lightly polished. The lips are drawn ever-so-slightly apart. Given its provenance from the *Agora of the Italians* supports the conclusion that it is a portrait of a Roman.

A4187 is generally more softly modelled than the examples already described (Ill. 56.1-3). It is indeed more difficult to assess in terms of its physiognomy and facial expression. The contraction of the brow and forehead is 'lighter' than in some of the other models discussed and it has much similarity with a Hellenistic royal portrait depicting *pathos* - thus it could be

98 Roussel and Launey, *Inscriptions de Délos*, no 1688.

classified as an iconistic image in the Hellenistic tradition, such as the lips being slightly parted. However, the portrait represents a man of early middle age and the general facial expression is one of concerned weightiness or heaviness. In Roman physiognomic terms, the contracted eyebrows, down-turned mouth and frowning forehead impart to the portrait an expression that is reminiscent of *severitas*, and *gravitas*.

A4188 represents what appears to be an older man and has a concerned, almost 'pained' expression – although this could be exaggerated due to the damage it has sustained (Ill. 57.1-3). The contracted eyebrows and forehead and the down-turned mouth are consonant with the Roman physiognomic patterning for the typical *severitas/gravitas* facial expression, though it is done in a highly dramatic way. This portrait may blend Hellenistic stylistic elements (such as the slightly parted lips) to which has been added the patterning of the *severitas/gravitas* expression

A4189 represents what appears to be an older, mature man (Ill. 58.1-3). The general expression to a modern contemporary viewer is one of heaviness, almost sadness; however, in Roman physiognomic terms, the contracted eyebrows, down-turned mouth and frowning forehead set on the face of an older man suggests *severitas* and *gravitas*. The view that it is communicating Roman values is supported by the context in which it was found in the *House of the Diadoumenos* which, as stated above, is suspected to have been owned by a Roman merchant.

A4190 depicts what appears to be a younger man, while the 'Hellenising traits' of the soft modelling of the features would seem to militate against it being representative of a Roman (Ill. 59.1-3). However, when compared with the physical features of the works described above, which represent much older men, this could explain why the usual *severitas/gravitas* expression and its characteristic physiognomic features were not so clearly distinguished. Overall, all the elements of the *severitas/gravitas* expression of the face are present, if rather incipient and much more softly modelled - contracted eyebrows and forehead, and down-turned mouth. However, given the strongly Hellenising overall presentation, it is difficult to conclude whether this represents a Roman or not. If not, it is someone who has been influenced by the Roman *severitas/gravitas* portrait style.

A4191 possibly that of a man possibly in his early middle age (Ill. 60). The lined facial expression is one of heaviness and seriousness, the contraction of the eyebrows and forehead,

as well as the down-turned expression of the mouth indicate *severitas* and *gravitas* typical of Roman facial expression.

A4193 appears to represent an older, more mature man (Ill. 61.1-3). The features are rendered in a much more linear and abstract style. Given the contraction lines of the forehead and the eyebrows as well as the down-turned mouth, I would conclude that the facial expression clearly communicates *severitas* and *gravitas* - although the artist was apparently less skilled (or less interested) in detailing anatomy as an organic, plastic whole, concentrating on the facial expression itself.

Neither A7258 (Ill. 62.1-3) nor of A7259 (Ill. 63.1-3) are of 'young men' - but noticeably older and 'care worn', their features expressing a weightiness more expressive and reminiscent of the *severitas/gravitas* expression - which tend to support the conclusion that these pieces, too, are portrait images of Romans transposed onto a typically Greek athlete torso. This pieces, as already noted, were found in a house in the Skardhana region associated with a Roman merchant, C. Aufidius.

Despite the damage to the forehead of A7529 the forehead and upper nose, the portrait represents what appears to be an older man, ironically attached to the upper torso of a younger, athletic man (Ill. 63.1-3). The downward turn of the mouth and the remaining lines on the forehead indicating a frown, as well as the receding hairline and the general heaviness of the facial expression, suggest the *severitas* and *gravitas* facial expression. The face contrasts with the body (what is left of it) which appears undoubtedly as that of a younger man or athlete. This piece, as already noted, was found in a house in the Skardhana region associated with a Roman merchant, C. Aufidius.

The features of NM1828 are not those described above as being typically expressive of Roman values (Ill. 64.1-2). While there is a slight hint of heaviness in the features, the bust is undoubtedly of a younger man (though not young) and there are incipient lines in the forehead and the down-turned lines around the mouth. The eyebrows themselves do not appear to have the contraction marks typical of most of the other portraits already discussed. Yet the hint of heaviness of the expression is apparent in the portrait from the modelling of the features already mentioned. The shaved head, the prominent ears and the implicit structure and expression of the face strongly suggest that it is echoing traditional Roman values (Ill. 64.2).

It may have been that the type of statue here represented, being of a naked athlete, was not one typically used to portray Romans - and since it was a 'novelty' the artist may not have been absolutely happy about installing a typically Roman face on it. An alternative explanation may have been that the person it portrays may have deliberately chosen a more youthful presentation for himself and therefore less emphasis on the *severitas/gravitas* style of expression given the context of the body to which the head is attached. Yet another hypothesis is that it could have been a dedication set up by someone else (a non-Roman?) other than the person it portrays, and hence, it only avers to the *severitas/gravitas* style by which the Romans preferred to depict themselves, preferring instead a more fully Hellenising effect.

Despite this, the marrying of traditional Roman facial expression to a nude athlete statue should not be considered a conundrum. It would appear that the genre is a deliberate attempt to convey explicit messages to diverse audiences. To the Greek audience, a nude athlete statue was particularly utilised to 'heroize' the Hellenistic kings - conveying precise messages concerning their power and position.⁹⁹ The typical *severitas/gravitas* patterning of the facial expression is communicating Roman values. By combining the two, the work is a potent statement concerning the power and position of Roman citizens during the late Republic.¹⁰⁰

This statue comes from the house of the Diadoumenos, which is suspected to have been owned by a Roman, and it may be that it portrays a one-time Roman owner of the house who wished to have himself shown in this athletic style echoing the copy of the statue of the Diadoumenos which was also found in the house.¹⁰¹ Equally, it may have been a dedication from the *demos* at Delos or some other Greek *polis* to a Roman patron.

There are two other pieces of evidence which suggests that NM1828 may be a Roman - the first is the fact that there is a naked athlete statue, also from Delos, which is known to represent a Roman, C. Ofellius, because of the dedicatory inscription (Ill. 65).¹⁰² It was carved by two Greek artists, Timarchides and Demetrios, who came from a family of sculptors who

⁹⁹ See Chapter 10, 304-309 and Appendix 3 *infra*.

¹⁰⁰ I am reminded of the reply Cineas gave to Pyrrhus of Epirus upon his return from Rome, that to him, the 'senate appeared as an assembly of Kings': Plut. *Pyrr.* 19.5.

¹⁰¹ The fact that the piece was found in the cistern of the house has rarely been commented upon - however, if it was a Roman portrait combined with a typically Hellenistic royal formula (nude athlete) which conveyed a potent message to a Greek audience concerning their rulers, it is plausible that the choice of the cistern for its disposal was not accidental, and that it was put there during the sack by Mithridates VI in 88 B.C. The other possibility was that it was put there deliberately by the owner of the house to protect it.

¹⁰² A 4340 Delos Museum; *CIL* 1688.

were known to have made statues at Rome.¹⁰³ Sadly, in this instance, the one crucial and conclusive factor, namely its head, is missing.

Another piece of evidence which suggest that NM1828 represents a Roman are the damaged upper torso portraits of a naked athlete type from the Skardhana region, A7259 and A7258 (Ills. 62 and 63), which bear the typical *severitas/gravitas* expression (discussed above) attached to an athlete torsos in the Hellenistic manner. Furthermore, as already stated, these two pieces were found in a house which contained clay seals bearing the name of C. Aufidius, strongly suggesting that they, too, are Roman.

6.12 Nude statues with Roman portrait heads

An interesting genre which has often confounded description and analysis, concerns those portraits of the nude body type, already mentioned in the context of the portraits discovered on Delos, which join heads in the Roman Republican portrait style with typically idealised youthful, athletic bodies. However, when one considers what has already been said above, concerning Roman attitudes to physiognomic communication and the utilisation of a Roman portrait style by Roman client kings, these works do not present that much of a difficulty.

It would appear from the frequency with which these images survive (as those found at Delos and elsewhere attest) that they were popular from the time of the Republic onwards and they appear in two types: the first involving martial imagery, and thence referring to heroizing or divinising aspects of the portrayed in the manner of Hellenistic kings derived from prototypes of Alexander; and the second where the individual is depicted as an athlete, in the mode of the Apoxyomenos, again an image favoured by Hellenistic kings to represent their prowess and physical strength, on occasion drawing analogies with divine imagery drawn from representations of Apollo, Hermes or Hercules.

A good example of the martial type is the 'Tivoli General', found in the substructure of the Temple of Hercules at Tivoli, said to be made from Greek marble and now in the Palazzo Massimo Museum in Rome (Ill. 66).¹⁰⁴ The torso of this piece depicts an athletic, young

¹⁰³ Michalowski, ed., *Les portraits antiques: les portraits hellénistique et romaines* 21; J. Marcadé, *Recueil des signatures des sculpteurs grecques*, 2 vols. (Athens: L'Ecole Française à Athens, 1953 and 1957) 41, 107-8, 31-2, 34; J. J. Pollitt, *Art in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986) 75, 163 and 72. Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* 129.

¹⁰⁴ Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* 53, ill. 35.

body, draped about with a military cloak – hence it is not completely nude. The right arm, lower right leg, and top of the head are missing, and the left hand is damaged. The weight of the torso is placed on the left leg, while what is left of the right leg appears relaxed and slightly forward. It appears from the musculature of the right shoulder, that the right arm was extended or raised in some way. Buttressing the lower left side of the statue is a carved military cuirass in the Roman style,¹⁰⁵ which in conjunction with the cloak makes it appear the statue represents a Roman general or military commander.

What is remarkable about the statue is the face. In contrast to the idealised youthful appearance of the torso, the face is that of an older, mature man.¹⁰⁶ In this instance the piece is averring, not to the athletic prowess of the man it portrays, but to heroizing or divinizing aspects of the individual as a successful general or *imperator* in the manner adopted by the Hellenistic kings – the nude heroic body parallel to the imagery of Zeus/Jupiter.

The overall stance and form of this piece can be compared with a similar statue found on a funeral monument on the Via Appia (Ill. 67).¹⁰⁷ This statue depicts an almost completely nude youthful, athletic body, whose stance is actually a mirror reflection of that of the Tivoli General, in that the weight rests on its right leg, while the left leg is relaxed and held slightly back. There is a cloak draped over the left shoulder which falls under the armpit, over the forearm to the back. There is a military cuirass buttressing the right leg. Unfortunately the face of this piece is completely damaged and cannot be made out.

105 Compare the cuirass from the relief from the Piazza della Consolazione in the Museo del Palazzo dei Conservatori, Rome, dating to the second-first centuries B.C. See G. Picard, "Les Fouilles de la Via Del Mare et les débuts de l'art triomphale romain," *MÉFR* 71 (1959). Also, T. Schäfer, "Die Siegesdenkmal von Kapitol," in *Die Numidier: Reiter und Königer nördlich der Sahara*, ed. H. G. Horn and C.B. Rügers (Cologne: 1979); T. Hölscher, "Römische Siegesdenkmäler der späten Republik," in *Taenia: Festschrift für R. Hampe*, ed. H. Cahn (Mainz: 1980); E. Kinzl, *Der römische Triumph siegesfeiern im antiken Rom* (Munich: 1980); T. Hölscher, *Historische Reliefs in Kaiser Augustus und die verlorene Republik* (Mainz: 1988) 384-86; Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* 41, fig. 22.

106 The face is heavily wrinkled and turns slightly to the right. The hair is short cropped, revealing the forehead as a large rectangular area (although the top of the hairline is missing). The forehead is traversed by several crease lines which curve over the eyes from above the temples, to dip down at the centre of the forehead over the nose bridge. There are bags depicted under the eyes and several crows-feet at each corner of the eyes. The eyebrows are curved, but are drawn in towards the nose bridge, each being delimited by two short outwardly diagonal lines which terminate under the first forehead wrinkle – thereby indicating the contraction of the eyebrows and forehead. The lower sinus lines are deeply cut and curve down to bracket the mouth, the line of the mouth is drawn closed and there is dimpling at each corner of the mouth, thereby heightening the downward turn of the mouth. The cheeks are slightly hollowed, but crossed with downward curving wrinkles.

107 S. Walker, *Greek and Roman Portraits* (London: British Museum Press, 1995) 79, ill. 55. See D.E.E. Kleiner and F.S. Kleiner "A Heroic Funerary Relief on the Via Appia", *AA* (1975) 250-265.

Another example is the marble statue from the Museo Archeologico, Chieti (Ill. 68).¹⁰⁸ The Chieti figure is also completely nude except for a military cloak which is draped over his left shoulder, comes under his left arm-pit and flows over his left forearm. He also has a sword belt over his right shoulder. His right arm is missing, but he stands with his weight on his right leg while his left is bent and slightly moved back. The head of the statue is turned slightly to his left, and is characteristic of a mature man with the *severitas/gravitas* expression.

An example of the draped nude athlete type is to be found in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen (Ill. 69) however, this one is lacking its head.¹⁰⁹ Similar to the face of the Tivoli General (but not as lined) is that of a nude athlete in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Chieti. It has several fold marks traversing the forehead, crows feet, a deeply cut lower sinus line which curves down and brackets the mouth (Ill. 70). There are short vertical lines delineate the beginning of the eyebrows on either side of the nose bridge, which terminate just below the first forehead mark – thereby indicating a contraction of the eyebrows and forehead. A bronze example is in the Vatican,¹¹⁰ which also possesses the same basic facial patterning communicating *severitas/gravitas* (Ill. 71).

While these statues may appear as a strange contradiction conjoining forms taken from Hellenistic Royal imagery with the traditional facial expression of *severitas/gravitas*, the combined effect is a powerful statement in political terms. Far from being ‘grotesque pastiches’ of various styles created for the vulgar taste of a Roman patron, they would seem to manifest a conscious choice by the patron to deliberately mix the relevant messages to the intended audience. Such statues basically proclaim the portrayed in terms of Hellenistic royal imagery – thus putting them in the viewers mind into the same category as the kings themselves. But the addition of the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression, consonant with the values of the ruling élite at Rome, is in effect putting every member of the Roman élite (and by extension other members of the Roman community) in a superior level to the kings themselves. The propaganda and social comment that such portraits conveyed to both Greek and Roman audiences was highly sophisticated.

108 Zadoks-Josephus Jitta, *Ancestral Portraiture in Rome and the Art of the Last Century of the Republic*.

109 HN 1657, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen.

110 See Chapter Seven, p. 193 *infra*.

6.13 Portraits of the non-élites: Plebeian classes: 'ingenui' and 'liberti'

The facial patterning that communicate *severitas* and *gravitas* are also found on a large number of portraits that are known to come from what has been ostensibly designated or identified as tombs of 'freedmen' (*liberti*) at Rome. These have been discussed at length by others.¹¹¹ However, there have been suggestions that the type of grave monument was not solely the reserve of nouveaux riches *liberti* but was a form utilised by any person with requisite wealth and position; this included wealthier members of the plebeian classes such as businessmen, tradesmen and merchants.¹¹² There appear to be two basic types of funerary portrait statues: those depicting persons in full length poses, and those that are upper torso representations only. A select few of these I discuss immediately below.

An excellent example of the full body type is that taken from a funerary relief of a man and his wife from the Via Statilia, now in the Museo Centrale Montemartini, Musei Capitolini, Rome (Ill. 72).¹¹³ This relief has two full length figures standing side by side, a man and a woman. The man wears a tunic and toga, draped in the early togate style,¹¹⁴ which is typically dated to the pre-Augustan period. The woman is clothed in a tunic and palla. She also holds her left arm across her waist, while the right arm is bent under the chin in the *pudicitia* pose. The heads of both figures are turned slightly to their right. The face of the woman is a generalised representation, with smooth, unlined features. The male head, however, is in the

111 E. Gazda, "Etruscan Influence in the Funerary Reliefs of Late Republican Rome: A Study of Vernacular Portraiture," *ANRW* 1.4 (Berlin 1973); P. Zanker, "Grabreliefs römischer Freigelassener," *JDAI* 90 (1975); H. G. Frenz, *Untersuchungen Zu Den Frühen Römischen Grabreliefs* (Mainz: 1977); D.E.E. Kleiner, *Roman Group Portraiture: The Funerary Reliefs of the Late Republic and Early Empire* (New York: 1977); H. R. Goette, *Studien Zu Römischen Togadarstellungen* (Mainz: 1990); L. Hackworth Petersen, "The Baker, His Tomb, His Wife, and Her Breadbasket: The Monument of Eurysaces in Rome," *The Art Bulletin* 85, no. 2 (2003).

112 It has been commonly accepted that the tomb of Eurysaces near the Porta Maggiore in Rome is of a *libertus*. However, as has been pointed out, there is no evidence from the monument itself that this was in fact that case: Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* 40-41, fig. 21. Other examples is the tomb of Lucius Antistius Sarculo, BM; and that of L. Vibius, BM: see E. D'Ambra, "Acquiring an Ancestor," in *Images of Ancestors*, ed. J.M. Hojte, *Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Antiquity* 5 (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2002) 223, 26-28.

113 Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* 105-09, figs 90-92.

114 Consisting of the toga being pulled tightly around the right shoulder and arm which forms a sling, only permitting the right hand to be seen.

severitas/gravitas style.¹¹⁵

Another example of this type of representation is provided by the portrait statues from the tomb of the baker, Marcus Vergilius Eurysaces, which depict Eurysaces and his wife Atistia, which were once in the Museo del Palazzo dei Conservatori, Rome, but is now lost (Ill. 73).¹¹⁶ Despite the fact that the face of Eurysaces was quite damaged the photos of these statues exemplify well the full-bodied togate type of funeral monument.

An example of the half torso type of tomb monument is presented by the funerary relief of Lucius Vibius and Vecila Hila, in the Vatican Museums, Museo Chiaramonti, Rome (Ill. 74).¹¹⁷ This is a family group consisting of a man and a woman, with a bust of a young boy set between them. The male and female figures are depicted from the chest up. The woman wears a *stola* which is draped over her head – the top roll of her hair being visible. Her left elbow is bent and the index finger is placed on the side of the left cheek, in the *pudicitia* pose. Her *stola* forms a sling for the right arm, the hand of which is placed under her left elbow. The man is wearing a toga, the folds of which form a sling for his right arm, the hand of which is visible and is placed over his left chest. His facial expression replicates the *severitas/gravitas* pattern.¹¹⁸ Interestingly, the face of the female accompanying him is also lined – although not as heavily as the man.

There is also the funerary stele of Lucius Ampudius Philomusus in the British Museum (Ill.

115 The hair is cropped short and follows the contour of the skull, while the large rectangular plane of the forehead is traversed by three prominent crease marks. The eyebrows are drawn rigid and straight, dipping and rising slightly at the beginnings on either side of the nose bridge. There are diagonally drawn fold marks that delineate the beginning of the eyebrows on either side of the nose bridge which end under the first wrinkle mark of the forehead – thereby indicating the contraction of the eyebrows and forehead. The lower sinus lines are deeply cut and bracket downwards around the corners of the mouth. The upper sinus lines are undercut, leaving the eyes slightly sunken and there are crows feet present at the outer corners of the eyes.

116 See P. Ciancio Rossetto, *Il Sepolcro del fornaio Marco Virgilio Eurisace a Porta Maggiore* (Rome: 1973); also F. Coarelli, *Roma*, vol. 6, *Guide archeologiche laterza* (Bari: de Donato, 1980) 225-27; D.E.E. Kleiner, "Private Portraiture in the Age of Augustus," in *The Age of Augustus*, ed. R. Winkes (Louvain: 1986); A. Claridge, *Rome: An Oxford Archaeological Guide* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998) 359-61; Walker, *Greek and Roman Portraits* 72 fig. 50.

117 No. 1081, marble, H. 75 cm.: Museo Chiaramonti, Musei Vaticani; Kleiner, *Roman Group Portraiture: The Funerary Reliefs of the Late Republic and Early Empire* 234-35 (cat. no. 69). Kockel, *Porträtreliefs stadtrömischer Grabbauten: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und zum Verständnis des spätrepublikanisch-frühkaiserzeitlichen Privatporträts* 180-81.

118 The man's head is lined. The hair is short cropped and the hairline is receding. The forehead is traversed by several wrinkles his cheeks are sunken and lined with wrinkles. His lower sinus line is deep cut and curves down to bracket the mouth. His mouth is drawn as a slit and the lips are slightly sunken, a little as though he had lost some of his teeth. There are crows feet at the corners of the eyes, and the eyebrows are arched over the eye sockets, and terminate at either side of the nose bridge by two short inward vertical lines – thereby indicating the contraction of the eyebrows and forehead.

75)¹¹⁹ and the funerary monument of L. Antistius Sarculo and Antistia Plutia, also in the British Museum (Ill. 76).¹²⁰ On the Philomusus monument, the male figure is flanked by two females. He again wears his toga so that it forms a sling for his right arm. Again the impression from his facial expression is that his eyebrows and forehead are slightly contracted.¹²¹ The bust of L. Antistius Sarculo, is in simple bust form without a draping toga. His head is turned to his left, and he too, has several crease lines across his forehead, slight crows-feet at the corners of the eyes, and modelling at the junction of the eyebrows to indicate a contraction. There is also a heavily incised lower sinus line which curves down to bracket the mouth.

In the funerary stelae of the non-élite classes the figures are usually frontally positioned, and they tend to look rather two dimensional. This is even more so with the truncated versions which depict the subjects from the chest up. Interestingly, the persons depicted may not necessarily be deceased. In some inscriptions, the name is marked with the letter 'V' [*vivus/a*] to indicate that the person concerned is still alive at the time the stele is dedicated. This can include some images of those that would otherwise be claimed by scholars to be based on death masks.

The loss of power and prestige of the traditional *nobilitas*, due to the opening up of membership of the senate and revision of its members by Augustus and the rise in importance of wealth as the true social distinguisher from this period, may also explain why wealthier members of the non-élite classes at Rome increasingly adopted the *nobiles'* method of portrayal for themselves - particularly the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression for *imagines* on their tombs.¹²² There is written evidence from the time of Cicero that the portrayal of one's ancestors (*imagines maiorum*) by undistinguished persons in the mode traditionally associated with the *nobiles* was considered as a lack of *modestia* and proper regard for one's social station.¹²³ With the breakdown of the power of the *nobiles* class, their portrait style (given that it represented traditional Roman virtues) became a powerful tool of social legitimisation for

119 British Museum Catalogue: Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities 1920.2-20.1, found near the Porta Capena at Rome: British Museum.

120 Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities 1858.8-19.2 (Sculpture 2275), British Museum. A.H. Smith, *A Catalogue of Sculpture in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum*, vol. 3 (London: British Museum, 1904) 288-89, plate 27.

121 His face is lined, the lower sinus line is deeply cut and curves downwards to bracket the mouth. There are crows feet at the corners of the eyes, and the eyebrows terminate at two short vertical lines which terminate near the first forehead wrinkle.

122 See Chapter 8, 235-239, and Chapter 9, 275-277 *infra*.

123 Cic. *Fam.* 9.21.2-3; also Tac. *Ann.* 2.43.6 and Plin. (E) *HN* 35.8

those members outside the élite which communicated precise messages concerning citizenship status and wealth.¹²⁴

6.14 Facial expression, *severitas/gravitas* and Roman portraits

The portrait images mentioned above have one thing in common: a similarity of facial expression. This involves contracted and wrinkled forehead, contracted eyebrows, prominent cheekbones, slightly sunken cheeks and eyes, and down-turned mouth. Further generic similarities are short cropped hair, protruding ears, and sometimes receding hairlines. Nearly all the portraits are what would appear, subjectively, to represent older or mature men (in their mid-to late 30s or older). However, even on portraits of persons known to be younger, the application of the *severitas/gravitas* expression can make the individual look decidedly more mature.¹²⁵

When negative images of some of these above-mentioned portraits are examined, the basic (and formulaic) patterning of the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression becomes more readily apparent (Ill. 77.1-4; 78.1-7.). A good example is the head of an old man from Otricoli once in the Museo Torlonia discussed above (Ill. 15).¹²⁶ Clearly evident is the schematic rendering of the receding hairline, the large rectangular plane of the forehead, the wrinkle lines traversing the plane of the forehead, the two short, diagonal lines sloping outwards that delineate the beginning of the eyebrows above the base of the nose bridge, etc. Above the eyes there are even more crease marks which arc over the ends of the eyebrows which thus emphasise the downward contraction of the eyebrows and the forehead. The portrait also has a prominently contracted eyebrow ridge (giving the eyes a sunken appearance), and heavily cut sinus lines (the lower of which diagonally cuts across the face from the base of the nostrils to curve around and bracket the mouth). The line of the mouth is drawn shut and turned down and there is dimpling at the corners of the mouth which thus heightens the effect of scowling.

In fact, as with all the heads already discussed, when the schematic lines of the face are drawn out, the method of depicting the facial expression appears formulaic - a set of intersecting

¹²⁴ See n. 120 supra.

¹²⁵ Such as portraits of Octavian before he became Augustus. An example is in the Stanza degli Imperatori, Palazzo Nuovo, Musei Capitolini: Ill. 83.1. Fittschen, K. and P. Zanker, *Katalog der römischen Porträts in den Capitolinischen Museen und den anderen kommunalen Sammlungen der Stadt Rom 1. Kaiser- und Prinzenbildnisse* (Mainz 1985) 26.

¹²⁶ See n.8 supra.

planes and lines, which may or may not be organic to the underlying anatomical structure (fig. 2). This basic composition of the face is repeated in almost every single portrait thus far discussed: the plane of the forehead (being large and rectangular, framed by the hair) is dissected by usually three or sometimes four crease lines which tend to start lower over the temples, then gently arch above the line of the eyebrows, to dip slightly where they meet in the middle of the forehead. This indicates a frown or contraction of the forehead. This is reinforced by the line of the eyebrows themselves, which again start lower near the temples, rise steeply over the corners of the eyes to change angle, and thereupon slope downwards to the top of the nose bridge. The eyebrows end at two, short vertical or diagonal sloping lines on either side of the nose bridge which themselves end at (or just below) the first forehead wrinkle - thus signifying a contraction of the eyebrows. There are crows-feet at the corners of the eyes to heighten the effect of frowning and of age. Under the eyes the sinuses are prominent and raised, giving the eyes a slightly sunken look and giving prominence to the cheekbones, while the cheeks immediately underneath are hollowed. The lower sinus line is deeply cut and declines diagonally away from the nostril before turning down to form a bracket around the mouth. The line of the mouth turns down at the corners and there is dimpling of the skin downwards from the very corners of the mouth to heighten the downturn of the mouth. The lips are typically drawn shut (although not always so), and the bottom lip is fleshy and protruding - the shadow immediately underneath the bottom lip giving prominence to the plane of the chin. Frequently the head is turned slightly to its left or right, the neck tendon directly opposite the direction of the head turn is taut and rises almost vertically, while the tendon on opposing side is generally relaxed and more softly modelled.



fig. 2: Schematic rendering of basic facial patterning exemplifying the *severitas/gravitas* expression.

When one recalls the Roman physiognomic beliefs, and the evidence already discussed concerning the link between the values of *severitas* and *gravitas* and the contracted eyebrows and forehead, one is left with the conclusion that the patterning of the facial expression of Roman Republican portraits was a deliberate choice, being a conscious attempt to convey the values of *severitas* and *gravitas* via the portrait to the viewer. Many scholars have believed instinctively for years that such portraits may represent Romans – and when one recalls the words of Cicero in the *Pro Sestio*, we are reminded of how powerful a tool the image of the face was to the Roman viewer as a means of communication, and how it could be used as a vehicle for expressing the values associated with the Roman ruling élite ([2] Cic. *Sest.* 19).

The replication of the same facial expression on such large group of portraits also calls into question the level of faithfulness to real physical appearance contained in the portraits (as is implicit in the labelling of such works as ‘veristic’ or ‘realistic’). The overall appearance of Roman Republican portraits was not predicated on a love of ‘verism’ or anything else similar to that notion, nor on elements of style (such as Hellenistic, classical, linear, etc.) but was expressed via a physical representation drawn from an understanding of communicative values inherent in physical features and the facial expression which was reproduced on portrait after portrait. The composition of the face in fact is a complex structure composed like a ‘mask’, and no matter what level of verisimilitude to the subject and irrespective of the overall style chosen for the piece and the material used, the overriding essential factor was

that the portrait should convey *severitas* and *gravitas* via its facial expression. The importance of the facial patterning also means that a wide variety of stylistic elements could be utilised to render a portrait with no contradiction: as long as the required facial expression was satisfactorily presented. It is the facial expression which gives these portraits their particular *Roman* characteristics. The fact that the facial expression could be worn like a mask to communicate precise moral messages was recognised by the Romans, as is revealed by the many quotations from Cicero already cited. In these passages he attacked individuals for assuming a facial expression so as to convey a misleading message regarding their *motus animi*, in the manner in which an actor assumes the mask of a character. Such attacks are particularly cogent and concentrate on the usurpation of the typical *severitas/gravitas* expression to deceive the viewer into believing that the bearer possesses true Roman virtues: [3] Cic. *Prov.* 8. This evidence suggests that the typical facial expression identified on the above portraits was not coincidental or arbitrary, but was a conscious attempt to communicate Roman moral values in physiognomic form.¹²⁷

Where the *severitas/gravitas* expression is evident on a portrait, it is highly suggestive that the piece represents a Roman or a person deliberately adopting a Roman portrait style to present themselves in Roman physiognomic terms. Given the importance of the facial expression, it is this which defines what I term as *Roman Republican severitas/gravitas portraiture* - and this which makes it a unique development in the history, not only of Roman art, but of portrait art in general.

127 The rest (stylistic *minutiae*, whether it was Hellenising or purely schematic, the material of the portrait, the context of its display etc.) depended on a range of social, political and economic factors, including the commissioner of the portrait, the individual to be portrayed, the skill of the artisan, the cost, the context in which it was to be displayed, etc.

PART 2

THE ORIGINS OF ROMAN REPUBLICAN PORTRAITURE

Crede mihi, plus est, quam quod videatur, imago Ov. *Her* 13.155

("Believe me, an *imago* is more than what it seems")

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE DATING OF ROMAN PORTRAITS IN THE REPUBLICAN PERIOD

7.1 Introduction

Thus far it has been shown that the Roman portraiture of the Republican period contained a highly precise form of physiognomic messaging which communicated the Roman values of *severitas* and *gravitas*. These values were particularly important to, and expressive of, the identity of the ruling élite at Rome.¹ The question remains how this facial expression came to be applied to Roman portraits during the Republican period, and to answer this satisfactorily several issues need to be examined. These include the dating of the portraits sharing the *severitas/gravitas* expression, the question of who commissioned the portraits, the identity of the artists, and the nature of the relationship between artist and patron, the method by which portraits may have been manufactured or replicated, and the uses to which portraits were put by the Romans including the context of their display. Once these issues are understood we may have important information as to how and why the Roman Republican portrait style as constituted by the *severitas/gravitas* expression originated and developed.

7.2 Observations on problems of dating of Roman Republican portraits

The issue of the dating of surviving examples of Roman Republican portraiture is important primarily from the fact that there are portraits from the island of Delos which are widely dated from the mid-second to the early part of the first century B.C.² These Delian portraits are claimed to predate any surviving examples of portraits in the Roman Republican style from Italy itself. This has led some scholars to claim that Roman Republican Portraiture was not 'Roman' at all, but derived from Greek sculptural portrait traditions, such as the Greek interest in portraying barbarians and non-Greek peoples or the portrait style of the Hellenistic kings. These scholars further contend that the transference point for the style to Rome was in fact via Roman generals operating in the Greek east, or via the Italian and Roman merchants working on Delos whence it influenced the lower classes at Rome in the style of their portraits

¹ See Chapter 10, 294-297 *infra*.

² That is, from the handing of Delos to the administration of Athens and its declaration as a free port by the Roman senate in 166 B.C. (following the defeat of King Perseus of Macedonia in 168 B.C. at the battle of Pydna) to the sack of the island by Mithridates VI of Pontus in 88 B.C. and again by pirates in 69 B.C.

and then 'seeped upwards' to be adopted by the ruling élite by the mid-first century B.C.³

Contrary to such a thesis is the simple fact that the emphasis in Greek physiognomics and the precise cultural messages drawn therefrom were not the same or identical with those drawn by the Romans, nor was the context of display, appearance and meaning of Greek and Hellenistic portraits equivalent to those of the Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* style. With regards to the chronological aspects of such a thesis, the evidence in no way lends itself to a secure dating system for Republican portraits, and most importantly, no portrait from the Eastern Mediterranean (Greek or otherwise) can be conclusively shown to predate examples of the Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* style from Italy itself.⁴

Most of the marble heads that we now possess have been dated through comparative stylistic or typological methods. This is done by comparing similarities in the stylist elements of the portraits with those more securely dateable – such as images of Caesar, Pompey, Augustus and others, sometimes found on other dated monuments or artefacts, including coins. There are, however, numerous Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* style portraits which are to be found in and around Rome on the tombs of the non-élite classes – usually made of travertine or tufa (but some in marble) – which, according to methods of dating related to clothing, hairstyle and epigraphy (as well as comparative stylistics as mentioned directly above), are typically dated from around 80 B.C. to well into the Augustan period.

In relation to such a methodology, and as shown in previous chapters, the important element in a portrait for Romans during the Republican period was the precise form of the facial expression – not, necessarily the 'style' through which this was achieved. This accounts for the fact that there are examples of Roman Republican portraits which bear the *severitas/gravitas* expression, yet are modelled in what is perceived to be an overtly 'Hellenistic' style – evidenced by the soft chiselling and polishing of the features, the pathic elements of the expression (such as parted lips and turn of the head) and detail in the manner by which the skin, muscles, tendons and bone structure are presented as an organically inter-related whole. By contrast there are instances of portraits where the face is drawn in a

3 G. M. A. Richter, *Three Critical Periods in Greek Sculpture* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951); G. M. A. Richter, "Origins of Verism in Roman Portraits," *JRS* 45 (1955); and R. R. R. Smith, "Greeks, Foreigners, and Roman Republican Portraits," *JRS* 71 (1981). See n. 1 *supra*, and Chapter 10, 289 *infra*.

4 In relation to the question of dating and what this suggests about the origins of the genre, I leave to Chapter 10 certain portraits of Hellenistic kings claimed to be in the Roman Republican style and to Chapter 11 the issue of the dating of Etruscan portrait heads from funerary contexts.

schematic, linear way – composed by a network of intersecting lines and planes – almost regardless of the dictates of proper anatomy and thereby providing an illusion of veracity.⁵ However one chooses to describe or categorise such portraits, the common attribute found in both is the patterning of the facial expression in the *severitas/gravitas* manner.

The ‘eclecticism’ of stylistic elements identified within a range of portraits suggests that the personal taste of the patron, the skill of the artist, and the intended uses of the portrait affected the precise manner of how the final portrait would appear – yet the paramount aim remained that the appropriate facial expression was presented. This means that the choice of overall style or styles used to create a portrait were quite flexible – being dictated by a combination of variable factors, such as the wishes of the patron, the skill of the artist, political considerations, the purpose and context of the portrait’s display, the money available, prevailing taste in fashion and by other cultural and social factors.

The problem that arises from this is that it hampers hitherto held assumptions establishing a dating scheme for surviving portrait works based on stylistic elements alone. In fact, methodologies for ‘dating’ Roman Republican portraits based on an assumed stylistic development from Hellenised, mid-Italic style, to an Italo-Roman veristic type, back to a combined Hellenistic or classicized variant, which developed in an orderly progression through the second and first centuries B.C., are based on assumptions that, in light of the considerations stated below, largely cannot be sustained.

Linked to this is the problem posed by the limited corpus of portraits that have survived. Many (if not most) of the portraits which the literary evidence attests as having once existed have not survived; there are only a handful of bronze portraits that can be said to date to the Republican period with any certainty;⁶ there are very few terracotta examples,⁷ and there are

5 Highly influential on the categorisation of stylistic elements in Roman Republican portraiture have been the works of Schweitzer. The chronological and organisational scheme still fundamental to our understanding of Republican portraiture is that provided by him. He perceived two major phases confined to the first century B.C. The first is the simultaneous presence and interaction of schools separately representing Mid-Italic portrait traditions, being a Hellenistic style combining both Hellenizing and Latinising variations, as well as a traditional Roman style associated with the particularism of death mask portraiture. Secondly, he perceived that as the first century B.C. progressed even more subtle sub-groups appeared, such as “painterly-pathetic” and “plastic” style: B. Schweitzer, *Die Bildniskunst der römischen Republik* (Leipzig-Weimar: Koehler & Amelang, 1948).

6 The bronze head of Scipio from the *Villa of the Papyri* now in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Naples (Ill.36); the bronze ‘Sextus Pompeius’ now in the Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg (Ill.94); the Capitoline ‘Brutus’ in the Museo Capitolino, Rome (Ill. 33); and possibly the bronze head of Cato from Volubilis, now in Rabat (Ill.85).

none surviving made from wax, or other materials.⁸ Despite the fact we do not have them, the literary sources make innumerable references to them, and so we have no legitimate reason to doubt they existed. Wax, wood and terracotta are fragile; bronze was highly coveted during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, and many bronze pieces were either deliberately melted down or otherwise destroyed. Portraits in stone, being hardier than the other materials mentioned, have survived in greater quantity, though many have been damaged and their original provenance and context of display are often entirely unknown.

Further it is important to understand that until the mid-first century B.C., when the Luna (Carrara) marble quarries in Italy were opened for large scale production, most quality marble had to be imported – thus making it costly, reserved for those who could afford it.⁹ Since many of the heads we now possess are in marble and their original provenance is claimed to have been Italy (or surmised to have been Italy) the assumption is often made that many of these must be made from Luna marble and that these must date to the mid-first century B.C. or later, and that, *absentes* portraits in other media, they are representative of the genre from

7 The terracotta head from Cumae, now in the Boston Museum of Fine Art (Ill. 236), and possibly the terracotta head in the Musée du Louvre, Paris (Ill. 37).

8 There is the wax head that survived from a tomb in Cumae now in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Naples (Ill. 106).

9 Plin. (E) HN 36.48 and 36. 135. See also D. E. E. Kleiner, *Roman Group Portraiture: The Funerary Reliefs of the Late Republic and Early Empire* (New York: 1977), 57; E. H. Richardson, *The Etruscan origins of early Roman sculpture*, vol. [Offprint] 21, MAAR (Roma: G. Bardi, 1953), 80; V. Kockel, *Porträtreiefs stadtrömischer Grabbauten: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und zum Verständnis des spätrepublikanisch-frühkaiserzeitlichen Privatporträts*, Beiträge zur Erschließung hellenistischer und kaiserzeitlicher Skulptur und Architektur, Bd. 12 (Mainz: Zabern, 1993), 57. It would be a mistake, however, to assume that marble statues and ornaments did not appear in nobles' houses before this date or on a large scale. As Cicero seems to suggest that there were marble statues and adornments to be found in the homes of the nobles, however, too many such things on display might indicate luxuria or extravagance: Cic. Rosc. Am. 133. Pliny (E) tells us that L. Crassus the orator was the first to have imported marble columns in his house on the Palatine: Plin. (E) HN 6.1. These references do indicate that marble was perhaps an expensive material.

its beginnings.¹⁰ This is confirmed by reference to the other sources of Roman portraiture for the period - the coins minted in the first century B.C. depicting the portrait of an ancestor of the moneyer concerned, and the tomb monuments of the non-élite classes found in and around Rome which are usually made of tufa or travertine. Thus, the argument runs, the earliest datable 'Roman' portraits in the Republican style in Italy only appear during the early first century B.C. and since there is no apparent development of the style evidenced in the database, the origins and proper course of development for the genre must be sought elsewhere than at Rome.

Several observations can be made regarding these assumptions. Firstly, while Pliny suggests that the Luna quarries only opened on a large scale from the time of Caesar onwards, there is no definitive proof that this was the case: except again for the fact that sources such as Vitruvius do not seem to mention it. It certainly does not negate the suggestion that there were other sources of marble within Italy or that marble was imported on a large scale before this time; archaeologically, some marble items do survive from Rome from what appears to be the second century B.C., if not earlier¹¹ and ancient literary sources refer to marble as a construction material in the same period.¹² Secondly, there is an assumption by scholars that any sculpture from Italy in fine grained white marble must be Luna marble, but without any real explanation as to how such a conclusion was reached. Importantly, the ancient sources tell us that the Luna quarries produced marble of varying colours and grains.¹³

Regarding the attribution of a piece of marble to a particular quarry (such as the Luna

10 F. W. Walbank, *A historical commentary on Polybius*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), 6.53.4. suggests that busts in various materials began to replace the wax masks (*cerae*) about 50 B.C. A. Maiuri, *La casa del Menandro*, 2 vols., vol. 1 (Roma: La Libreria dello stato, 1932), 98-106, discusses the evidence for *imagines* in Pompeii's so-called "House of Menander," which belonged to the family of Poppaea Sabina. Hollow casts in the ash revealed the presence of five objects in a niche, three of which clearly were once heads made out of organic materials ("in legno o in cera") but all were of varying sizes: illustrated in J. R. Clarke, *The houses of Roman Italy, 100 B.C.-A.D. 250: ritual, space, and decoration* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 192, fig. 07. The modelling of all was relatively crude, and the largest head was most likely made of wood, but some connection with the *imagines* is suggested by some scholars: N. Slater, "Nero's Masks," *CW* 90 (1996): n. 12; H. I. Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 55. However, I reject the thesis that these are *imagines maiorum*. They are under life sized, they were not found in the typical association that all the sources indicate that *imagines* were to be found, and they include a portrait of a woman, there being no textual reference that support the conclusion that women were honoured by portraiture among the *imagines*. On the issue of women as ancestors, see H. I. Flower, "Were Women ever 'Ancestors' in Republican Rome?" in *Images of Ancestors*, ed. J. M. Højte, Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Antiquity V (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2002).

11 For instance the Etruscan sarcophagus made of 'marble of Circeii' from Cerveteri: Cat. No. 14949 in the Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, Musei Vaticani (Ill. 153). See also Chapter 10, 339 *infra*.

12 Plin. (E) *HN* 36.3.5.

13 Plin. (E) *HN* 36.4.2.

quarries) the method, I would suggest, is not wholly reliable, due to the limitations of a comparable database and the margin of error that all scientific measurement must entail. Scientific methods using elemental and isotopic fingerprinting or from Electro-Spin Resolution (ESR) of marble from various sites are still in their infancy, and the database is nowhere near large enough to yet be wholly reliable.¹⁴ The attribution of a piece of marble to a particular quarry is still largely based on certain methods of observation, and a large deal of intuition and assumption by the observer which cannot really be tested or proven scientifically.¹⁵

In any event, even if most of the marble heads we now possess, whose provenance was originally in Italy, are made from Luna marble, this simple assumption alone does not mean that there was not a tradition of portraiture in other media that had a long history at Rome; or that portraits were made of marble or other stone from somewhere else in Italy;¹⁶ or that some of the portraits we now have are in fact made from marble of similar texture or appearance to Luna marble that was imported from some other source before 50 B.C.

On the contrary, if the Romans preferred to make their portraits of other materials (such as bronze, terracotta, wax, or gypsum) as the literary sources amply attest, and did not adopt marble until the beginning to middle of the first century B.C. with its commercial availability (and granting that many of those portraits in marble from Italy that we do have are in fact made of marble from the Luna quarries), it should not be surprising, therefore, that the *severitas/gravitas* style just 'appears' in the archaeological record with the marble and travertine/tufa examples. This would suggest that the true genesis of the genre actually took place in portraits of other materials that may have been made in Italy or at Rome itself from a

14 The precise determination of the provenance of a marble object is of great archaeological importance, and is now mostly obtained by coupling the petrographic study of a thin section with the analysis of the C and O stable isotopes, or by stereomicroscopy and EPR: L. Lazzarini and F. Antonelli, "Petrographic and isotopic characterisation of the marble of the island of Tinos (Greece)," *Archeom* 45, no. 4 (2003). This assists in attributing provenance for a piece (if the sample data base and finger printing of possible sources is developed enough). However, it does not assist in dating. Thermoluminescence is not reliable as a dating source – it depends on many variables and can only give approximate dates which are not really of assistance in the instance of Roman Republican portraiture. For a recent discussion see J.J. Hermann, jr., N. Herz and R. Newman, ed. *Interdisciplinary Studies on Ancient Stone* (ASMOSIA 5, London 2002).

15 In fact the reasoning is circular: portrait 'x' is of marble and was found in Italy; it resembles what we think of as Luna marble, therefore it is made of that material; and because we know the Luna quarries only became operational on a large scale after 100 B.C., so must portrait 'x' date to after this time. Despite the neat logic and attractiveness of such an argument, the only real conclusions we can make in this equation are possibilities: that the portrait is made of marble, possibly of Luna marble, and possibly dating after 50 B.C.

16 Pliny tells us that Mamurra was the first to have his house made of marble: Plin. (E) *HN* 37.7.48. See also Plin. (E) *HN* 36.4.2 and n.9 supra.

far earlier period than those that appeared on Delos or at Athens, but which have not survived.

The portraits of the Plebeians and members of the non-élite classes from their tombs tend to support this. The earliest examples (based on elements of fashion in dress or style of inscription etc.) are dated from around 80 B.C. and already sport the *severitas/gravitas* expression (Ill. 72) – and it is this expression which remains constant throughout the period of the production and appearance of this genre. Remarkably, there is no evidence of the development of the *severitas/gravitas* style in the portraits from these non-élite tombs at Rome.¹⁷ This in itself suggests that the use of this facial expression on portraits was adopted by the non-élite from *something* which already utilised the style.

That the *severitas/gravitas* style of portraits found on the non-élite tombs at Rome developed from a native Roman/Italic tradition of portraiture (and not from an external source such as Delos) is strongly inferred from the evidence already discussed concerning the physiognomic linkage in the Roman mind between a precise facial expression and Roman moral values, and the appearance on portrait after portrait of exactly this facial expression. Other factors (which are more fully considered in Chapter Eleven and Appendix 6) also tend to point in this direction: that there was a tradition of portraiture at Rome going back at least as far as the early third century B.C. as attested by the literary sources,¹⁸ that *imagines* were put to diverse uses derived from practices of the élite classes, and that there was the close association of *imagines maiorum* with Roman ethical and moral terms, particularly *severitas* and *gravitas*, which were key values of the élite classes at Rome. If the surviving stone portraits display physiognomically *severitas* and *gravitas*, and given the close association in the Republican literature of the *imagines maiorum* and other *imagines* which appeared in public and private contexts (no matter what their material), it can be assumed that these earlier *imagines* in bronze, terracotta, wax or gypsum (which have not survived but which the sources amply attest) also bore a similar facial expression to the stone portraits that we now possess.

Due to these factors any purely stylistic analysis (which dissects republican portraits into “Hellenistic” or “Roman” elements) becomes virtually meaningless. From the archaeological evidence it seems that there was no orderly development of the style of Roman Republican

¹⁷ Likewise, there is no real evidence of the development of the style among the surviving portraits of the Hellenistic kings – despite what is sometimes claimed – other than those which suddenly appear from the mid-second century B.C. onwards, and which as already stated and more fully discussed in Chapter 10, are associated with those kings who are heavily dependent on Roman power for their legitimacy.

¹⁸ See Chapter 8, 224-230 and Chapter 9, 270-271 on honorary statuary at Rome.

portraiture over a period of time evident in the surviving portraits; the eclectic use of stylistic elements by Roman patrons, as evidenced by the surviving portrait heads, militates against it.

As a result, a portrait which appears to blend Hellenistic stylistic elements with the traditional Roman facial expression communicating *severitas/gravitas* may not necessarily indicate that the work is earlier or later than the more linear and abstract type. As has been noted above, the appearance of a piece may have simply depended on the context for which the *imago* was to be used, or resulted from the taste of the patron or the ability of the artist or the money available for the commission, or a combination of all of these. The meaning deduced from the facial expression by the viewer would have been shaped according to traditional views of Roman society.¹⁹

The problem in attempted to trace the development of Roman Republican portraits is that we have NO absolutely datable pieces in the style that assist us in identifying when or where the style appeared. What we do possess are a few examples which can be given a *terminus ante* or *post quem*. We also have changes in method of execution (changes in technology etc), changes in epigraphy, changes in fashion (clothing or hair styles) which may be supported by other sources, especially literary or absolutely dateable monuments, that may also give relative indications as to the date of a piece – but again it must be stressed that these are only approximate. As already noted, other scientific and technical methods of dating marble are still in their infancy and are wholly unreliable or inapplicable to most of the heads that we already have – or these methods give dates that are so broad inclusive of the margin of error that in the context of Roman Republican portraits they provide no meaningful information. There is also inferential or circumstantial evidence which can give clues or support tentative dates attributed to portraits: such as find contexts, inscriptions etc.

Superficially, this does nothing to resolve the debate on the true origins of Roman Republican portrait style. However, from other factors considered in previous Chapters and those discussed in the following Chapters, I would contend it is more logical to see the development of the style as being a product of Roman culture which drew on various technical or stylistic elements as a vehicle for presenting specific Roman social values, rather than seeking its origins outright in the portrait styles of a subject or foreign people.

19 U. Heisinger, "Portraiture in the Roman Republic," *ANRW* 1.4 (1073), 819: "Portraiture is an art where the patron has a high personal stake since the image will inevitably be regarded as a reflection of himself. Thus the Republican Portrait had an ideological function in the private as well as in the public sphere."

7.3 The evidence regarding dating of Roman Republican portraits

A) Portraits from the island of Delos:

These portraits are largely accepted as having a *terminus post quem* of 166 B.C. when the administration of Delos was handed to the Athenians and its declaration as a free port by the Roman senate and a *terminus ante quem* when the island was sacked by Mithridates VI of Pontus in 88 B.C. and again by pirates in 69 B.C.

For between 166 and 50 B.C. inscriptions evidence approximately 30 statues dedicated to Romans.²⁰ The earliest attested statue seems to have been of Scipio Aemilianus (now lost except for the inscription), dedicated by a Roman in 141-139 B.C.²¹ Of the 24 surviving sculpted heads found on Delos, approximately half are in the Republican *severitas/gravitas* manner (the other half being in the Greek Classical or Hellenistic style), but none of these heads has been found in association with inscriptions – and only the statues of C. Billienus (Ill. 79) and C. Ofellius Ferus (Ill. 65) have been found in conjunction with their bases and inscriptions, but both of these statues are headless.²² The find spots of at least six portraits in the Republican *severitas/gravitas* style strongly suggest that these represented Romans.²³

There is much controversy among scholars as to precisely when the portraits in the Republican *severitas/gravitas* style from Delos should be dated. For instance, Marcadé dates most pieces to between 95 and 88 B.C. with some dedications continuing to 75 B.C.²⁴ Stewart suggests that most fall between 100-88 B.C.²⁵ These schemes tend to be based on the idea that

20 R. R. R. Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 22 and n.73. Although there is evidence of Roman activity on the island to before 166 B.C. such as a dedication to Scipio Africanus in 193 B.C.: IG 11.4.712.

21 P. Roussel and M. Launey, *Inscriptions de Délos*, vol. IV, Délos (Paris: Exploration de Délos Archaeologique, 1934), ID 1842.

22 Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 127. Billienus: Roussel and Launey, *Inscriptions de Délos*, ID 1710; see J. Marcadé, *Au Musée de Délos, étude sur la sculpture hellénistique en ronde bosse découverte dans l'île*, Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome; fasc. 215 (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1969), pl. 75. Ferus: Roussel and Launey, *Inscriptions de Délos*, ID 1688; see C. Michalowski, ed., *Les portraits antiques: Les portraits hellénistique et romaines*, vol. XIII, Délos (Paris: Exploration de Délos Archaeologique, 1932), 21, fig. 13.

23 A4186 found in the Agora of the Italians; and A7258 and A7259 from a house in the Skardhana region which clay seals suggests probably belonged to a Roman merchant of the name C. Aufidius: see Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 127, n.15. Also NM1828, A2912, and A4189 were found in the House of the Diadoumenos which is strongly believed to have been a house of a Roman merchant. A. F. Stewart, *Attika: Studies in Athenian sculpture of the Hellenistic age* (London: Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, 1979), 65-72.

24 Marcadé, *Au Musée de Délos, étude sur la sculpture hellénistique en ronde bosse découverte dans l'île*.

25 Stewart, *Attika: Studies in Athenian sculpture of the Hellenistic age*, 65-72.

the more Hellenising portraits are influenced by the portrait traditions of the Hellenistic kings or is a style created by Athenian artists working on Delos for a Roman clientele, and that as time passed the style became more abstract. Because of the close affinity of these more abstract heads with the style of pieces found at Rome which (as already mentioned) are largely dated from around 80 B.C. onwards (particularly the portraits from the non-élite tombs at Rome) these Delian versions are seen to be the precursors for the style. However, while the polishing and the nature of the technical aspects of the carving of some of the pieces suggest that some could date to much earlier than 100 B.C., and possibly even to 133 B.C., there is no precise way of telling, and the placement of the more abstract style heads as later in the sequence based on comparative stylistics is really only an assumption.²⁶

The portrait of the old man from the palaestra in Delos, A 2136, is a case in point (Ill. 52.1-3). On this piece the notches in the forehead between the eyebrows indicate the contraction of the eyebrows: yet these marks appear like they have been added as an after-thought in an attempt to portray contracted brows without necessarily including other physical requirements to show such a contraction anatomically – almost in the way they have been applied to the bronze head of Scipio from the *Villa of the Papyri* at Herculaneum, now in Naples (Ill. 34). The contraction lines appear merely as two notched lines on the brow, and they are not symmetrical. In fact in order to create the illusion of contracted brows they would need to have turned inward or outwards towards the top as is the case with other portraits from Delos.

The cause of this 'contradiction'²⁷ in stylistic elements within the one piece may have several plausible explanations. It could be that the artist was responding to the instructions of the patron when the artist himself was unsure about the precise appearance of the desired effect. This would indicate an earlier date for the piece, say around 150 B.C. (which is in keeping

26 Given that a patron may have required a traditional Roman facial expression for his portrait irrespective of the style utilised to achieve this, does not mean that those portraits which appear to blend typical Hellenistic stylistic traits with such a facial expression predate those that are in a more 'pure' Roman portrait style or *vice versa*. The inclusion of typical Hellenistic stylistic elements may merely have been a matter of taste of the artist, patron or the circumstances for which the piece was commissioned – and therefore the presence or absence of Hellenistic stylistic elements may contribute nothing meaningful to the question of the chronology for such pieces. Indeed, it could equally be conjectured that the pieces in the more 'extreme' Roman Republican (*severitas/gravitas*) physiognomic style may have predated the later stylistically 'blended' works, as the earlier large scale presence of Italians on the island may have created the necessity for those Romans to distinguish clearly between themselves and the local Greek population. Contrariwise, and just as plausibly, it could equally be suggested that those in the more extreme linear style post-date the more Hellenising *severitas/gravitas* portraits because it took time for the island's artists to grow accustomed to the demands of their Roman patrons. The possibilities are in fact manifold.

27 I should say that I doubt that any such contradiction would have been apparent to a Roman viewer.

with the other neo-classical elements of the work). Contrariwise, it could suggest that it is a later re-working of an earlier Hellenistic head to fit a new Roman attribution, or the elements of the facial expression were later applied to suit the whim of the patron. Equally, it may just be that the artist was not so skilled.

The other oddity about A2136 is the hairstyle. The hair is composed of long wavy curls which, while the subject has a receding hairline and is short cropped, is not represented in the manner typical of the other statues in the group where the hair is either predominantly textured in 'a penne' style of lumped, short locks drawn over the top of the forehead, or is composed of striated, short, curved lines delineating the mass of the hair itself which is depicted as being short cropped and generally receding, fitting the contour of the skull almost like a cap. The hairstyle of the palaestra head is in the Neoclassical, Hellenistic style. This suggests that it was either executed during the revival of neo Attic taste prevailing among Roman patrons and catered for by Athenian artists from the middle of the second century B.C. shortly after the grant to the island of free port status in 166 B.C.; or perhaps following the resurgence of Hellenistic taste following the sack of Corinth in 146 B.C.; or a little later on the bequest of the Kingdom of Pergamon by King Attalos III to the Roman State and the creation of the Province of Asia in 133 B.C. Any of these dates could be correct. I would favour an earlier date supported by the observation that the artist appears to have been unsure about the precise method for portraying the *severitas/gravitas* expression combined with the other Hellenising traits mentioned above, such a date is by no means absolute - it may simply be that the artist was unskilled or it is a reworking of an earlier head at some later time which could fall anywhere between 166 and 88 B.C.

There are some other portraits from outside Delos which utilise a hairstyle in a similar composition to A2136: the so-called 'Sulla' in the Munich Glyptothek (Ill. 24.1-2), a head from the *braccio nuovo* in the Vatican Museum (Ill. 27.1-2), and another marble head, the so-called 'Albinus', now in the Louvre but said to be from Rome (Ill. 28.1-2).²⁸ As for these last two mentioned, Schweitzer believed that Louvre head bore a likeness to the coin portrait of A. Postumius Albinus, struck by Decimus Junius Brutus in around 49 B.C. - and since the latter was the adopted son of Aulus Postumius Albinus, Consul in 99 B.C. and *legatus* under Sulla in 89 B.C. he believed the portrait represented Albinus' adopted father, thereby indicating a

28 Musée du Louvre: Number MNC 1004 (no. usuel Ma 919).

date for the portrait of the mid-first century B.C.²⁹ Hafner, on the other hand, saw it as a portrait of an earlier ancestor, the Consul of 180 and 151 B.C., a view supported by Heisinger.³⁰ Just how difficult the technique of dating and identifying three dimensional portraits from coin images can be, is further shown by the fact that Poulsen identified the Louvre portrait as Cato the Elder.³¹ On comparing the coin portraits with the portrait in the Louvre, I am not satisfied that there is enough similarity to justify identification with any particular individual; accordingly, the subject of this marble portrait must remain unknown.³² That it shares Hellenising stylistic elements cannot be doubted, and thus it could to any period of Hellenising taste at Rome, from 166 B.C. until the time of Augustus. However, other factors might suggest an earlier date for the Albinus.

The exuberance of the fall of the locks on these pieces is reminiscent of the hair style on the image of Titus Quinctius Flaminius on a gold coin in the British Museum (Ill. 26), minted somewhere in Greece possibly around 197 B.C. and in a highly Hellenising style. The Munich Glyptothek 'Sulla' also has a hairstyle particularly similar to the portrait of Flaminius, and if it were not for Flaminius' beard and the fact that we cannot compare the nose shape of the two pieces (since the Sulla's nose is missing) it could be suggested that these are the same person.³³ Also common to these pieces is the deep frown-lines of the forehead, the deep-carved notches at the beginning of the eyebrows over the nose bridge to portray a contraction of the forehead and eyebrows, as well as the polishing of the surfaces.

Similar deep carving of the locks (although not as exuberant and much shorter) to that of A2136 is found on A4187 (Ill. 56.1-3). Another piece, the 'Marius' in the Munich Glyptothek has these elements, although the hair is cut very short (Ill. 23.1-2), while the bronze portrait of Scipio from the *Villa of the Papyri* (Ill. 34) has a contraction of the eyebrows carved in a similar manner to A2136 (Ill.52.1-3) – although the Scipio portrait does not have hair as such, being more or less composed of pointed or notched lines, similar to the carving at the back of the head of A4186 (Ill. 55.2-3). Another two examples are the marble heads in the Palazzo Massimo, Rome (Ills. 80 and 81). These also have the deeply notched nose bridge indicating the contraction of the eyebrows, mixed with smooth polishing of the facial

29 J. D. Breckenridge, "Origins of Roman Republican Portraiture: Relations with the Hellenistic World," *ANRW* 1.4 (1973), 846.

30 U. Heisinger, "Portraiture in the Roman Republic," *ANRW* 1.4 (1973), 818.

31 Breckenridge, "Origins of Roman Republican Portraiture: Relations with the Hellenistic World," 843.

32 See Chapter 6, 144-146 *supra*.

33 I am conscious of how mischievous, and indeed subjective, such identifications can be.

surfaces, but a with a hair style similar to that of the bronze bust of Scipio.

It is interesting to note that the 'Sulla' (Ill. 24) and the 'Marius' (Ill. 23) in the Munich Glyptothek, the 'Albinus' head in the Louvre (Ill. 28), and heads from Delos such as A4187 (Ill. 56), A 4191 (Ill. 60.1-3), and to a slighter degree, A 4186 (Ill. 55.1-3) (and possibly A4188 (Ill. 57.1-3) although it is badly damaged) all have lips which are drawn slightly parted – something *not* usually found in other typical Roman Republican (*severitas/gravitas*) portraits – and this again suggests a highly Hellenising (rather than Classicising) pathic element in their style. A4187 (Ill. 56) also possesses other Hellenising elements – such as a highly polished surface and treatment of the hair in curly, full locks which may well suggest that this particular example dates to later in the sequence: perhaps to between 140-125 B.C. Other portraits from Delos also share this polished surface treatment: A2136 (Ill. 52), A4186 (Ill. 55), A4189 (Ill. 58.1-3), and perhaps to a lesser degree A4191 (Ill. 60.1-3) and A2912 (Ill. 53.1-3), the last of which, due to its poor state of preservation, is difficult to ascertain precisely.

Because of these 'Hellenising' stylistic components, and the fact that they are made from marble, it has been suggested that these portraits date to the Augustan period. However, as noted there were several 'revivals' of Hellenistic styles in Rome from the early second century B.C. onwards, and this suggests in reality that these portraits could date from any time in this period. However, certain elements (such as the fact the lips are drawn parted rather than closed, the animism of the expression of the eyes and the exuberance of the hair) is more suggestive of Hellenistic pathos styles of portraiture, rather than the more Classicising form of Augustan portraiture, where the lips are usually drawn closed and the hair is usually depicted with striated penne, smooth curving, more subdued locks. These factors suggest to me a date for these portraits in the early to middle second century B.C.

In contrast to the manner of portrayal of A2136 (Ill. 52), and at the other end of the stylistic extreme is the head A4193 (Ill. 61.1-3) from the *House of the Lake*. This portrait has a very precise lineal expression which is quite abstract to our perception. It would appear to be unpolished. It would therefore seem that the artist concerned was at ease in portraying the required *severitas/gravitas* facial expression. The hair is composed of schematically drawn, closely placed striated lines which cover the skull. Perhaps this detail and the schematic rendering of the facial expression suggests that it dates to later in the sequence, perhaps in the early first century B.C.

In between the style of rendering the hair of A2136 (Ill.52) and A4193 (Ill. 61) stands A2192 (Ill. 53). Its hair is formed by short, curving, triangular shaped penne style locks that are sometimes bifurcated. The hair lines are not deeply cut. Similar is the hair of A4188 (Ill. 57.1-3) although the bifurcated, triangular penne style locks of this piece are somewhat longer than A2192 (Ill.53), however the hair is severely damaged, only that around the ears and back of the neck is now visible. Similar again is the hair of A4189 (Ill. 58.1-3) – although it is slightly more deeply cut than A2192 (Ill. 53) and A4188 (Ill. 57). Interestingly, A2192 and A4189 were both found in the *House of the Diadoumenos*, both heads are turned to their left, and both were made for insertion into larger statues.³⁴ It has also been suggested that the hair of these pieces is drilled – thus suggesting a further affiliation.³⁵ Relevant is the claim that the *House of the Diadoumenos* was destroyed in 88 B.C. with the sack of the island by Mithridates;³⁶ however some scholars dispute this.³⁷ Stewart would place A4189 (Ill. 58) with NM1828 (Ill. 64) contemporaneously, claiming that both were unfinished due to the destruction of the house in 88 B.C.³⁸ – but again, other scholars see this as doubtful.³⁹ All that can be stated is that even if the statues were destroyed with the house in 88 B.C., this merely provides a *terminus ante quem*. Stewart also sees similarities in the hair style between A2192 (Ill. 53) and the hair of the male on the Tomb relief from the Via Statilia (Ill. 72)⁴⁰ which he and others date to sometime in the first quarter of the first century B.C.⁴¹ However, Bianchi Bandinelli proposed a later date for the Via Statilia portrait at the time of the second triumvirate.⁴²

Given the similarity of the hair styles between the three pieces (A2192, A4188, A4189), this suggests that these date after A2136 and A4187, but before A4193. Perhaps the earliest is A2192, then 4189, followed by A4188. In timescale, all these would appear to be fairly contemporaneous.

34 Stewart, *Attika: Studies in Athenian sculpture of the Hellenistic age*, figs 18 c-d, 20c and 22a.

35 Ibid., 68. B. Lundgreen, "A Female Portrait from Delos," *ActHyp* 4, no. *Ancient Portraiture: Image and Likeness* (1992), 62.

36 Stewart, *Attika: Studies in Athenian sculpture of the Hellenistic age*, 70.

37 M. Kreeb, *Untersuchungen zur figürlichen Ausstattung delischer Privathäuser*, 1st ed. (Chicago: Ares Publishers, 1988), 5, n.27; Lundgreen, "A Female Portrait from Delos," 62, 68-69.: "...the finds in general do not support the definite terminus ante quem of 69 B.C. put forward by Marcadé and Stewart, and the evidence for a violent destruction of the House of Diadoumenos in 88 or 69 B.C. is also uncertain..."

38 Stewart, *Attika: Studies in Athenian sculpture of the Hellenistic age*, 70.

39 Kreeb, *Untersuchungen zur figürlichen Ausstattung delischer Privathäuser*, 158-59.

40 Stewart, *Attika: Studies in Athenian sculpture of the Hellenistic age*, 74, fig.18c, pl.21D.

41 W. Helbig, *Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom*, 4 Aufl. ed., IV vols. (Tübingen: 1966-1972), no 1631.

42 R. Bianchi Bandinelli, *Roma: L'arte romana nel centro del potere* (Milan: Feltrinelli, 1969), 94.

The hair of A4186 (Ill. 55.1-3) on the front half of the head is composed of short, striated lines cut softly into the surface to make individual locks giving the hair a cap-like appearance. It is similar to that of A4191 (Ill. 60). Interestingly, both these pieces were carved as faces made for attachment to a separately carved back head – in the case of A4191 (Ill. 60), the back-head attachment is missing. Both are polished (but not overly so). The lips of A4191 are slightly parted, while the lips of A4186 (Ill. 55) are ever-so-slightly parted. This may well suggest a date later than that of A2136 and A4187 but before A2192.

A4190 (Ill. 59.1-3) is difficult to place. The skin is far less wrinkled, with only softly modelled notches over the nose bridge, merely hinting at the *severitas/gravitas* expression. The hair is formed by deeply cut lines forming chunky, short curls of hair suggestive of A4187 (Ill. 56) but which are short and sometimes carved with lines to indicate separate locks suggestive of the later ‘a penne’ style. This may indicate that it comes earlier in the sequence, after A2136 and A4187, but before A4186 and A4191.

Similar difficulties lie in placing A4142 (Ill. 54) – while its facial expression is suggestive of the *severitas/gravitas* expression, it is associated with a himation clad torso which is under life size. The hair is largely missing, although the fragments suggest longer locks softly carved more in the manner of A4187 (Ill. 56), while the carving of the facial expression, particularly the frown lines on the forehead are more suggestive of A2136 (Ill. 52), although not as deeply carved.

Based on the comparative stylistic method already mentioned, particularly of the hairstyles, the drawing of the elements of the facial expression and on occasion the polishing of the surfaces (where this can be shown to have been ancient), it would be tempting to place all the pieces discussed in the following sequence – the Flaminus coin portrait to about 196 B.C.; the Scipio head in Naples and the Palazzo Massimo marble head to about 190 to 180 B.C.; the Glyptothek ‘Marius’ and ‘Sulla’ shortly thereafter, say between 180 and 160 B.C.; the Palaestra head from Delos, A2136, around 150-140 B.C. contemporaneous with the ‘Albinus’ head in the Louvre and the one in the Vatican; A4187 to between 140-130 B.C.; A4190 possibly dating soon afterwards to around 130-120 B.C.; while A4191 and A4186 date between 125 and 110 B.C. This would suggest that the closer cropped, penne style hairstyle of the other portraits from Delos, A2192, A4189 and A4188 would come somewhere between 115 and 90 B.C. The latest would be A4193 which would fall possibly around 95-88 B.C.

According to these observations, I would suggest a date for the bulk of the Delos heads from about 133 B.C. until about 88 B.C.⁴³ None of the busts have elements (technological or otherwise) that strongly suggest they should date after the sack of the island in 88 B.C. It would seem that while there was some Roman activity on the island between 88 and 69 B.C. (as inscriptions in honour of Sulla on the island [*CIL* 712 dated to 87 B.C.] and in honour of a Roman named Orbius [*CIL* 717 and 2252] attest), the presence of Roman traders did not reach the height it had during the period between 166 and 88 B.C.⁴⁴ This is supported by the fact that the number of inscriptions for dedications and evidence of sculptors' signatures radically dries up after 88 B.C.⁴⁵ While it is not beyond possibility that some heads date to between 88 and 69 B.C, it is more logical that most date to the heyday of Roman merchant activity on the island.

Having said this, there are really too few pieces from the island to construct a sensible database for stylistic comparison, and differences in polishing of the features and hairstyle may merely have reflected the purpose for which the portrait was intended, the skill of the artist, or the taste of the patron – or a combination of all of these factors.⁴⁶

Regarding the nude athlete statues from Delos bearing *severitas/gravitas* heads, some scholars have suggested that these date to between 110 and 88 B.C. given the highly Hellenised form of their torsoes linked with a traditional Roman Republican portrait - but in truth, they could date to any time after 166 B.C. An interesting clue is provided by the statue of C. Ofellius Ferus (Ill. 65), which bears an inscription indicating that the artists were from a family of sculptors known to have been active in Rome in about 146 B.C. or slightly later.⁴⁷ This would

43 Suggested also by the frequency of signed statues and other statues known to have been dedicated in this period.

44 There is also evidence for some activity on the island around the time of the assassination of Caesar: J. C. Balty, "Groupes statuaire imperiaux et privées de l'époque julio-claudienne," in *Ufficiale e Ritratto Privato, Atti della II conferenza internazionale sul ritratto romano, Roma, 26-30 Settembre 1984*, ed. N. Bonacasa and G. Rizza (Roma: Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Quaderni de "La Ricerca Scientifica", 1988), 36-37.

45 Stewart, *Attika: Studies in Athenian sculpture of the Hellenistic age*, 66-67.

46 Lundgreen, "A Female Portrait from Delos," 68: "The extreme difficulties in dating according to style in the last two centuries B.C have been illustrated... Different styles existed at the same time, and one is not being substituted by the other, or at least not in the last century B.C. Delian society is considered strongly pro-Roman i.e., Roman Republican, in the last centuries B.C. as the Romans, more specifically the senate, guaranteed the prosperous economy and life of the island"

47 See Chapter 10, 287 *infra*.

militate against such a late date of 100 B.C. for this piece.⁴⁸ The unfortunate thing about the statue of Ferus is that its head is missing – so we can only speculate that it would have sported a head in the Roman Republican (*severitas/gravitas*) portrait style. There also exists a military statue (sadly again with its head missing) dedicated to C. Billienus (Ill. 79) which has an inscription indicating its date as around 100 B.C. This style of statue, although utilised by the Hellenistic kings, became particularly favoured by the Romans.

In a similar style are the portraits of the 'Tivoli General' (Ill. 66), now in the Palazzo Massimo, Rome, and a bronze nude torso extant from the waist up now in the Vatican Museum (Ill. 71).⁴⁹ The Vatican Museum bronze torso has the remains of a cloak draped from its left shoulder over the back and around the waist – a remnant of drapery similar to the half busts from Delos A7258 and A7259 (Ills. 62 and 63). The same turn of the head and positioning of the drapery is similar to the pose of the Pseudo-Athlete from Delos, NM1828 (Ill. 64). The similar composition of the stance, the turn of the head and the positioning of the drapery (except for the Tivoli General who is more demurely draped) suggests modelling of these statues on a common prototype or concept – and most would appear to date to the second half of the second century B.C.⁵⁰

The conclusion that most of the Delian heads discussed are in a style introduced by Romans to the island and clues as to their dating are evidenced by three other considerations: (i) the find-context of some of the pieces (in that they come from houses belonging to Roman/Italian merchants, or the *Agora of the Italians*); (ii) evidence that suggests the vast majority of 'Italians' living and working on Delos were Roman citizens (and not merely 'Italian'); (iii) the social status that these individuals may have had within Roman society vis a vis the Greek community on the island as to why they would have had portraits of themselves set up on the island.

48 It would be more likely that if the statue was made by Timarchides (Y) and Dionysos (his uncle) then for both to have worked on it (and Dionysos is known to have worked on a statue in 146 B.C at Rome), would perhaps suggest that a date of around 125-120 B.C. (or earlier) is more likely. While some scholars have adduced proof of the transference of the Republican portrait style from Delos to Rome via artists such as Timarchides and Dionysos, the reverse could just as easily be true. The familiarity of these artists with the demands of Roman patrons at Rome, could have made them highly sought after to execute portrait statues of Romans living in Delos and Athens. The fact that the family appear to have been active as sculptors on the island from the mid-to late second century B.C. could also be suggestive of the date of the bulk of heads found at Delos in the *severitas/gravitas* style.

49 Catalogue number 15055, Musei Vaticani.

50 Although adapted from a Greek form of warrior portrait, it was a form evidenced from an early period in Etruria and at Rome.

(i) With regards to find spots, we know that there were two pieces, A7258 (Ill. 62) and A7259 (Ill. 63), found in the house of C. Aufidius, which indicate they represent Romans due to the ownership of the house. These busts are in the nude heroizing type, but with applied *severitas/gravitas* facial expressions. Another, A4186 (Ill. 55), was found in the *Agora of the Italians*, while three more, NM 1828 (Ill. 64), A2912 (Ill. 53) and A4189 (Ill. 58), came from the *House of the Diadoumenos* near to the harbour which is also suspected to have been owned by a Roman merchant. These find-spots are strongly suggestive that these heads represented actual Romans.

(ii) Regarding the citizenship status of the Italian merchants living on Delos, recent studies have suggested that in fact most of the *rhomaioi* were in fact Roman citizens and Latins, and not merely 'Italians'.⁵¹ Many *municipia* in Italy had long held Roman citizenship; of those possessing the Latin status, the magistrates of those towns became Roman citizens on entering office (and election to office, even local office, suggests wealth – the type of people who may have made their money through mercantile activities); the question of course becomes moot following the grant of Roman citizenship to all those living south of the Po by the *lex iulia* in 90 B.C. and the *lex plautia papiria* of 89 B.C. In addition there is the fact that the contracts for collecting taxes in the Roman provinces (particularly the new province of Asia) was granted via the *lex sempronia* to companies which were primarily owned by *equites* in 123 B.C.⁵² which could also have greatly stimulated Roman merchant presence in the Aegean. Finally, the fact that Mithridates had 80,000 Roman citizens murdered in 88 B.C., 20,000 of who were on Delos, suggests that the vast numbers of Italians living on the island were in fact Roman citizens.⁵³

(iii) In relation to the social status of the Italians on Delos, given the bar on senators from engaging in business,⁵⁴ much of the trade was run by men who gained considerable wealth and were probably eligible (if they were Roman citizens) for admission to the *equites* class at

51 See Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 126 and n.9; A. J. N. Wilson, *Emigration from Italy in the Republican Age of Rome* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1966), 88-93, 105-11; E. S. Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* (Berkeley, London: University of California Press, 1984), 303-04, and n.83.

52 Plin. (E) *HN* 33.8; although there does not seem to have been a formal requirement that a *publicanus* was an *eques*, given that such contracts were only let to rather wealthy persons, by Cicero's time the terms *publicani* and *equites* appear to have become synonymous: Cic. *Att.* 2.1.8.

53 Val. Max. *Mem.* 9.2; App. *Rom. Hist.* 12.4.22-23; 12.9.61-63.

54 The *lex claudia* of 218 B.C. affirmed the ban on senators from engaging in commercial activities.

Rome.⁵⁵ Many of the older *equites* families were connected by blood and marriage to the leading *nobiles* clans, but with the rapid increase in those who were legally of the *equites* class or considered themselves members of the class due to their wealth, by the middle to late second century B.C. they must have presented a considerable 'wealthy' strata with political and social aspirations of their own not necessarily linked or consonant with those of the senatorial and *nobiles* order.⁵⁶

It also seems, notwithstanding the ban on senators engaging in business, that many did so through their connections with the *equites* class, thus providing some *equites* not only with wealth but with possibly very high connections at Rome.⁵⁷ The handing of tax gathering prerogatives to the *equites* in 123 B.C. may provide a clue as to the time when Roman mercantile activity on the island of Delos reached its height.⁵⁸

Given the power and social status of the *equites* within the Roman social order, one other factor accounts for why there may have been such large numbers of portrait images and

55 Formally, admission to the class of *equites* early on appears to have been based on enrolment in one of the 18 centuries of the *comitia centuriata* – which contained those of the property level required to maintain a public horse, its members making up the cavalry of the Roman army. By the time of the Gracchi informal admission to the class appears to have been based on holding the minimum level of wealth and on being freeborn. We know from the time of Augustus the level was set at 400 000 sesterces: Hor. *Ep.* 1.1.58. However, what was at the time of the Gracchi can only be conjectured.

56 The other phenomenon concerning the *equites* is that while *liberti* could not formally refer to themselves as *equites*, their sons, who met the necessary wealth requirement, could be admitted to that class socially if not formally. There is evidence that the Emperor Tiberius insisted on free-birth for three generations in the male line for formal admission to the class; although the Emperor Augustus is known to have bestowed the right to wear a gold ring on some *liberti*: Plin (E) *HN* 33.8. The *equites* thus offered scope for social legitimisation that would not have been open within the senatorial class.

57 Originally it appears that Patricians made up the senatorial and *equites* classes of the *comitia centuriata*; with the conclusion of the struggle of the orders, Plebeians who met the entry qualification were admitted to those centuries, while a *plebiscitum* around the time of Scipio Africanus seems to have removed senators from those centuries leaving them exclusively for *equites*. However, given that wealth was the basis for admittance to the formal (and social) class of *equites* it would appear that many branches of senatorial families who themselves were not senatorial would have been *equites*.

58 This considerable rise in the public standing and wealth of the *equites* is consonant with the concession to the *equites* of the right to collect the taxes on behalf of the state in the new province of Asia by the *lex sempronia* passed by the *tribunum plebis*, Gaius Gracchus. Also significant was the *lex acilia*, passed in 123 B.C. by the Tribune M. Acilius Glabrio, which formally gave to the *equites* the sole prerogative to sit as jurors in the standing court against corruption – the *quaestio de pecuniis repetundis*. This law may have entrenched the *equites* as a social class (*ordo equestris*) as opposed to those who were formally of the Equestrian centuries of the *Comitia Centuriata* i.e., possessed the public horse (*equo publico*). It appears that the *iudices* (jurors) according to the *lex sempronia* had to be chosen from those citizens who possessed the monetary wealth to be admitted to that class: Plut. *C. Gracch.* 5; App. *B. Civ.* 1.22; Tac. *Ann.* 12.60. It appears from the *lex servilia de repetundarum*, passed in 105 B.C., that every person who was to be selected as a juror was required to be above thirty and under sixty years of age, to have either an *equus publicus* or to be qualified by his wealth to possess one, to be free born, and not to be a senator. The latter law gave persons defined as *equites* considerable power over members of the senatorial order and it became a bone of contention between the old *nobiles* and the wealthy *equites* in later years.

statues erected on Delos by these wealthy Roman merchants. In the provinces, they would have been free from the class restrictions that would have operated at Rome and which may have hindered the display of their *imagines* in any public context (except for their tombs and perhaps in the privacy of their own *atria*, if they had them). The other advantage in setting-up images in semi- or fully public spaces on Delos is that they served as a public statement that these persons were aligned with the imperial power of Rome – as beneficiaries and as benefactors - in that they were protected by it while at the same time could utilise it for the benefit or detriment of others. Many Roman merchants would no doubt have seen this as a positive benefit for the conduct of their business activities.

The fact of Roman power in the region would also have served as an incentive to the Delians to honour the *equites* and Romans living on the island. Given their wealth and the fact that many operated in collusion with leading senatorial families, these merchants would have been perceived as being well placed to offer support to the community at very high places in Rome itself. By the second half of the second century B.C. the Hellenistic Kings were no longer a potent force that could offer the community the same benefits of protection and patronage which the Romans provided (as opposed to menace that the Kings now posed). Indeed, it was the Roman senate which had granted Delos the benefits of being a free port and to which it now owed its continuing survival and protection. This is evidenced by statue inscriptions which show a rapid drop off of royal and other statues dedicated to the Hellenistic Kings after 166 B.C. which only account for 40 % of dedications evidenced in this period.⁵⁹

The above factors taken as a whole strongly support the conclusion that many of the *imagines* from Delos identified as being in the Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* style, would date to between 133 B.C. and 88 B.C., with perhaps one or two examples before and possibly after these dates. Despite such inferences, and whatever the precise dating of the Delos heads and other pieces bearing the *severitas/gravitas* expression, several things can be concluded.

1. Crucially, none of these facts confirm that the Delos heads are earlier than portraits bearing the *severitas/gravitas* expression found in Italy – this is suggested by the proposed dating at least of the Louvre ‘Albinus’ (Ill.28), the Munich Glyptothek ‘Marius’ and ‘Sulla’ (discussed above (Ills. 23 and 24)) and the bronze Capitoline Brutus (discussed below

⁵⁹ Compared with over 80 % for the period of 314-166 B.C. when 60 out of 75 public portrait statues were of royal or court subjects: see Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 21-22.

(Ill.33)). It simply suggests that marble as a material was more widely available on the island than in Italy where it may have been more expensive – and that merchants had the money, time and inclination to have themselves represented in the manner to which they were accustomed. It may also indicate that marble was not as widely available in Rome or that it was not considered as worthy as bronze was for public and semi public *imagines* (or contrariwise, that the commercial unavailability of quality marble in Italy made it more expensive and more prized for portrait images but nonetheless rarer).

2. The patterning of the facial expression of the portraits on Delos makes them identifiable as “Roman” portraits: in that each of those discussed employ the *severitas/gravitas* expression to convey specifically Roman morals and values to the viewing public. If the subjects of these portraits were not Roman citizens *per se*, they were individuals who were consciously attempting to present themselves utilising Roman values and thereby to align themselves with the economic and military power that Rome represented.⁶⁰ As the Delos heads show, a wide variety of methods and techniques could be utilised to create a Roman portrait - and the overall style or stylistic elements would have depended on the context of the piece, the material employed, the artist’s skill and the tastes of the patron. The use of models and the *severitas/gravitas* expression permitted a high degree of similarity in the appearance of these portraits so as to make them ‘recognisable’ as Romans, with the appropriate messages communicated through the facial expression and context in which the image was displayed.

3. It may well be that the Delian portraits which bear the *severitas/ gravitas* expression just ‘appeared’ on the island with the arrival of large numbers of Italians from 166 B.C. onwards, and need not have ‘developed’ there at all.⁶¹ In fact the context of the Delos heads suggests that the style was one brought with the Roman merchants to the island, and was not one developed there by Greek artists and thence taken back to Rome. This will become clearer in Chapter Ten where theories on the origins of Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* portrait style are discussed.

60 The fact should not be dismissed that a Roman citizen may also wish to have themselves portrayed utilizing a Hellenistic or Greek style – but given the importance of Roman power as ensuring the benefits that commercial activity in the region may offer, it would require a further study to identify those situations when a Roman citizen might choose to do so.

61 Interestingly, apart from the heads in the *severitas/gravitas* style on Delos, the other portrait heads are clearly in the Hellenistic style and that favoured by the Hellenistic kings. There is no evidence that the *severitas/gravitas* style developed on Delos. See Appendix 7 on the Hellenistic sculptures from Delos.

Apart from these observations, there can be no clear chronology for the Delos heads, other than perhaps the suggestions I have already proposed: that is, that A2136 is the earliest, dating to around 160-150 B.C. while the remainder most likely date to between 133 B.C. (or 123 B.C.) and 88 B.C., with the bulk of portraits clustering around 120-90 B.C.

B) Portraits of identified individuals:

These have a *terminus post quem* which is the point in time at which the portrayed individual may have had an *imago* made of them while alive, to any time after their death. Most portraits of identifiable individuals actually come from coins – these are discussed at C) below. The fact that a portrait may or may not be of an identified individual, brings us to the point that this methodology can account for only a small number of Roman Republican portraits, the bulk of which have no known identification. However, there are some surviving portraits which have been found with *tituli* identifying the individual concerned, or have been identified by comparison with coin portraits, or have been found in contexts which strongly suggest who the individual was.

An example is provided by portraits of Augustus on his coins and positively identifiable monuments (Ills.81-83). The problem with Augustus is that he appears to have deliberately eschewed the use of the Republican *severitas/gravitas* form of portraiture for a new, highly classicising style which befitted the age at which he gained power and his political programme – although early Octavian coin portraits depict him still with elements of the *severitas/gravitas* expression.⁶² The classicising form of his portraiture is clearly evidenced by the images from the *Ara Pacis* and the statue of *Augustus togatus* and *Augustus Prima Porta* (Ill.s 82 and 83.2-3). This style of portraiture heavily influenced other portrait images, most notably those of the imperial family, private portraits, and recreations of images of famous men of the late Republic (such as Cicero, Pompey, Cato etc.) made during the Augustan and Julio-Claudian period.

While some scholars believe that Augustus' portrait style provides a *terminus ante quem* for those of the purer Roman Republican (*severitas/gravitas*) portrait style, many portraits made during the Augustan period and into the early Principate continued to have elements of a softer or more muted *severitas/gravitas* facial expression formulated through a Classicising

⁶² Early coins of Octavian minted soon after Caesar's assassination, however, are very much in the *severitas/gravitas* style of Caesar's coinage.

portrait style, frequently combining pathic elements.⁶³ Furthermore, there still appear to have been portrait images in the more abstract or linear Roman Republican portrait style made during the Augustan and Julio-Claudian period perhaps due to a conscious choice demanded by the patron or the social context for which the portrait was intended – as is suggested by some of the portrait images on the tombs of the non-élite classes at Rome.⁶⁴

Complicating the issue is the fact there were revivals of the Roman Republican portrait style *contra* the overt Hellenising of Augustan and Julio-Claudian images at various times subsequently. Most notable was the revival of a Republican *severitas/gravitas* expression under the Emperor Vespasian (Ill. 84.1)(whose images are identified by comparison with coin images, Ill.84.2). It would seem that Vespasian, by adopting this style of image, was endeavouring to create a legitimised *nobiles* legacy for his family entrenched in the old values of the Republic, in a similar manner as the non-élite classes had done in the first century B.C.⁶⁵ The revival or reemphasis on the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression by Vespasian thus served as a counterpoint to the classicising style favoured by the Julio-Claudian dynasty established by Augustus – and the political message communicated by his use of such a style would not have been lost on the contemporary viewer.

The problem with identifying a portrait as being of Augustan or Julio-Claudian date due to the presence of Hellenising or Classicising style, is that already mentioned in relation to the Delian portraits: there were several ‘revivals’ of Hellenising or Classicising style throughout the second and first centuries B.C. There was also Greek influence in the sculpture of Rome going back to the Regal period, and evidenced by works dated from the sixth to third centuries B.C.⁶⁶ Indeed, it seems in the case of portrait sculpture that the use of a Hellenistic or Classicising style combined with the *severitas /gravitas* expression depended much on the personal choice of the patron (perhaps predicated on his social standing and the intended

63 Such as slightly parted lips and softer, more polished surfaces. Some of the portraits of Cicero and Pompey are a case in point, if they are in fact Augustan or Julio Claudian recreations of the images of famous persons from the late Republic. As noted above at n.62, some of the earlier portraits of Octavian are more in the stricter *severitas/gravitas* style.

64 For instance, the Funerary relief of the Licinii, BM (Ill.111); Funerary relief of the Antistii, BM (Ill. 76); and Funerary relief of the Vibii, BM (Ill. 74).

65 As with Caesar’s portraits made while he was alive, Vespasian’s choice of the Republican *severitas/gravitas* style is highly political. Despite his irregular method of coming to the throne, he wished to convey not only the fact that he was now a *nobilis*, but perhaps that he was a ‘Republican constitutionalist’ – in that he had restored the constitution and the state after its threatened usurpation by pretenders and tyrants after the murder of Galba – the person properly declared emperor by the senate on the murder of Nero. Thus putting him on the same level as Julius Caesar.

66 See Appendix 6.

purpose of the portrait), the availability of money and capable artists, the context in which the portrait would be displayed, and perhaps trends in taste and fashion. Hence we have a number of portraits which may be in what is described as a 'Hellenising' style combined with the *severitas/gravitas* expression that, without more, could date any time from 300 B.C. until the Julio-Claudian period. For instance, the so-called 'Brutus' in the Palazzo dei Conservatori, Musei Capitolini, Rome (Ill. 33.1-3) (discussed below).

An interesting piece, now in the NY Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen, is said to have come from the *Tomb of the Licinii* in Rome (Ill. 31).⁶⁷ This head is known in other versions, for instance the head in the Louvre (Ill. 32). There is uncertainty regarding the provenance of the Copenhagen head,⁶⁸ but if this head does in fact come from the *Tomb of the Licinii* and represents Marcus Licinius Crassus, the Triumvir as claimed⁶⁹ then we may have a portrait which is coeval to the lifetime of the man it represents, or which, if manufactured in the Julio-Claudian period, may have been modelled on an extant (perhaps bronze) portrait dating to his lifetime. This would attest the Republican (*severitas/gravitas*) portrait style to at least the period of Crassus' death at Carrhae in 53 B.C. Interesting features of the Glyptotek piece are the sternness of the expression, the down turn of the mouth, the contraction of the eyebrows and forehead, combined with a smooth polishing of the features to give the wrinkles a softer appearance, while the hair is carved in short individuated locks in the penne style. The hair itself is reminiscent of the hairstyle that was to become characteristic of portraits of Augustus and his coterie which have led some scholars to date this piece to this period. However, I would not discount the possibility that the bifurcate locks on the forehead actually communicated a physiognomic message (possibly obtained from Greek physiognomic theories) which was utilised by Crassus and later taken up by Augustus, much in the same way Pompey adopted the anastole of Alexander the Great with its leonine reference.

Another example is provided by the portraits of Pompey (Ill. 17) and Cicero (Ills. 46-48), and we are fortunate in being able to identify these portraits with some certainty (Pompey's portrait from coins minted by his sons (Ill. 51); and Cicero from a bust that was inscribed with a *titulus* bearing his name). The Pompey in the Ny Carlsberg is also said to have come from

67 P. Kragelund, "The Emperors, the Licinii Crassi and the Carlsberg Pompey," in *Images of Ancestors*, ed. J. M. Hojte, *Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Antiquity* 5 (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2002), 190-91.

68 F. van Keuren, "Unpublished documents shed new light on the Licinian Tomb, discovered in 1884-1885, Rome," *MAAR* 48 (2003); P. Kragelund et al., *The Licinian Tomb. Fact or Fiction?* Meddelelser fra Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek Copenhagen (Copenhagen: Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, 2003).

69 Kragelund, "The Emperors, the Licinii Crassi and the Carlsberg Pompey," 191.

the *Tomb of the Licinii* in Rome.⁷⁰ Both these are highly Classicising in their overall style, but which still combine elements of the *severitas/gravitas* facial patterning. These may date from the lifetime of these men (say 55 B.C. – 43 B.C.) or more likely they may be Julio-Claudian recreations, which although Classicising in overall style, were possibly modelled on portrait images in the more overt Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* manner dating to the lifetime of the subjects. Images of Pompey on the coins minted by his sons would suggest that this latter scenario was so – since the coin images are more noticeably in the *severitas/gravitas* style – with Pompey's lined forehead being clearly visible.⁷¹

A further example of dating by comparison with known portrait images is provided by a bronze portrait of Cato from Volubilis in North Africa, now in the Musée d'Art Archéologique, Rabat (Ill. 85). This is the only portrait of Cato which is inscribed with his name – and it was found in the *House of the Busts*⁷² / *House of Venus*⁷³ which it has been shown was first built in the mid-first century A.D. and then largely renovated or rebuilt in the third century A.D.⁷⁴ There is a reference in Plutarch to a bronze portrait statue of Cato on the beach at Utica [Plut. *Cato* 71], and it is known that King Juba II of Mauretania had a collection of Greek and Roman bronze portraits, so it is not implausible that the bust once belonged to him or it is a copy of the one owned by him – which suggests a date of the late first century B.C. The overall appearance of the portrait is in the Classicising style favoured in the Augustan/Julio-Claudian period. In reality, it could date to anytime after Cato's death in 46 B.C. through to the end of the first century A.D. – although a later date in the Augustan or Julio-Claudian period is more likely given its likely provenance.

There is also a marble head from Castel Gandolfo, now in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Firenze, which bears a striking resemblance to the bronze head, particularly in the details of the nose and the slightly overhanging upper lip and slim neck (Ill. 86).⁷⁵ This

70 HIN733, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek. Ibid., 186, fig. 1.

71 See the coin minted by Sextus Pompeius which has an image of Pompey that looks rather more lineal than the smooth Hellenising version from the *Tomb of the Licinii* that we now possess.

72 J. C. M. Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1978), 39.

73 See S. Walker, "The King and the Philosopher: Role models at Volubilis" (paper presented at the Role Models: Identity and Assimilation in the Roman World and in Early Modern Italy 17-19 March 2003, American Academy in Rome, 2003): online at <http://www.aarome.org/confs/rm_abstr/rm_ab_walker.htm>

74 C. Picard, "La date du buste en bronze de Caton d'Utique trouvé à Volubilis, Maroc," in *Neue Beiträge zur klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Bernhard Schweitzer*, ed. B. Schweitzer and R. Lullies (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1954), pl. 73; Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits*, 40, ill. 38.

75 There is also a bronze copy found at Pompeii, thus providing a terminus ante quem of 79 A.D. now in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Naples. See Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits*, 40, n.3.

suggests that both may have been modelled on an original, possibly of bronze and possibly set up somewhere at Rome. However, apart from the highly Hellenised style of both portraits, revealed by the soft modelling of the features and the composition of the hair in wavy locks there is nothing else which suggests a firm date - both heads could date from the time of Cato to the third quarter of the first century A.D.

Despite the conjecture, there is not much inherent in either of these portraits which can be used to date the bulk of portraits in the Roman Republican (*severitas/gravitas*) style.

C) Portraits on coins:

Coins of the first century B.C. sometimes bear an *imago* of an illustrious ancestor of the person responsible for minting them. With the exception of the coins of Scipio Africanus from Carthago Nova (Ill. 40), and the Stater of Flaminius (Ill. 26)(which were minted outside Italy), the use of Republican coin images which might refer to ancestral portraiture cannot be traced any earlier than the period of the Gracchi; and the earliest to bear the portrait of an ancestor dates to 62 B.C. – being a coin minted by C. Coelius Caldus (Ill. 43).⁷⁶

If these coin portraits were in fact images created for the portrait *de novo* then we have an absolute date provided by the date the coin was minted. However, if the coin portrait was based or modelled on another portrait that was extant at the time the coin was minted, then we have a *terminus ante quem* for the portrait which served as the model. This means that the model on which the coin portrait was based (and by extension the style of the coin portrait itself if it is a faithful replica of the model) could date to any time from when the coin was minted back to the time when the subject was alive.⁷⁷

The process of identifying individuals from coin portraits (which is then used to date extant portraits) is fraught with problems, most notable of which is that with the exception of a few individuals of the Republican period, there are not enough surviving examples in a variety of coins to establish a sound iconographic or physiognomic database from which to make the

⁷⁶ Breckenridge, "Origins of Roman Republican Portraiture: Relations with the Hellenistic World," 841.

⁷⁷ See the comment of Heisinger, "Portraiture in the Roman Republic," 818-19: "Except in rare instances, and excluding the funeral reliefs with their largely unknown subjects, the sculpted portraits of the Republic survive as a vast, unordered, unidentified and undated mass of material. The primary source of documentation is in the form of coin portraiture which first appeared in the late Republic. ... [N]evertheless coin portraiture was confined to a relatively short period of the republic, and provides only indirect evidence that requires cautious evaluation and application."

comparison with extant portraits in stone or bronze. The exceptions would include notables such as Pompey, Caesar, Antony, Agrippa, Octavian/Augustus and a few others.

There is an irony in identifying surviving stone or bronze portraits from coin images, in that it is more likely that the coin portraits were modelled on the three dimensional portraits in bronze or terracotta than freehand versions merely created for the coin. This is confirmed by reference to several artistic conventions utilised in the portraits themselves; such as the sharp curvature of the neck line (which makes it look like a hollow bronze cast bust), and tight or twisting neck tendons – which indicate that the head is in fact turned in a particular direction. This would be unnecessary if the head were in fact a freehand image produced by the artist *ab initio* for a coin.

A case in point is the portrait of Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa found on several coins (Ill. 86). The best example is from an *as* minted posthumously, possibly under Caligula or Claudius. The coin shows the head of Agrippa facing left with the inscription M AGRIPPA L F COS III. While the overall style of the portrait is in the Classicising mode favoured in the Augustan and Julio-Claudian principates, there are still incipient features of the face which hint at the Roman Republican style – most notably the (softly modelled) contracted eyebrows and forehead marked by a diagonal crease mark on the forehead which starts from the base of the nose bridge, while the line of the mouth is drawn closed and curves slightly down at the corner.

In relation to whether the coin portrait is modelled on a bust or portrait work of Agrippa, there are two important facts to observe: the diagonal fold marks on the neck suggesting that the neck is turned to its left, and the hair style, which is formed by multiple *penne* style locks which frame the forehead. In particular there is an inverted 'V' formed by the hair locks over the temple, one lock falling over his forehead, the other curving downward away from his temple. Surprisingly, we have an extant portrait of Agrippa in marble found at Gabii in the eighteenth century and now in the Louvre (Ill. 88.1-2).⁷⁸ This portrait has exactly the two features mentioned in relation to the portrait on the *as*: the diagonal fold marks on the left side of the neck and the fact that the head of the marble portrait is turned to its left; and the inverted 'V' described from the coin image formed by the hairline. While the stone image is

⁷⁸ L. M. Ugolini, *L'Agrippa di Butrinto*, vol. 4, *Rivista del R. Istituto d'archeologia e storia dell'arte* (Roma: Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato, 1932), pls.4 and 6; Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits*, 66, pls. 4 and 6. De Kersauson, K. *Catalogue des portraits romains I* (Paris 1986) n.22, p.54.

intensely modelled in the classicising style (polished, softened surface with few wrinkles), still present is the dimpling at the corners of the mouth indicating it is down-turned, and there are outward diagonally modelled lines at the nose bridge which spread onto the forehead indicating the eyebrows are contracted. The only difference between the coin and stone portrait is that the coin portrait is wearing a 'rostral' crown.

It is unlikely that the marble portrait was modelled on that of the coin. It is thus far more likely that both the coin image and the marble portrait (if both date to the early Claudian period) were modelled on a surviving (possibly bronze) portrait of Agrippa, possibly set up some time after the battle of Actium.

As described in Chapter Six, we have several coins minted in the first century B.C. which bear the portraits of illustrious ancestors or persons connected with the individual issuing the coin. The problem is that the portraits usually depict persons who were long dead by the time the coins were made.⁷⁹

These portraits could lead to two conclusions: either the portraits are created *ab initio* by the artist for the die; or the images were modelled on extant portrait images in bronze (or possibly terracotta) that existed at the time the coins were minted. In the first scenario, this would provide an absolute date for the portrait – and would tell us that definitely by the mid-first century B.C. there were portraits utilising the *severitas/ gravitas* expression at Rome. However, it is far more likely, as already discussed, that these portraits were modelled on extant images that existed in the city at the time the coins were made. This suggests that the derived coin portraits (and the originals on which they were based) could date back to the lifetime of the individual concerned – in which case we have indirect evidence that the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression was utilised for Roman portraits from at least the end of the third century B.C. The portrait of Marcellus is a case in point (Ill.39).

Regarding coin images identified as portraying Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus – there is

⁷⁹ For instance, the coin bearing the portrait of Marcus Claudius Marcellus (who died in 208 B.C.) was minted in 50 B.C. by his descendant Publius Cornelius Marcellinus; Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits*, 17. That of Aulus Postumius Albinus (who died 89 B.C.) was minted in 49-48 B.C. by Decimus Postumius Albinus; Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits*, 21. That of Caius Coelius Caldus (consul in 94 B.C.) by Caius Coelius Caldus (probably the grandson) in 51 B.C.; Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits*, 21. Those of Sulla and Quintus Pompeius Rufus (Consuls in 88 B.C.) were issued by Quintus Pompeius Rufus (probably the grandson of the Consul Rufus) in 54 B.C.; Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits*, 22-23. While that of Caius Antius Restio (*Tribunum Plebis* in 72 B.C.) was minted by his grandson Caius Antius Restio in 47 B.C. (See Ill.s 40 – 46): Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits*, 23-24.

a shekel from Carthago Nova minted around 209 B.C. (Ill. 40)⁸⁰ and the image from a portrait gem signed by Herakleides in the Naples Museum (Ill. 41).⁸¹ The problem is that neither image is conclusively proven to be of Scipio – since neither has identifying *tituli*. The bronze head of Scipio found in the *Villa of the Papyri* at Herculaneum (Ill. 34) (concerning which there are also some doubts as to its identification) does tend to have some elements that suggest an earlier date.⁸² While it has a *terminus ante quem* of 79 A.D., we can be no firmer than saying that it dates sometime from perhaps the mid-second century B.C. to the late first century B.C.⁸³

With heads of Pompey, minted on coins after his death by his sons – we are again on firmer ground – at least as regards identification. The image of Pompey from a denarius minted by his son, Sextus Pompeius Magnus Pius, in Sicily in 42-38 B.C. (Ill. 51). The image of Pompey from the coin has a strong similarity to the portrait of Pompey in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek (Ill. 17) – the crest of the hair in the characteristic anastole, the lines of the crease-marks on the forehead, the slight double chin etc. However, the image of Pompey on the coin is much more heavily lined. This suggests that both the marble portrait and the coin image were modelled on some extant portrait of Pompey that would date some time from Pompey's lifetime, say from the year he held his first consulship in 70 B.C. onwards, or following his conquest of the east in 63 B.C. The marble portrait itself is heavily Classicising – and this suggests that it is a recreation and dates to the Augustan or Julio-Claudian period, while the coin seems more linear and abstract (but this could merely reflect the talent of the artist). However, we know that Pompey was heavily influenced in his style of portrait image by those of Alexander the Great, and this in itself may indicate that the original was also heavily Hellenising in its form – despite this (and as noted in Chapter Six), the marble portraits of Pompey still present the *severitas/gravitas* expression.

80 Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* 18-19.

81 Ibid., 18, ill. 4.

82 Such as the simple modelling of the hair as pinpointed on the skull, and the simplicity of the rendering of the facial patterning, particularly the schematic frown lines on the forehead and the frown indicated by two short, upwardly carved lines on either side of the nose bridge. Another factor worthy of note is that the portraits on the shekel and the gem bear no real semblance to the bronze head of Scipio. This may be because Scipio conquered Carthago Nova while still a young man, being only 26 or 27 – while the bronze portrait may date much later in his lifetime or after his death (but modelled on an earlier piece dating to the lifetime of Scipio that has not survived). The fact is we cannot really know.

83 There is also a marble head in the Capitoline Museum, Rome, (Ill. 35) which has the features already mentioned, although it is highly polished and more softly modelled, with less deeply carved facial lines. The pupils of the eyes of this piece are incised and it has the form of a head with upper torso – thus indicating that it is not a work of the Republican or early imperial period. If it is ancient, it is a copy of the mid-Imperial period (early third century B.C.) but it is more likely to be a Renaissance recreation.

Thus, while we can conclude that the coin image was minted sometime from 42 B.C. to 38 B.C., the marble image is most likely to be a copy made sometime in the Augustan period or later: while the original on which both were based could date to Pompey's lifetime. It is tempting to think that for political purposes, Sextus may have modelled the image of his father for the coin on the portrait statue at the foot of which Caesar was said to have been murdered; however, this is purely conjecture on my part.

D) Portraits found in Pompeii and Herculaneum:

These have a *terminus ante quem* of A.D. 79 when those cities were destroyed by the eruption of Mount Vesuvius. With portraits of some individuals, other epigraphic and written records give us a good idea of when that individual lived; thereby providing us with a *terminus post* and *ante quem* for identified portraits of the individual concerned.

Already mentioned is the bronze bust of Scipio (Ill. 34) and another said to be of Cato, both now in the Museo Nazionale Archeologico, Naples. However, as noted previously, the Cato may have been made during the Augustan or early Julio-Claudian period, while the Scipio could be of any date from 180 B.C. to the late Republican/early Augustan period.

Another example of a portrait of a person who is nowhere near as illustrious as those just mentioned, is the bronze herm bust found in the atrium (Ill. 90) of the home of Lucius Caecilius Iucundus, a banker, in Pompeii (Ill. 89.1-2). The house was known to have belonged to the banker from the many documents in wax tablet that have been found there. It is disputed who the image actually represents – although there is evidence from the graffiti found in the house that Caecilius had died some years before the final destruction of the town in A.D. 79 and that it then belonged to his sons. This might suggest that the image in fact depicted Lucius Caecilius Iucundus himself or his *patronus*. The alternative suggestion is that the portrait represents Caecilius' father, who it seems was a *libertus* and the first in his family to be a Roman citizen. If the portrait is of either Lucius or his father, it may be an attempt to create a legitimate family lineage celebrating the Roman citizenship status and economic success of the family. It appears from documentation and the size of the house that the family was probably wealthy enough to be admitted to the *equites* class – thereby providing even more incentive to the family to celebrate Caecilius or his father as the founder of the family line.

What is interesting is the style of Caecilius' portrait – the drawn eyebrows and the downturn of the mouth evidencing *severitas* and *gravitas* are exactly what one would expect of an *imago* displayed in the *atrium* of a house. It would appear that the bust would date to before 63 A.D. at the time of the earthquake which damaged the town. This would provide a tentative date for the portrait covering a period of some 50 years: say 10-60 A.D. If it does date to the period suggested, it clearly evidences the use of *imagines* in the family home, even of freedmen, in the older Republican (*severitas/gravitas*) portrait style, at least in provincial contexts, in the early to middle of the first century A.D.

E) Portraits dated by typology or stylistic criteria:

This is the method used to date most of the portraits we now possess, including those from the tombs of the non-élite classes at Rome, and other surviving heads in marble and bronze. It is done through comparison of the overall stylistic and other elements (such as fashions in hairstyle or method of dress, or epigraphical or technological information including provenance of the material) with those from securely dated monuments or which have a *terminus ante* or *post quem*. I have already used this methodology above in discussing the Delos and other heads in order to place them in a tentative chronological sequence.

From securely identified sculptures from the time of Augustus (the *Ara Pacis*) we know that Augustus introduced a style of portraiture that was heavily classicising (Ill. 82—83.2-3). His images are also identifiable by reference to his coins (Ill. 81.3-5). As already noted, this should mean that portraits which combine a heavily classicising style with traditional Roman facial expression and are made from, say, Luna marble, have a *terminus post quem* of the time of Augustus onwards. The *Ara Pacis* also suggests to us that there was a style of wearing the toga that came into common usage in the Augustan period (Ill.82).⁸⁴ We also know that that there was a distinctive style of rendering the hair for men (*penne* locks) while women wore their hair with the fringe rolled back over the forehead or later in a 'melon wave style of hair-do'.⁸⁵

Factors such as these should mean that if a statue possesses the mode of dress or hairstyle which are similar to those on statues of Augustus or the figures from the *Ara Pacis* then it has

⁸⁴ For dating relating to toga style, see Kockel, *Porträtreliefs stadtrömischer Grabbauten: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und zum Verständnis des spätrepublikanisch-frühkaiserzeitlichen Privatporträts*, 15-16 and 18-19.

⁸⁵ For dating relating to hairstyle, see *Ibid.*, 32-35 and 58. Kockel dates the introduction of the 'Marcellus' style for depicting the hair to 30 B.C. onwards.

a *terminus post quem* dating to this time; if the style of wearing the toga or hair is an earlier style, then we should have a *terminus ante quem*.

Such a methodology is replete with problems – and at its best it becomes simply reasoned conjecture. An example of the difficulties of dating a monument according to such criteria is provided by the *Tomb of Eurysaces* (Ill. 105). The dating of this monument is by no means secure, ranging from the mid-second quarter of the first century B.C. to the mid-Augustan period. Evidence for dating the tomb comes primarily from three sources: the inscriptions, the building materials, and the style of the relief portrait. Scholars have studied the style of the inscriptions, in both appearance and content, on the three extant facades. Archaisms in the Latin inscriptions (both on the three facades of the monument and in the epitaph of Eurysaces' wife, Atistia) suggest a mid-to late Republican date or possibly the preservation of late Republican style in the early Augustan era.⁸⁶

The building material, the concrete core in particular, has provided another means of analysis. One scholar has suggested that since it consists of a reddish brown tufa used as an aggregate, is firmly Augustan in date.⁸⁷ Another scholar using the same material suggests a late Republican-early Augustan date.⁸⁸ Based on the limited use of marble and the unusual capitals of the pilasters, a specific date of 30-20 B.C. has been proposed, a date that would coincide with the late Republican and early Augustan date of the inscriptions.⁸⁹

In comparison, Kleiner suggested a later, mid-Augustan date for the monument, specifically

86 H. Brandt, *Wird auch silbern mein Haar: Eine Geschichte des Alters in der Antike* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2002), 14-15. Also see M. Massaro, *Epigrafia metrica latina di eta repubblicana* (Bari: Istituto di Latino, Universita di Bari, 1992), 36-37. Richardson suggested that the style of the letters is late Republican or early Augustan period: L. Richardson, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1992), 335. Also see L. Keppie, *Understanding Roman Inscriptions* (London: Batsford, 1991), 28-29.

87 E. B. van Deman, "The Methods of Determining the Date of Ancient Roman Concrete Construction," *AJA* (1912).

88 P. Ciancio Rossetto, *Il sepolcro del fornaio Marco Virgilio Eurisace a Porta Maggiore* (Rome: 1973), 67.

89 It has been suggested that the statue of Atistia and her accompanying inscription do not come from Eurysaces tomb but another tomb nearby. See L. Hackworth Petersen, "The Baker, His Tomb, His Wife, and Her Breadbasket: The Monument of Eurysaces in Rome," *ABull* 85, no. 2 (2003). For a general discussion dating the monument in this way see Kockel, *Porträtreliefs stadtrömischer Grabbauten: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und zum Verständnis des spätrepublikanisch-frühkaiserzeitlichen Privatporträts*, 88.

between 13 B.C. and A.D. 5.⁹⁰ This later date seems to contradict the other proposed dates which rest on the material evidence of the monument itself. This contradiction could either mean that Atistia's statue is wrongly attributed to the Eurysaces' monument; that it was added at a date after the monument was initially constructed; or that we simply do not know enough about hairstyle, drapery or epigraphic techniques and prevailing fashion (or that such criteria are too subjective) to provide sensible conclusions. As it is, scholarly opinion, relying on similar material, has proposed a range of dates covering a time span of some 50 years.⁹¹

Dating schemes relying on typology of stylistic criteria can thus only be relative and tentative. The issue regarding the provenance of the material of manufacture has already been commented upon – compounding this issue is the fact that for *imagines* of the *nobiles* at least, sources suggest there was generational replication of the portraits for placement in the ancestor galleries for display in the *atria* of the leading member of the *gens* and *familia*. This suggests copies were made of older portraits dating to the subject's lifetime possibly for many generations after they were dead. In the public sphere, the *curules aediles* had responsibility for the repair and maintenance of public statuary and monuments, which means there could have been an ongoing process of renovation of portrait images, including their inscriptions, resulting in the fact that the context of display and information concerning the identity of these portraits could have changed considerably over time from the original display.⁹²

Regarding the identification of stylistic elements employed in a particular portrait, there were earlier and later revivals of Hellenism or Classicism at Rome other than the one under Augustus.⁹³ Simply, the use of Classical or Hellenistic stylistic elements for a portrait may merely have reflected the taste of the patron, and the identification of such traits in a portrait depends very much on the eye of the modern viewer.⁹⁴ This means that an image or portrait

90 Kleiner, *Roman Group Portraiture: The Funerary Reliefs of the Late Republic and Early Empire*, 154-56, and 38-39. She bases this conclusion on stylistic grounds, not of the monument itself but of the relief portrait. Her analysis depends on a model of what could be called 'trickle-down' aesthetics, which assumes that there is a time-lag between styles and fashions as first evidenced for individuals from the richer or elite classes until it is taken on by larger circles of society lower down the social ladder. She concludes that Atistia's drapery corresponds with aristocratic examples dating to between 40 and 13 B.C., but that her hair style, (which she argues imitates the hairstyles of upper class women of the mid-Augustan period), is an indicator of its true dating.

91 See Kockel, *Porträtreliefs stadtrömischer Grabbauten: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und zum Verständnis des spätrepublikanisch-frühkaiserzeitlichen Privatporträts*, 83, 88-90, for bibliography on the proposed dates of the relief, most of which cluster between 40-20 B.C. Kockel himself proposes a date between 60 and 50 B.C.

92 See Chapter 9, 266-267, n.51 *infra*.

93 Pliny suggests that there was just such a 'revival' in 146 B.C. '*deinde revixit ars...*' Plin. (E) HN 34.52.

94 A good example of this type of methodology is that used by Papini, *Antichi volti della Repubblica*, 2004.

utilising a Classical or Hellenistic stylistic repertoire could date any time from the Hellenistic period onwards: i.e., say 300 B.C. or maybe even earlier for those works in a classicising style.

The fact that a toga or hair style is one that is earlier than that evidenced on the *Ara Pacis* or other such monuments does not necessarily mean it predates the Augustan period; it could simply be that the manner of rendering the hair or clothing is archaic or old fashioned. Even if the style of the toga or hair style suggest a time earlier than the Augustan period, just how much before the Augustan period comes into question. Again, a statue with such hair or toga style could date just about anywhere from the early second century B.C. to 33 B.C if not later.

Another factor supposedly providing a *terminus post quem* is the statement by various written sources suggesting barbers were first introduced to Rome in 300 or 296 B.C.⁹⁵ Accordingly it has been suggested that a portrait which has a beard may date to before 300 B.C. while a portrait which is beardless may suggest that it dates to after 300 B.C.

Even if it is accepted that barbers were introduced to Rome at this time, this does not mean that all the men started clean shaving instantaneously. It may simply mean that beards were more groomed or close cut, rather than clean shaven. So even where portraits have beards, it does not mean that they cannot post-date 300 B.C. A quote from Pliny is instructive in this regard.⁹⁶ He tells us that L. Cornelius Scipio Africanus was the first to shave 'everyday' (*cotidie*) – which means most men must have sported some facial hair most of the time before Scipio made it fashionable to clean shave regularly. In fact we have a portrait of T. Quinctius Flaminius from a gold stater minted probably in Greece sometime around 197 B.C. and now in the British Museum, which indisputably depicts the General with a beard (Ill. 26). On the other hand there is the coin depicting Marcus Claudius Marcellus, minted in 50 B.C., which is beardless.⁹⁷ This may infer that before 300 B.C. shaving was less regular and so beards were worn longer and less tonsured, while after that date, they were kept short, tonsured, or men

95 Varro *Rust.* 2.11.10; Plin. (E) *HN* 7.211; Cic. *Cael.* 14.33: *illa horrida (barba) quam in statui antiquis atque imaginibus videmus.* Plin. (E) *HN* 7.59.211: *in Italiam ex Sicilia venire post Romam conditam anno CCCCLIII adducente P. Titinio Mena, ut auctor est Varro; antea intonsi fuere. primus omnium radi cotidie instituit Africanus sequens; Divus Augustus cultris semper usus est.* '[Barbers] came to Italy from Sicily, 454 years after the foundation of Rome, having been introduced by P. Titinius Mena, as the author Varro says; before that [the Romans] were unshaven. Scipio Africanus was the first of everyone to be shaved everyday. The deified Augustus always used his razor.'

96 Plin. (E) *HN* 7.59.211.

97 Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits*, 17.

went clean-shaven, though not until after Scipio Africanus did it become widespread to shave everyday.

That this was evident in the statues and portraiture of the period is confirmed to some degree by Cicero: *si illo austero more ac modo, aliquis mihi ab inferis excitandus est ex barbatis illis, non hac barbula qua ista delectatur sed illa horrida quam in statuīs antiquis atque imaginibus videmus* [Cic. *Mil.* 33]. He then proceeds to summon the *imago* of Appius Claudius Caecus, the Censor, who was renowned for his *severitas* and *gravitas*. This infers that there were bearded portrait images which dated to around 300 B.C. (the lifetime of Appius Claudius), and that at some time between then and the time of Scipio Africanus around 200 B.C. it became common fashion for men to shave everyday, after which time it might have been common for portraits to depict their subject as completely beardless and clean shaven.

As for dating a monument by lettering of the inscription, this combined with examination of the clothing and hair style, has been particularly utilised in dating images on the tombs of the non-élite classes. Of course as noted in reference to the *Tomb of Eurysaces*, this method does not assist with the bulk of portraits which do not bear inscriptions, and utilising such a methodology where a portrait can be associated with an inscription only provides a comparative and, by no means, absolute date. There are some tomb groups which appear to depict individuals wearing the toga in the pre-Augustan form, with linear or abstract rendering of the facial features and the *severitas/gravitas* expression, which have inscriptions in lettering reminiscent of the pre-Augustan period, but which are dated to the time of Augustus due to other factors. For instance, the funerary relief of Lucius Vibius and Vecilia Hila, in the Vatican Museums, Museo Chiaramonti, Rome (Ill. 74).⁹⁸ On the tombstone there is the bust of a child between the male and female adults in a classicising style reminiscent of the images of child members of the imperial family. However, there are doubts that this alone indicates the correct date of the monument.⁹⁹

While most of the tomb sculptures are given dates from the early first century B.C. onwards based on typological and stylistic considerations, these are far from settled. An example is the

98 No. 1081, H. 75 cm, marble. Musei Vaticani.

99 The classicism of the child's image could simply result from the fact that children were not generally individuated in sculpture and so a classicising style for their images may have always been considered appropriate throughout the Republican and Augustan periods. So in reality, while it is tempting to date Vibius' tomb monument to the Augustan period, it could well pre-date it, being from some time in the mid-first century B.C.

tomb relief bearing an inscription of Blaesus and Blaesia made of travertine and found on the Via del Mortaro which is regarded as among the earliest example of the rectangular framed Republican tomb type (Ill. 91).¹⁰⁰ This was originally given a date of the late second century B.C., but Vessberg believed it dated to the first quarter of the first century B.C.¹⁰¹

An image given a date of around 90 B.C. based *inter alia* on the letter forms of the inscription is the 'Arringatore' representing Aulus Metellus (Ill. 6.1-3). It is also premised largely on the fact that after 90/89 B.C. when all the towns of Italy were granted citizenship, an inscription honouring a local magistrate would have been in Latin. However, there is nothing on stylistic grounds, the style of the toga or the inscription itself which suggests a date any firmer than perhaps between 150 and 90 B.C. In fact the abstracted expression of the facial expression is highly reminiscent of the bronze head of Scipio from the *Villa of the Papyri* (Ill. 34), and so this could suggest an earlier date. The style of the toga and other epigraphic factors mean we can really be no firmer.

An example of the difficulty in dating portraits can be provided by the Capitoline 'Brutus' (Ill. 33) – which has been variously dated from 300 B.C. to the mid-first century B.C.¹⁰² The dispute as to the date of this piece speaks volumes about the problem of dating Republican portraits. Its identification as Brutus came from comparing it with images on coins minted by Brutus the assassin (Ill.s 33.1-3 and 92.1-2). This has led some to conclude that the bronze portrait was a late Republican recreation. However it has also been classified as an example of "mid-Italic" style of portraiture which combines Hellenistic stylistic elements with traditional italic forms of presentation.¹⁰³ Despite the identification as Brutus there are in fact other coins dating from the late Republican period which have portraits of men from the early years of the Republic whose profiles bear a strong resemblance to the Brutus, showing just how precarious such identifications can be (Ill. 93).

In accounting for the similarity of the Brutus to the image from the coins of Brutus several

100 MC 2279: Museo Nuovo, Sala VI, Palazzo dei Conservatori, Musei Capitolini, Rome. CIL 2998: "...aesius C(ai) l(ibertus) Blaesia A(uli) l(iberta)".

101 O. Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik*, 2 vols. (Lund, Leipzig: C. W. K. Gleerup, O. Harrassowitz, 1941), 183-84.

102 Pollitt dates the piece to around 300 B.C.: J. J. Pollitt, "Rome, the Republic and early Empire," in *The Oxford History of Classical Art*, ed. J. Boardman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 225-26.; as does Robertson: M. Robertson, *A History of Greek Art* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), pl. 190a. However, Kilmer suggests a date between 125 and 75 B.C.: M. F. Kilmer, "Review of John Boardman, *Oxford History of Classical Art*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.," *BMCR* 94.10.09 (1994).

103 D. E. E. Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992), 24-25.

scenarios can be suggested:

- 1) that the portrait on the coin and the 'Capitoline Brutus' are not the same person (merely being a confusion stemming from a similarity of appearance);
- 2) that the coin was modelled on the bronze image but that the true identity of the bronze had become lost or confused in late Republican times so that it came to be considered to be a portrait of Brutus by the time the coin was minted;
- 3) that the coin was modelled on the bronze, and that the bronze was a 'recreation' for a statue of Brutus the Tyrannicide of the late Republican period.

The first two scenarios offer nothing constructive regarding the date of the Capitoline Brutus. If the suggestion that the portraits of Alexander the Great were the first attempts at individualised portraiture in Greek art is correct, then it would be difficult to accept that the head of Brutus could date before Alexander's time – and this would provide some *terminus post quem* for the Capitoline Brutus of 330 B.C.¹⁰⁴

The other fact is that the head is bearded – which superficially suggests that it predates the introduction of barbers to Rome in 300 B.C., although as noted above, it would appear that Romans could still be depicted bearded until the time of Scipio Africanus (the stater portrait [Ill. 26] of Titus Quinctilius Flaminius dating to around 197 B.C. proves it). Thus we may have a core date for the Brutus of between 330/300 B.C. down to 190 B.C.

The hair of the Brutus is composed of long, articulated locks, although the overall hairstyle is short. The beard is composed of relatively long locks that curl about the jaw line – although it is not a full beard. Reminiscent of the hair and beard style is a bronze head in the Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg (Ill. 94).¹⁰⁵ Its beard is in a similar style of composition to that of the Brutus, although the face is less lined (appearing to be a portrait of a man younger than 'Brutus') and its hair is composed of shorter, more penne style locks – similar to a beardless

104 However, this should not obscure an equally valid viewpoint that the emphasis on the individualism of the more mature man exhibiting *severitas/gravitas* as embodying the virtues of the ruling élite at Rome was a particular Roman development, then the style of the Brutus portrait could well have developed on its own without the precedent of style established by Alexander's portraits.

105 The head is suggested to be a portrait of Sextus Pompeius, based on comparisons with coin portraits – however, such an identification remains extremely doubtful.

bronze in the Cleveland Museum of Art, said to be from Rome (Ill. 95).¹⁰⁶

There is nothing in the technical aspects of the composition of the Brutus to suggest that it could not date to the third century B.C. There are bronze and marble heads from other parts of Italy dating to the fourth and early third centuries B.C., but in a highly classicising style, which clearly attest the skill of artists working locally during this period.¹⁰⁷ What I propose is that the Brutus head suggests that the Republican (*severitas/gravitas*) portrait style may well have been established sometime in the third century B.C.

The only other observation regarding the Brutus is that it undoubtedly portrays a well known Roman – and I would suggest someone of the third century B.C.; but who, exactly, can only be guessed at. Candidates could range from Appius Claudius Caecus (who dates between 340 B.C. to 273 B.C. and who served as Censor, Consul twice, and Dictator); or Quintus Fabius Maximus Cunctator (who was Consul five times in 233, 228, 215, 214, 209 B.C., Dictator in 217 B.C., and defeated the Ligurians in 233 as a result of which he celebrated a triumph). Interestingly, Pliny (E) tells us that the Consul, Spurius Carvilius, in celebration of his victory over the Samnites in 293 B.C. dedicated a colossal bronze statue of Jupiter on the Capitol at the foot of which he placed a bronze portrait of himself¹⁰⁸ – and it would be nice to think that perhaps the Brutus is in fact this portrait of Carvilius – since there is some evidence that the Brutus was found on the Capitol itself.

F) The Gallic sack of Rome in 390 B.C. (or 386 B.C) provides a *terminus post quem* for all portraits found at Rome:

It has been suggested that due to the destruction of the city that no portraits or statues could have survived from before 390/386 B.C. to be visible at the time of Augustus. Hence portraits of individuals predating this period referred to by the ancient sources (such as Cicero, Livy or Pliny) cannot have existed from the time these authors suggest but were later recreations.

It would seem, to judge by the archaeological evidence, that the scenario that the city was completely destroyed at this time was largely a fiction exaggerated by later Roman authors in order to explain or glorify curiosities of Roman history. There is no archaeological evidence

¹⁰⁶ No.1928-860, Cleveland Museum of Art.

¹⁰⁷ Such as the heavily classical head of a young man from the lago di Bolsena and now in the British Museum (Ill. 191).

¹⁰⁸ Plin. (E) *HN* 34.43

that shows a large scale destruction of the city that can be dated to this period. Even if the city was widely destroyed at this time, the sources tell us that the *capitolium* and the *arx* escaped unscathed. Despite the burning of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus at the time of Sulla in 83 B.C., Cicero and other sources states along with other sources that there were statues of great antiquity still to be found there and at other locations throughout the city even in his day.¹⁰⁹ I see no problem in accepting the testimony of these authors (even from the late Republican period) that there were many statues and images in the city that could well have dated back to the earliest years of the Republic.¹¹⁰

7.4 Conclusions on dating of Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* portraiture

The above discussion amply illustrates the difficulties in arriving at a sound chronology for Roman Republican portraits that provides clues as to the origin and development of the genre. The fact that diverse chronology for the same piece can be suggested by different scholars speaks eloquently about how troublesome proposed dating schemes actually are. Many portraits, especially those said to come from Italy and which are of marble, are largely dated

109 The *aedes iuppiter optimus maximus capitolinus*, or *aedes capitolina* (Plin. (E) *HN* 33.16.19; 35.14; 36.45): was situated on the *Capitolium* hill in Rome. According to sources Tarquinius Priscus vowed the temple, and some of the foundations have been dated to the mid-sixth century B.C., but a large part of the work was allegedly done by Tarquinius Superbus. The temple was allegedly dedicated on 13th September in 510 B.C. by Horatius Pulvillus who was selected by lot (Liv. *AUC* 2.8; 7.3.8; Polyb. 3.22; Tac. *Hist.* 3.72; Plut. *Popl.* 14; Plin. (E) *HN* 33.19). The temple consisted of three *cellae*. The middle *cella*, dedicated to Jupiter, contained a terracotta statue of the god, allegedly the work of Vulca of Veii (Ov. *Fast.* 1.201-202; Plin.(E) *HN* 33.111-112; 35.157). The entablature of the temple was made of wood, and on the apex of the pediment was a terracotta group, Jupiter in a quadriga, also made by Vulca (Plin.(E) *HN* 28.16; 35.157; Fest. 274; Plut. *Popl.* 13). This statue was replaced in 296 B.C. by another, probably of bronze (Livy *AUC* 10.23.12). It seems that the pediment and roof were decorated with terracotta figures, among them a statue of Summanus 'in fastigio' (an acroterion ?) destroyed by lightning in 293 B.C.(Cic. *Div.* 1.10; Liv. *Epit.* 14.). This temple became a repository of works of art and statues, dedicated as votive offerings by Roman generals and foreigners, as well as of dedicatory offerings and trophies - the earliest recorded being a golden crown presented by the Latins in 459 B.C. (Livy *AUC* 2.22.6). Because of the great number of these statues and dedications in 179 B.C. some were removed (Livy *AUC* 40.51.3). The temple was burned to the ground on 6th July, 83 B.C. (Cic. *Cat.* 3.9; Sall. *Cat.* 47.2; Tac. *Hist.* 3.72; App. *B.Civ.* 1.83 and 86; Plut. *Sull.* 27), and along with it the statue of Jupiter was destroyed (Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 71; Ov. *Fast.* 1.201). However, it is recorded that the treasure of the Temple was carried to safety by Marius (Y) to Praeneste (Plin. (E) *HN* 33.16). The rebuilding was undertaken by Sulla (Val. Max. *Mem.* 9.3.8; Tac. *Hist.* 3.72; Plin. (E) *HN* 36.45), but most was carried out by Q. Lutatius Catulus, on being assigned the job by the senate (Cic. *Verr.* 4.69; Lactant. *De Ira Dei* 22.6; Suet. *Caes.* 15). The rebuilt temple was dedicated by him in 69 B.C. (Liv. *Ep.* 98; Plut. *Popl.* 15; Plin. (E) *HN* 7.138; 19.23; Suet. *Aug.* 94). Under the temple were passages (favissae) entered from the *cella* in which the sources state were stored the old statues that had fallen from the roof, and various dedicatory gifts (Fest. 88; Gell. *NA* 2.10). All the sources confirm that even in the period of the Late Republic there could still be seen many statues of great antiquity, at least on the *capitolium* - if not elsewhere in the city.

110 The suggestion that the destruction of Rome by the Gauls in 390 B.C. provides a *terminus post quem* cannot be sustained. In any event, since I believe the Roman Republican (*severitas/gravitas*) portrait style probably only commenced from the beginning of the third century B.C., this makes the issue regarding the sacking of Rome in 390 B.C. largely irrelevant to the dating of Roman Republican portraits in the *severitas/gravitas* style.

to the middle of the first century B.C. onwards, based on the evidence concerning the Luna marble quarries. There are portraits in the *severitas/gravitas* style in marble from Delos which are dated to the late second and early first centuries B.C., and there are the portraits from the tombs of the non-élite classes at Rome which are usually dated from the end of the second century B.C. until the period of Augustus. Most of the dates for the portraits mentioned rely on comparative stylistics.

The dating of individual pieces utilising stylistic comparisons is problematic and offers no real guideline for the genre as a whole. As stated, earlier revivals of Hellenism throughout the Middle and Late Republican periods combined with other culturally determinative factors (such as the desire or taste of the patron, skill of the artist, context or intended purpose of the portrait, etc) could mean that there is no orderly development in the style evidenced by the surviving heads, resulting from the skewing of the database because of the non-survival of portraits in materials other than marble. The presence or absence of Hellenistic stylistic traits may not in itself offer meaningful or conclusive information regarding chronology.

What can be stated is that there is no evidence based on dating of portraits alone which shows categorically that the genre of Roman Republican portraiture in the *severitas/gravitas* style originated as a product of Greek art in the Hellenistic East, nor does it negate the suggestion that the style originated as a Roman art form from the third century B.C. onwards. In fact, there are no surviving examples of the genre from Hellenistic contexts which can be definitively said to predate examples found in Italy itself. It is when other factors are looked at in conjunction with the issue of dating – such as the close correlation in the Republican literature of facial expression and the moral values of *severitas* and *gravitas* from the early third century B.C. onwards, the context in which Romans displayed and utilised their portraits, and the meaning attributed to these – that the origins of the genre can be shown more likely to have been in Italy.

CHAPTER EIGHT

IMAGINES ET STATUAE AT ROME

8.1 Introduction

Whatever the context of display, *imagines* (particularly *imagines maiorum*) were viewed as embodying the traditional values of Roman society – particularly the values of *severitas* and *gravitas* which were the values expressive of the ethos of the élite class. This close association becomes clear once it is considered how *imagines* were displayed and the uses to which they were put.

8.2 The display and use of Roman portraits in the Republic

The written sources indicate that during the Republican period the Romans utilised portraiture in a wide variety of contexts - in public, private and semi-public places.¹

8.2.1 Public statuary, votive statuary and semi-public *imagines*

One of the main sources for statuary at Rome is Pliny the Elder. Nearly all the statues which Pliny (E) discusses were important public monuments² - either cult statues, or votive or honorary statues set up mostly by the state in public or semi public spaces to commemorate notable individuals.³ The exception is his brief discussion of the *imagines maiorum* which is

1 See G. Lahusen, *Untersuchungen zur Ehrenstatue in Rom: Literarische und epigraphische Zeugnisse* (Rome: G. Bretschneider, 1983); M. Sehlmeier, *Stadrömische Ehrenstatuen der republikanischen Zeit: Historizität und Kontext von Symbolen Nobilitären Standesbewußtseins*, Historia (Wiesbaden, Germany). Einzelschriften; Heft 130 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1999). While I have made a distinction between 'private' and 'public' displays of portraiture, the fact that portraits were generally of men involved in the affairs of state (and were therefore mostly of men of a certain standing or class within Roman society) means that the line between 'public' and 'private' was often blurred. See A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society in Pompeii and Herculaneum* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 4-5. On the legal level, there was a distinction between those things which were considered *res publica* and those which were considered *res privata*. This legal distinction extended also to *statuae* and *imagines* depending on who erected them and the context of their display – those erected by the state in public spaces were obviously *res publica*, those set up by private individuals on private land were *res privata*. However, the distinction may not have been entirely so clear: private dedications in public or semi public spaces most likely remained *res privata* – although those placed on tombs, since these were considered to be *loci religiosi*, fell under the jurisdiction of the College of Pontifices. Despite the fact that the tomb could be privately owned, there were penalties imposed on any person who should deface, damage or demolish a tomb without permission.

2 Pliny (E) traces the origins of honorary statues: Plin. (E) *HN* 34.16-17; then moves on to discuss the types of statues used to depict men at Rome: Plin. (E) *HN* 34.18-20; and finally, he details particular works notable because of their subject or their type: Plin. (E) *HN* 34.21-32.

3 Plin. (E) *HN* 34.15.

dealt with below. Any other exception he mentioned was because he wished to cite it as a moral *exemplum*⁴ or because of the novelty of the material or context for which it was created.⁵

Pliny (E) mentions that at Rome there were bronze and honorary and votive statues which dated from the earliest years of the Republic⁶ standing in public or sacred/semi public spaces. Some were donated by private individuals or *clientes* in the sanctuaries of the gods⁷ or they were dedicated by the state to honour distinguished citizens or as votive offerings, or they were donated by foreign states or communities in gratitude for some benefit or service bestowed on them by the Roman state or Roman citizens.⁸ All the sources indicate that the number of such dedications greatly increased from the third century B.C.⁹ Of course, the literary evidence by no means provides an exhaustive list of the number of public dedications that must have been visible in and around the city during the Republican period.¹⁰

4 Plin. (E) *HN* 34.19.

5 For instance, votive statue of Mancinus: Plin. (E) *HN* 34.18.

6 According to Pliny (E) the earliest honorary statue at Rome represented Horatius Cocles (Plin. (E) *HN* 34.22) which he describes as a bronze warrior in full armour and which supposedly was contemporary with the hero: thus providing a date of circa 510 B.C. Livy further tells us it was placed on the *comitium* (Livy *AUC* 2.10; There is a problem with this account, as earlier sources tell us that Horatius died holding the bridge: Polyb. 6.55). Dating to the fifth century B.C. Pliny (E) mentions the column statue of L. Minucius, prefect of the corn supply in 439 B.C. (Plin. (E) *HN* 34.20); the figure of Hermodorus of Ephesus, who interpreted the laws of the Twelve Tables in about 450 B.C. (Plin. (E) *HN* 34.21); and the group of five ambassadors murdered by the people of Fidenae in 438 B.C. (Plin. (E) *HN* 34.23). For the fourth century B.C. Pliny (E) mentions several important honorary dedications – representing L. Furius Camillus and C. Maenius in 338 B.C., and Q. Marcius Tremulus who defeated the Samnites in 306 B.C. (Plin. (E) *HN* 34.20.23; see also Livy *AUC* 8.13.9; 9.43.22; Cic. *Phil.* 6.5.13). These are all described as equestrian statues with the rider wearing a toga. For later centuries he tells us that honorary statues were erected for C. Duilius in 260 B.C. (Plin. (E) *HN* 34.20), for the group of ambassadors killed by Queen Teuta in 230 B.C. (Plin. (E) *HN* 34.24), for Gaius Octavius killed on his embassy in 162 B.C. (Plin. (E) *HN* 34.24), possibly a statue of Cornelia, the mother of the Gracchi (Plin. (E) *HN* 34.31), and a number of statues for Marius Gratidianus, who was praetor in 86 B.C. (Plin. (E) *HN* 34.37). Other statues mentioned include those dedicated to Roman citizens by other states – e.g., the statue dedicated to C. Aelius, *tribunum plebis* by the people of Thurii in 285 B.C. (Plin. (E) *HN* 34.32). For most of these later statues, Pliny (E) does not specifically mention what form they took. He only mentions that the Cornelia was seated and wearing slippers – a fact suggesting it was more like an Hellenistic grave monument type that were to become popular in Imperial times, rather than a proper honorary statue *per se*. Other sources also attest to the fact that there was public statuary at Rome going back to the beginning of the Republic – and possibly into the regal period (e.g. Cic. *Deiot.* 34).

7 For instance, the statue dedicated by Mancinus and the figure of L. Accius in the shrine of the Camenae: Plin. (E) *HN* 34.18-19.

8 Sehlmeier suggests that these statues were set up in order to create and sustain a sense of common identity and security for the Roman population: M. Sehlmeier, *Stadrömische Ehrenstatuen der republikanischen Zeit: Historizität und Kontext von Symbolen Nobilitären Standesbewußtseins* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999), 103-09.

9 Sehlmeier suggests that the rise in public honorary statuary was accompanied by the trend in setting out larger public spaces in the late third to mid-second century B.C.: *Ibid.*, 171-73.

10 P. Stewart, *Statues in Roman Society: Representation and Response* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

Regarding state decreed honorary statues and some votive statues there is evidence that the senate voted for the placement of a statue of Julius Caesar among those of the kings on the Capitol. In talking about the propriety of this, Cicero tells us that the *Capitolium* was a highly prestigious place for such an honour; he also tells us that another such place was the *rostra*: [1] Cic. *Deiot.* 34 and that the practice of setting up public honorary statues in these public spaces (the Rostra, the Capitol and the Forum) was an ancient one, dating back to the beginning of the Republic: [2] Cic. *Phil.* 9.4. Both Cicero and Livy specifically confirm that statues in these public places included gilded equestrian statues and were voted as a mark of honour by the senate, or more rarely, the Assembly: [3] Cic. *Phil.* 5.41; [4] Livy AUC 9.43.22.

Statues could also be erected in certain ‘public’ spaces (perhaps temple precincts) by private individuals or organisations or groups, such as large classes of *clientes* - an example being the statue dedicated to Lucius Antonius in front of the Temple of Castor in the *forum romanum*, and another equestrian statue is referred by Cicero as having been dedicated by the order of the *equites* to their ‘*patronus*’ in an unidentified location: [5] Cic. *Phil.* 6.13.¹¹

Sources indicate that *statuae ac imagines* of Roman citizens were also erected in the provincial cities of the empire. Cicero refers to statues of Verres in Sicily, and there are later sources which indicate there must have been some mechanism for erecting portraits in provincial capitals and other places, at least for statues of public officials: [6] Suet. *Tit.* 4.1. This is confirmed by Tacitus, who tells us that there were *statuae ac imagines* of the officer-in-command in the legionary camps, and in the Imperial period, this meant statues of the Emperor himself.¹² In Imperial times, it is no surprise that there are frequent references to such images being overthrown, repaired, restored or destroyed (in relatively brief periods of time) according to the political and military situation: [7] Tac. *Hist.* 4.37; [8] Tac. *Hist.* 3.14; [9] Tac. *Hist.* 1.55; [10] Tac. *Hist.* 3.13. That there was also a mechanism by which the portraits of private individuals may have been replicated and disseminated is also hinted at by the *senatus consultum* against Gnaeus Piso the Elder – and given the frequency with which

¹¹ However, just whether anyone was permitted to set up a statue in any particular public place is debatable and is discussed more fully in Chapter 9, 265-277. It seems that for religious dedications in temples and some public spaces, these had to have the sanction of the senate or the people, and if not, then the College of Pontifices could order those erected improperly to be cleared away: Cic. *Dom.* 136 [see Appendix 2, Chapter 9 [155]]. It might be that if a general in the conduct of a war or facing some calamity made a public vow to dedicate certain statues, this may have been referred to the Assembly or senate for ratification and implementation – since it was a matter of religious propriety.

¹² These statue portraits probably helped foster or focus loyalty among the troops.

copies of this decree have been found in Spain, may suggest, given the close associations of the *Calpurnii Pisones* with the province, that there were numerous private and publicly dedicated statues of Piso to be found in public contexts there.¹³

Such public statues and their accompanying *tituli* provided ample opportunity for public familiarity with the physiognomic appearance of the portrayed (and hence this implies a certain degree of regularity in the appearance of the portrait images of the same individual, no matter what their location), as well as a form of public documentation as to the achievements, deeds, and offices of the individuals concerned. However, most importantly, such portrait images stood as public statements of the morals and values of the portrayed and of their social position within the Roman power structure – not least through the communication of the *severitas* and *gravitas* via the appropriate facial expression. A public portrait statue served as a visual means of communicating these aspects of the character, irrespective of whether the viewer was literate or not, and no matter whether these messages were subconsciously or consciously received.

The literary sources also indicate that *statuae ac imagines* in public contexts were often dedicated contemporaneously with the person they portrayed or were created shortly after their death. These same sources also indicate that there was a proliferation of portraits displayed in private contexts, such as those displayed in the *atrium* of the house. Any of these could have provided the mechanism by which any *imagines* of the same individual created at a later date would continue to bear a similar, if not identical, physiognomic appearance.¹⁴

The literary sources suggest that by the late first century B.C. the city of Rome was full of

13 A. Caballos, Eck, W., Fernandez, F., "S.C. De Cn. Pisone Patre: informe preliminar," in *Il congresso de historia de Andalucia*, ed. A. Fraschetti (Cordoba: 1991); W. Eck, "Das S.C. de Cn Pisone Patre und seine Publikation in der Baetica," *CCG* 4 (1993); W. Eck, Caballos, A., and Fernández, F., *Das Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre*, *Vestigia Bd. 48* (München: Beck, 1996).

14 For instance, it may have been the case that when one was creating a set of *imagines maiorum* in wax for one's *atrium*, these archaic, public *imagines* reputed to be of the individual concerned could have served as models where actual *imagines* made of wax etc., had not survived; or that these public works served as models from which plaster casts could have been taken, or copies could have been made using various techniques, or that they could have served as models for free-hand copies or renditions. Pliny (E) confirms that these *imagines* were handed down and remained identical over long periods of time: Plin. (E) *HN* 35.4: *Imaginum quidem picture, qua maxim similes in aevum propagabantur figurae, in totum exolevit*. Particularly Plin. (E) *HN* 35.9: *Non est praetereundum et novium inventum, siquidem non ex auro argentove, at certe ex aere in bibliothecis dicantur illis, quorum immotales animae in locis iisdem loquuntur, quin immo etiam quae non sunt finguntur, parluntque desideria non traditos vultus, sicut in Homero evenit*. I would suggest that it would only have been when there was no known securely identified surviving portrait of an individual, or such an original had been destroyed, that the artist would have been free to construct one, but utilising those elements, such as the correct facial expression, considered essential for communicating the status of a *nobilis* and *maior*.

public statuary.¹⁵ This suggests that there was a great latitude for certain individuals to erect statues and portraits in public or semi public spaces. In relation to this some scholars maintain that the Roman *nobilis* had total freedom to erect statues of deceased ancestors within the city boundary;¹⁶ others, that it was a specific right bestowed by law (*ius*).¹⁷ Irrespective of these viewpoints, it does seem that individuals had greater freedom and latitude to set up statues and portraits in semi-public (essentially private) spaces, such as on tombs or in temple precincts (which it seems the *nobiles* were very keen to exploit for such purposes); whereas to set up a statue in truly public spaces and in certain religious areas that were deemed also to be public spaces (such as the *rostra*, the *forum romanum*, and in the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the *Capitolium*), required the sanction of the senate, or the popular assemblies, or at least of a responsible magistrate. However, individuals appear to have taken advantage of the laxity in enforcement of the rules and placed statues of themselves or their family members in many public spaces without proper sanction. The indications are that such dedications must have been large in number, given the frequency with which such statues are recorded as being removed by the Censors.¹⁸

The sources also tell us that individuals would take advantage of the fact of holding public office (such as the curule aedileship) to erect *imagines maiorum* on public monuments, sometimes including *imagines* of themselves ([11]Cic. *Vat.* 28) – often doing so on the pretext of restoring or repairing an already existing monument. The restoration of family monuments when one was *aedilis* provided an important opportunity to create a very public piece of propaganda in central locations of the city which celebrated the members of the family over generations in continuous succession.¹⁹ Several such ‘ancestor portrait galleries’ are recorded; such as that erected by Marcus Claudius Marcellus in 148 B.C. near the temples of Honos and

15 The statements that the Censors were forced to clear away many ‘illegally’ set up in public spaces: e.g., Plin. (E) *HN* 34.30. Stewart, *Statues in Roman Society: Representation and Response*.

16 Lahusen, *Untersuchungen zur Ehrenstatue in Rom: Literarische und epigraphische Zuegnisses*.

17 However, the examples of statues frequently cited to substantiate the argument of freedom to set up public statuary are often those dedicated in connection with temples, tombs or victory arches (and hence were private works or publicly sanctioned), or which a descendant repaired in his role as curule aedile, or dedicated as an office holder. For those who claim it was a specific ‘right’ reliance is often placed on a passing comment by Cicero: Cic. *Verr.* 5.14.36.

18 For instance, as occurred in 158 B.C.: Plin. (E) *H.N.* 34.30. Sehlmeier believes that it is around 200-130 B.C. that statues begin to be erected to non-magistrates; a rising phenomenon which posed a threat to the senate (and hence *nobiles*) control of public statuary as a means of valuable propaganda through which they substantiated their control of the offices of state: Sehlmeier, *Stadrömische Ehrenstatuen der republikanischen Zeit: Historizität und Kontext von Symbolen Nobilitären Standesbewußtseins*, 158. The aspect of who had the right to erect statues and portraits is discussed more fully in Chapter 9; see n.11 supra.

19 See H.I. Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 71-75.

Virtus (a temple which had been built by his grandfather, the victor of Syracuse).²⁰ Another was referred to by Cicero, concerning the restoration of a triumphal arch near the Forum by Quintus Fabius Maximus²¹ which he restored to include portrait statues of Aemilius Paullus, Scipio Africanus and himself, all accompanied by *tituli*.

Regarding such public dedications, Cicero refers to a curious incident involving Quintus Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio Nasica (cos. 52 B.C.)²² who dedicated a group of statues of his ancestors on the Capitol in about 50 B.C.: [12] Cic. Att. 6.1.17. Cicero is amazed that Metellus does not seem to know either the true likeness or the career of his own ancestor, Scipio Aemilianus, since he mistakenly placed the *cursus* of Publius Cornelius Scipio Nasica Serapio onto his statue. It is revealing that a *nobilis*, such as Metellus, could be severely criticised for fabricating, misrepresenting or mistaking the *cursus* of his ancestors or from simply not recognising the likeness of his own ancestor in such a public way. Cicero's comments suggest that members of the public (at least other *nobiles*) were well-schooled not only in the physical appearance of certain famous individuals but also in the salient facts of their career. The fact that there were other statues of Aemilianus in the city (which must have been recognisable and had the same *cursus* inscribed on them as Cicero implies) confirms that these provided an important source of information to the community as a whole and served as reference points for historical accuracy.

Cicero's letters also reveal the flexibility one had to include the portraits of people who were ancestors by adoption and marriage within one's ancestor gallery (either in public or private contexts), and suggests that public statues of one's *maiores* provided an opportunity for manipulating the public record by presenting the information in the *tituli* to highlight or maximise the cumulative number of offices and honours held by the group.²³ It also bespeaks of a readiness on the part of the *nobiles* to identify themselves publicly with their ancestors through their *imagines maiorum*.

This phenomenon is also evident from coinage of the late Republican period, when

20 Asconius 12C; T. Stangl, *Ciceronis Orationum Scholiastae* (Vienna: 1912), 18; A. Maggiani, "Ritrattistica Tardo-Elenistica Fra Etruria E Roma," *Prospettiva* 60 (1985).

21 Possibly when he was curule aedile in 47 B.C. but originally erected by his grandfather in celebration of his victory over the Allobroges in 121 B.C.

22 E. J. Bickerman, *Chronology of the Ancient World*, Rev. ed. (London: Thames and Hudson, 1980), 151.

23 Discussed more fully in Chapter 9, 265 *infra*.

magistrates began to place *imagines* of famous ancestors upon them.²⁴ Given the wide circulation of coins, such images were a remarkable form of family propaganda which assisted the present member of the family gain public appreciation and recognition through the suggestion he had inherited the *fama* and *gloria* (and hence *dignitas*) of such ancestors.²⁵ Most importantly, the fact of putting an ancestor's head on a publicly circulated coin (and given traditionally that Roman coins only bore the head of the personification of *Roma*) identified that individual with the *Res Publica* itself. In such circumstances, it was essential that the portrait displayed the requisite social, moral and political messages – and this meant the facial expression communicating *severitas* and *gravitas*.

Pliny (E) also mentions the *clipeati*, portrait shields which were hung in temples or in other public buildings in celebration of great military achievements.²⁶ Pliny (E) states that these, as with other *imagines maiorum*, were a source of encouragement to virtue for those who should view them.²⁷

8.2.2 The “semi-private” context of portraiture

In contrast to purely public spaces, there was no necessity to gain permission to erect statues within the more public areas of the house (in the *atrium*), on grave monuments, and in most temples or their precincts – the commissioning and location for such portraits and statues seems to have been governed by *mos* ('custom').²⁸ It would seem that individuals with the necessary resources and social standing took full advantage of this fact.

24 See Chapter 6, 151-158 supra.

25 Stemming from the facts of the career of the particular ancestor portrayed, an image placed on a coin might also indicate the political agenda, allegiances, or policies of the descendant.

26 Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture* 75-77.

27 Plin. (E) HN 35.12: *quales clupeos nemo non gaudens favensque aspicit*; and 35.13: *origo plena virtutis, faciem reddi in scuto cuiusque qui fuerat usus illo*. Interestingly, Pliny (E) credits the Phoenicians with first inventing the *clipeati* as proven by the fact that a portrait shield which had originally belonged to Hasdrubal had been carried off in the Punic War and hung in the Capitolium – and this is how the idea of portrait shields was introduced to the Romans (at 35.14). The first Roman example was by Appius Claudius Caecus who set up *clipeati* bearing portraits of his own notable ancestors in the Temple of Bellona. There are surviving examples of 'portrait' shields as votives from Etruscan sites which date as early as the sixth century B.C. – these have gorgon or satyr heads as the central image: O.J. Brendel, *Etruscan Art, Pelican History of Art* (New York: Penguin Books, 1978) 35; and N. Spivey, *Etruscan Art* (London; New York: Thames and Hudson, 1997) 43.

28 See Chapter 9, 267-269 infra.

a) Funeral procession - *pompa funebris*

One of the most frequently attested uses of the *imago* or of the *imagines maiorum* was in the *funus* ('funeral'), more particularly in the *pompa funebris* (funeral procession) of notable citizens. It would seem that the holding of a 'public' funeral (and hence the *pompa funebris*) was largely the preserve of the ruling élite – since the permission of the *aedilis curulis* had to be obtained before holding one.²⁹ It is therefore unlikely that permission would have been granted to anyone of lesser standing.

In the first part of the funeral was the *collocatio* or 'lying in state', usually in the *atrium*, whereby the deceased (or a manikin representing the deceased) was dressed in fine clothes and laid out on a couch with his feet facing the door. The face of the deceased was covered by an *imago* (Polyb. 6.53-54). The doors of the house (which were usually always open) were then closed as a sign of mourning.³⁰ The *collocatio* appears to have been a very ancient practice according to some evidence: for instance, Etruscan terracotta urns which portray a body laid out on a bed and wearing what appears to be a mask (Ill. 96.1-2); a fragmentary relief depicting such a *collocatio* dating to the second century B.C. (Ill. 97 and 98),³¹ as well as reference to it in a fragment of a satire by Lucilius: [13] Lucil. *Sat.* 2.73-74 - apud Nonius 4.18.

The *collocatio* was followed by the *pompa funebris* which is described in an oft-quoted passage of Polybios, dating to about 150 B.C.: [14] Polyb. 6.53-54. Polybios indicates that *imagines* of the deceased's notable ancestors were worn by actors in procession. These actors wore the gowns of the highest offices attained by the person they represented, carried the emblems of their rank and were accompanied by *lictores* bearing the *fascēs*.

Polybios also records that at these funerals a speech was delivered from the *rostra* in which the achievements of the deceased and his distinguished ancestors (who were all 'present' via

²⁹ See Chapter Nine, nn. 51 and 53 *infra*.

³⁰ Tac. *Ann.* 2.83.3.

³¹ The relief of the funeral procession from Amiternum in the Museo Aquilano, Aquila dating to the Republican period (Ill. 97). Also Relief from the *Tomb of the Haterii* in the Vatican Museum dated to the late Flavian or early Trajanic period (Ill. 98).

the *imagines* wearing actors) would be related.³² After the end of the funeral, he tells us that an *imago* of the deceased was placed in a special cupboard, called *armarium*, in the *atrium* of the *domus*, among the *imagines* of the other notable ancestors.

The opportunity for the display of a family's *imagines maiorum* at a funeral may not have been that frequent - the opportunity only arising when there was a death of a notable (originally, male) person within the *familia* or *gens*. However, the opportunities for utilising the *imagines* in a public *pompa funebris* increased towards the end of the second century B.C. when women were permitted to have such a funeral. Minors, on the other hand, were buried at night without any public ceremony, and this remained the case throughout the Republican period and even into Imperial times - although on the epitaph of a child's grave, there might still be a *titulus* bearing the *cursus honorum* of his notable ancestors.³³

b) Display in the Atrium, Family Custom and the *Salutatio*

Apart from funerals, but in some ways linked with ancestral funeral practice, the literary evidence shows that *imagines* served a distinct role in the home. The sources tell us that the *imagines maiorum* specifically, and other forms of *imagines*, were mostly to be seen as part of a display in the *atrium* - where they could be viewed by any person who should enter the house.³⁴ However, the fact that these could be viewed continuously indicates that these were not identical with the *imagines maiorum* of wax used to cover the face of the deceased in the funeral and which were housed in the *armaria*, since the doors were only opened on specific occasions.³⁵

An interesting fact of the *nobilis* house, again indicating the semi-public/private dichotomy

32 This speech was known as the *laudatio*: Dionys. 5.17; Cic. *Mil.* 13, Cic. *De or.* 2.84; Suet. *Jul.* 84, Suet. *Aug.* 100) See Livy *AUC* 2.61.6, on the funeral of Appius Claudius: *Cuius laudationem cum tribunus plebis impedire conaretur, plebs fraudari sollemni honore supremum diem tanti uiri noluit, et laudationem tam aequis auribus mortui audiuit quam uiui accusationem audierat et exsequias frequens celebrauit* ['The tribunes tried to prevent any funeral oration being pronounced over him, but the Plebeians would not allow the obsequies of so great a man to be robbed of the customary honours. They listened to the panegyric of the dead as attentively as they had listened to the indictment of the living, and vast crowds followed him to the tomb.']

33 Sen. (Y) *Brev. Vit.* 20.5. Serv. 1.727; 6. 224; Livy *AUC* 2.8.8; *CIL* 6.888-893; see also Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 96-97. Often the epitaphs of those who died young before holding public office, make mention of the fact that had they lived longer they would have excelled the *dignitas* of their ancestors: *ILLRP* 312.

34 Polyb. 6.53.4; Cic. *Phil.* 2.26; Ov. *Fast.* 1.591; Val. Max. *Mem.* 5.8.3; Sen. (Y) *Ben.* 3.28.2; Sen. (Y) *Ep.* 44.5; Sen. (Y) *Ep.* 76.12; *Laus Pisonis* 8ff; Plin. (E) *HN* 35.6-8; Plin. (Y) *Ep.* 5.17.6; Mart. *Ep.* 2.90.5-8; 5.20; Juv. *Sat.* 8.1-5 and 19-20; Ov. *Am.* 1.8.65.

35 Sen. (Y) *Contr.* 7.6.10.

that *nobilis* status entailed, was the fact that the doors of the house, the *ianuae*, were largely kept open, only being closed as a sign of mourning.³⁶ The *atrium* was the first room generally entered after coming through the front door, and if the house were built with the entrance facing the street, this meant that those passing by could also see directly into the *atrium* and hence *imagines* that were on display there.

The *atrium* served as the most important and traditional place where *negotium* (public, private and semi-public) would be conducted: [15] Vit. *De Arch.* 6.5.1.³⁷ Due to the importance of the *atrium*, Vitruvius goes into great detail about the type of architecture required for a *nobilis* in constructing this part of the *domus*: [16] Vit. *De Arch.* 6.5.2. He also says that the cupboards housing the wax *imagines* should be displayed at a height on the *atrium* wall equal to the width of the *alae*: [17] Vit. *De Arch.* 6.3.4.³⁸ Because of its significance, the decoration of the *atrium* was usually rather conservative, often being first style wall decoration (Ill. 99) and simple furnishings.³⁹ Cicero also confirms the importance of the *atrium* to the *nobilis* in conducting his affairs and in confirming his prestige.⁴⁰ For this reason, the *atrium* was in reality a semi-public space. As late as the fourth century A.D. it was still the practice to conduct business in the public part of the house⁴¹ where the *imagines* were housed, although *atria* as an architectural form had largely disappeared: [18] S.H.A. *Tacitus* 19.6. From the literary sources, it can be concluded that the display of *imagines* in the *atrium* was governed by *mos* (custom) and unlike the staging of a public funeral (for which approval of the *aedilis* had to be obtained), the style and decoration of the *atrium* were not controlled by any laws or

36 Tac. *Ann.* 2.83.3.

37 The importance of the *atrium* in this respect is confirmed by Varro: Varro *Ling.* 5.161. R.P. Saller, *Patriarchy Property and Death in the Roman Family*, vol. 25, *Cambridge Studies in Population Economy and Society in Past Time* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 91-92: "It was vital for a Roman aristocrat to have a fine house because, unlike his classical Athenian counterpart, he had to carry out most of his dealing with his public there. In particular, the morning salutation was an open demonstration of a man's position in the social hierarchy [Seneca (Y) *Ep.* 68.10, 76.12 and 15; 84.11-12; Sen(Y) *Ad Marc.* 10.1; Vit. *Arch.* 6.5.1-2] Consequently the *domus frequentata* repeatedly appears in texts as an indication of power in an active public life"

38 Flower interprets this passage to refer to *clipeati*: Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 325. However, there is nothing that makes this so – and given that the *imagines* were on display in cupboards could indicate that they were placed high on the wall to protect them.

39 Asconius, 43C = 37.8k.s = 38 Stangl

40 Cic. *Off.* 1.138-9.

41 For an overview of the history of Roman houses see Axel Boethius, Roger Ling, and Tom B. Rasmussen, *Etruscan and Early Roman Architecture*, 2d integrated ed., *Pelican History of Art.* (Harmondsworth, Eng.; New York: Penguin Books, 1978); E. Dwyer, "The Pompeian Atrium House in Theory and Practice," in *Roman Art in the Private Sphere: New Perspectives on the Architecture and Decor of the Domus, Villa and Insula*, ed. E. K. Gazda and A.E. Haekl (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1991). The atrium has been shown to have been important from the archaic age onwards via the excavations of Andrea Carandini, *Schiavi in Italia: gli strumenti pensanti dei romani fra tarda repubblica e medio impero*, vol. 8 (Roma: Nuova Italia Scientifica Studi NIS archeologia, 1988), 359-73.

legislation.⁴²

It appears that *nobiles* could have several copies of their *imagines* made for their various homes and that each individual senior male member of the *gens* or *familia* (*in sua potestas*) would have their own set. In one letter, Cicero advises Papirius Paetus which *imagines* to have installed in his *atrium* at his home near Naples,⁴³ and likewise, Cicero tells us that Brutus had another set of *imagines* manufactured for his home near Tusculum.⁴⁴ This also confirms a wide discretion as to who to include in the display,⁴⁵ although a great deal of criticism is directed against those who display *imagines* not strictly connected with them or who are not considered worthy enough.⁴⁶

Of the various kinds of *imagines* that might be found in the *atrium*, a number of sources confirm that some made of wax were housed in *armaria* in order to protect them - the passage from Polybios cited above is a case in point. Most of the time it appears that the doors of these cupboards were left closed, but the literary evidence attests to the fact that in times of celebration or on special occasions the cupboard doors could be opened - often being garlanded or wreathed.⁴⁷ What these *armaria* actually looked like is conjectural.⁴⁸ However, there are a few instances from Second Style wall paintings at Pompeii which show frames with folded wooden doors which may represent them, as well as some representations of busts in cupboards from grave reliefs (Ill. 100).⁴⁹ The sources also reveal that each *imago* was accompanied by a *titulus* which listed the filiation and *cursus* of the person concerned⁵⁰ - none have been found *in situ* but they may have been similar to epitaphs found inscribed on

42 Unlike laws restricting extravagance at funerals, such as the laws of the 12 tables cited by Cicero: Cic. Leg. 2.23.59; 2.24.60; also laws introduced by Sulla against extravagant funerals which Sulla himself violated in the funeral of his own wife Metella: Cic. Phil. 9.17; Plut. Sull. 35.

43 Cic. Fam. 9.21.

44 Cic. Orat. 110.

45 Mart. Ep. 2.90.

46 Plin. (E) HN 35.8.

47 Cic. Mur. 88.

48 E. Budde, κίβωτος, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des antiken Mobilars (Würzburg: 1939), 46-9. for a discussion of *armaria*.

49 J.R. Clarke, *The Houses of Roman Italy 100 B.C.-A.D. 250: Ritual, Space and Decoration* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 64-72 figs 16 and 17. For instance, Inv. 1187, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen: A.N. Zadoks-Josephus Jitta, *Ancestral Portraiture in Rome and the Art of the Last Century of the Republic*, *Archaeologisch-Historische Bijdragen 1* (Amsterdam: Allard Pierson Stichting, 1932), 26, 43 pl.49; J. M. C. Toynbee, *Death and Burial in the Roman World* (London: 1971), no. 13; E. S. Gruen, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1992), 155; Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 7.

50 Many sources attest to these *tituli*: Ov. Fast. 1.591; Pan. Mess. 28; Val. Max. Mem. 5.8.3; Laus Pis. 13, 21; Livy AUC 8.40.4-5 etc.

Republican tombs - such as the *Tomb of the Scipiones*.⁵¹

The sources already cited indicate that there were other *imagines* of the *dominus* and his *maiores* in the *atrium* made of a variety of materials, such as bronze, terracotta, possibly travertine or even gypsum, and increasingly, from the middle of the first century B.C., of marble.⁵² Some of these portraits may well have been antique, passed down through several generations. Juvenal, in one of his satires, comments on how many of these there may be in the *atrium*, and observes that some might be damaged through age, missing ears, noses etc. which suggests that those on display were of more fissile materials than bronze or hard stone.⁵³ Other sources tell how the *imagines* frequently became discoloured or dirty from exposure to smoke, possibly from the hearth or religious ceremonies carried out at the *lararium*.⁵⁴

Pliny (E) confirms that other *imagines* either of the *dominus* or of his ancestors could also be found in other parts of the house, such as outside the doorway, where trophies celebrating official military triumphs or ovations would be set up, including an *imago* of the *triumphator* (*aliae foris et circa limina animorum ingentium imagines erant adfixis hostium spoliis*: at 35.7). This *monumentum* would publicly proclaim the victory of the occupant and which, as Pliny (E) comments, would thence become a permanent part of the immoveable property of the house and although the house could be bought or sold (as a *res Mancipi*) the trophy and *imago* could not be removed (*quae nec emptori refigere liceret, triumphabantque etiam dominis mutatis aeternae domus*: at 35.7).⁵⁵ Pliny (E) states that the house itself, on account of the *imago* of the *triumphator* attached to it, would admonish any future occupant with the glory of his achievement - referring not only to the admonitory and didactic role of the *imagines maiorum* but how important they were in terms of property ownership under Roman law.

Sources also state that frequently painted on the walls of the *atrium* were family-trees,

51 Cicero refers to the fact that marble statues and adornments would be found in the *nobilis* house of his day, although it seems to be regarded as a luxury item - too much of which would indicate *luxuria* or extravagance: Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 133: *quid praeterea caelati argenti, quid stragulae vestis, quid pictarum tabularum, quid signorum, quid marmoris apud illum putatis esse?* [What quantities besides of embossed plate, of embroidered quilts; of paintings, of statues, and of marble, do you think he has in his house?]. See Chapter 2, 37 *supra*.

52 See Chapter 3, 73 *supra*, and Appendix 2, Chapter 3 [17].

53 Juv. *Sat.* 8.1-23.

54 Cic. *Pis.* 1; Sen. (Y) *Ep.* 44; Juv. *Sat.* 8.8.

55 Gai. *Inst.* 2. 14a-17; J. A. Crook, *Law and Life of Rome*, Cornell paperbacks ed. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984) 141.

stemmata, depicting the lineage of the *dominus*, each branch ending in a painted portrait head with an accompanying *titulus*.⁵⁶

c) Tomb display

There are very few surviving portraits from *nobiles'* tombs at Rome during the middle and late Republican periods that can be identified with any certainty.⁵⁷ This may be because the large aristocratic *mausolea* have not survived intact. This is not to say that aristocrats did not have their tombs decorated with portrait statues inscribed with *tituli* – the many surviving tomb inscriptions, such as those from the *Tomb of the Scipiones* and the *Tomb of the Licinii*, suggest that there were portraits or portrait statues contained in such tombs and sometimes outside them).⁵⁸ Fragments of portrait statues and statuary that have been uncovered in tomb contexts put the issue almost beyond doubt.⁵⁹ The incentive to place portrait statues of family members on tombs would have been for exactly the same reasons already evident from the use of portraits already discussed: an opportunity to proclaim the identity, career and character of a deceased member of the family in a semi-public context for the benefit of the family members.

Tombs were not generally permitted within the *pomerium* of the city of Rome, and radiated out along the roads leading to and from the city.⁶⁰ Part of the success of the tomb monument

⁵⁶ Plin. (E) *HN* 35.4-14.

⁵⁷ The *Tomb of the Licinii* in Rome is an exception, if in fact the portraits and inscriptions come from the same tomb: F. van Keuren, "Unpublished Documents Shed New Light on the Licinian Tomb, Discovered in 1884-1885, Rome," *MAAR* 48 (2003). P. Kragelund, M. Moltesen, and J.S. Ostergaard, *The Licinian Tomb. Fact or Fiction? Meddelelser Fra Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek Copenhagen* (Copenhagen: Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, 2003).

⁵⁸ References to a statue of Ennius being included among those on or in the tomb: Cic. *Ach* 22; Plin (E) *HN* 7.114; Suet. *Poet.* 8; Livy *AUC* 38.56 – Livy also refers in this passage to statues of Publius and Lucius Scipio also being in the tomb. See Toynbee, *Death and Burial in the Ancient World* (London 1971) 103-120. It is recorded that statues of Scipio Africanus and Scipio Asiaticus, as well as the poet Ennius adorned the façade of the tomb: Holliday, P.J. *The Origins of Roman Historical Commemoration in the Visual Arts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002) 33.

⁵⁹ Such as the fragments from the *Tomb of the Scipiones*. See Toynbee, *Death and Burial in the Ancient World* (London 1971) 104 and 120.

⁶⁰ A tomb, or any place in which a person was buried, was *religious* and under the authority of the college of pontifices; all things which were left or belonged to the *Dii Manes* were *religiosae* (Gaius, ii.46) and this included the burial place of slaves (*Dig.* 11 Tit.7 s2). Whoever violated a sepulchre was subject to an action termed *sepulcri violati actio* (*Dig.* 47 12; cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 1.12, *de Leg.* 2.22). Those who removed the bodies or bones from a tomb were punished by death or *deportatio in insulam*, according to their rank; if the tomb was violated in any other way, they were punished by *deportatio*, or condemnation to the mines (*Dig.* 47 Tit.12 s11). For further Roman law relating to tombs see *Digest* 11.7 "*De religiosis et sumtibus funerum*"

appears to have been its capacity to catch the attention of the passer-by.⁶¹ Accordingly there appears to have been competition to construct a tomb that would distinguish itself from those around it – and the lavishness of the tombs constructed in the late second and first centuries B.C. tend to evidence this.⁶² For example, the pyramid tomb of Gaius Cestius Epulo (Ill. 101) and the tomb of Caecilia Metella on the Via Appia (Ill. 102). For the larger tombs, the combination of visual imagery (the *imago* or other painted or carved decoration), the size of the tomb, and the inscription meant that it served to communicate precise messages concerning the deceased to the viewer, no matter what their level of literacy.⁶³ As stated, for tomb statuary and portraiture there is much more evidence for tomb portraiture of those of the non-elite classes at Rome⁶⁴ (mostly Plebeians, including those who were free born [*ingenui*] and ex-slaves [*liberti*]), who from the late second century B.C., began to build more lavish tombs and to fit these out with carved portraits of both the deceased and living members of the family.⁶⁵

The view has arisen that most of the portraits from tombs which survive are of *liberti*, and that the genre was specifically created for them as a class;⁶⁶ however, this interpretation does not wholly accord with the evidence. While some epitaphs specifically state that the deceased or persons portrayed are *liberti* (by the inscription following their name of an 'L' accompanied

61 P.J. E. Davies, "The Politics of Perpetuation: Trajan's Column and the Art of Commemoration," *AJA* 101, no. 1 (1997), 49.

62 H. Von Hesberg, *Römische Grabbauten* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992), 22-37; L. Hackworth Petersen, "The Baker, His Tomb, His Wife, and Her Breadbasket: The Monument of Eurysaces in Rome," *ABull* 85, no. 2 (2003); P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, trans. A. Shapiro, Rep. ed. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998), 5-31.

63 For the impression that these tombs must have made on the passer-by, see G. Susini, "Spelling out Along the Road: Anthropology of the Ancient Reader, or Rather, the Roman Reader," *AMStud* 1, no. 1 (1988). On the contentious subject of the level of literacy in the late Republic and early Imperial period, see W.V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989), who views the literacy rate in Rome at about 10-15 percent. For a more optimistic response, see the various essays in M. Beard, ed., *Literacy in the Roman World, JRA, Supplementary Series, No. 3* (Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1991).

64 For discussion of reliefs, see W. Altmann, *Die römischen Grabaltäre der Kaiserzeit* (Berlin: 1905), 196-97.

65 For the complexity of who made up the non-elite classes during the late Republican period, see Hackworth Petersen, "The Baker, His Tomb, His Wife, and Her Breadbasket: The Monument of Eurysaces in Rome," 232: "Freeborn non-elite individuals, who made up a significant portion of Roman society, typically worked for a living, and they constituted a tremendously diverse group. In this category belong wealthy merchants, manufacturers, tavern owners, and so on, as well as working individuals who could barely make ends meet. *Libertini* also had citizen status and acquired most citizen rights. However, because of their status as former slaves, they could not hold elective office, which meant that a freed slave could never achieve elite status in Roman society. ... As a group, *libertini* were also hugely diverse; only their former slave status united them. Taken as a whole, the category of non-elite included almost all of Rome's people--slaves, freed slaves, and most of Rome's freeborn citizens--thus making it a highly complex category."

66 Gazda, for instance sees these tomb portraits as representative of the Plebeian freedman class and hence as representative of a vernacular form of art at Rome: E. Gazda, "Etruscan Influence in the Funerary Reliefs of Late Republican Rome: A Study of Vernacular Portraiture," *ANRW* 1.4 (1973), 856.

by the *nomen* of the former master) there are numerous examples where the status of the individual is not stated at all⁶⁷ – it merely being assumed by scholars that the deceased must be a *libertus* from the fact of having a Greek cognomen or that he was involved in a particular trade. An example is the *Tomb of the Baker Eurysaces* (Ill. 103) – at no point on the monument or statue of Eurysaces does it state that he is a *libertus*; a strange omission if it in fact had been the case. It is plainly evident from the monument and the inscription that Eurysaces was a Roman citizen – and while the absence of filiation in his *tria nomina* may support the conclusion that he was a *libertus*, there is nothing else that positively shows this to have been the case. He could just as easily have been a Greek from a city in southern Italy who had possessed citizenship for several generations. The tomb in this case still serves the functions noted above – but in the non-élite sense of proclaiming aloud Eurysaces' success in his chosen professional field and his aspiration to the values derived from the elite class by displaying his facial expression in the *severitas/gravitas* manner.⁶⁸

This could also explain why on numerous non-élite tombs there are work-related images and the identification of an individual in terms of his profession. It could be that this is based on the idea that members of the non-élite classes, unable to achieve their social or cultural goals through participation in the affairs of state – still aspired to élite social status and thereby imitated it with the only means they had, through their work and the acquisition of money. In general, such an interpretation assumes that these persons felt a certain pride in their work and status and therefore were keen to celebrate them in a public, funerary context.⁶⁹

Many of these tomb monuments were made from tufa, or less often, the more expensive travertine (such as the *Tomb of the Baker Eurysaces*). This suggests that from late second

67 Hackworth Petersen, "The Baker, His Tomb, His Wife, and Her Breadbasket: The Monument of Eurysaces in Rome," 239.

68 Just how convergent the imagery is between tombs of the élite and non-élite classes in the first century B.C. is evidenced by the tomb of C. Cartilius Poplicola, outside the Porta Marina in Ostia, dating to around 30-20 B.C. Poplicola's tomb celebrates the deceased's civic and military achievements with both an inscription (IV, IX, 2) and pictorial reliefs (Ill. 104). Like Eurysaces' tomb, it was crowned with a frieze, here (instead of the process of baking) are depicted naval and military victories of Poplicola, and displayed prominently on its facade (beneath the frieze) are sixteen large *fascies* in relief. The inscription tells us that among other honours, he was elected *duovir* thirteen times, the city's highest magisterial office. There are also other similarities, such as the tombs' comparative sizes, the use of similar materials in construction (marble, tufa, travertine), location at the main entry gates or approaches to the cities, and the sheer scale and visibility of the monuments. The similarities in tomb style, but divergent status of both individuals, speaks volumes about claims that such imagery was the preserve of a particular class such as *liberti*: Ibid., 257. It should be noted that there was also a nude athlete style statue of Poplicola that he had dedicated in the Temple of Hercules at Ostia (Ill. 105). See N. Kampen, *Image and Status: Roman Working Women* (Berlin 1981) for images of work depicted on funerary reliefs.

69 Ibid., 255.

century B.C. onwards members of the non-élite classes managed to amass great fortunes – some would have been free-born Plebeians who may have been the *clientes* of richer, more powerful *nobiles* or connected with them in some other way, while others were *liberti*, most of whom were granted citizenship upon manumission, but were not entitled to hold public office and remained *clientes* of their former *domini*. The children of *liberti*, however, attained the full benefits of Roman citizenship.⁷⁰ Given the large numbers of slaves owned by the wealthier *nobiles* houses, and the political incentive to manumit them, this may account not only for the capacity and opportunity of the *liberti* to make large sums of money (given the financial contacts provided by their former masters' families), but also for their desire to adopt the values of their former masters as a form of social legitimisation stemming from their newly acquired freedom and Roman citizenship. It also seems that free-born Plebeians who obtained wealth through their business activities, whether in connection with the aristocratic houses or not, also pretended to the customs and attitudes of the ruling elite, and probably for similar reasons as the *liberti*. No better advertisement of their legitimacy in social terms could be exhibited than by adopting the style of portraiture utilised by the élite classes – particularly the facial expression communicating *severitas* and *gravitas* which confirms them as aspiring pillars of the social order.

The fact that members of the wealthy non-élite classes placed images on their tombs in the style of the *nobiles* served two functions: the first is that the tomb monument and its portrait served as a definite and tangible reminder of the identity, values, and success of the deceased.⁷¹ This success was trumpeted not only in the size and elaboration of the tomb itself, but in aspects of the portrayal of the deceased utilising the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression and the accompanying inscription, all of which served as a form of social legitimisation. A

70 There is evidence that the *nobiles* possessed large numbers of slaves in this period – and given the importance of the *plebs urbana* in the voting assemblies (particularly in the *comitia tributa* and the *concilium plebis*) there must have been at times a political incentive for a *nobilis* to manumit certain numbers of slaves, who would thus become citizens and once enrolled (usually in the city tribes) could vote in the various assemblies and who would, no doubt, form part of the *clientela* of the former master. According to Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 4.22, Servius Tullius placed the *libertini* in the four *Urbanæ Tribus*. In 311 B.C., the censor Appius Claudius gave the *liberti* a place in all the tribes: Plut. *Popl.* 7; Livy *AUC* 9.46; Diod. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 20.36. In 304 B.C., they were again placed in the four *tribus urbanae* (Livy *AUC* 9.46); but it seems over the years they were enrolled into other *tribus*, because in 220 B.C. they were again placed in the four *urbanae tribus*: Livy *Epit.* 20. In the censorship of Tiberius Gracchus in 169 B.C. they were placed in one of the *tribus urbanae* determined by lot: Livy *AUC* 14.15; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 4.22; Cic. *De or.* 1.9. Subsequently in about 116 B.C. by a law of Aemilius Scaurus they were transferred to the four city tribes, and there they until the end of the republic, though various attempts were made to have them spread throughout the other *tribus*. For instance, in 58 B.C. C. Manilius tried to spread the enrolment of the *liberti* throughout all the tribes Cass. Dio 36.25.

71 M. Koortbojian, "In Commemorationem Mortuorum: Text and Image Along the Street of Tombs," in *Art and Text in Roman Culture*, ed. J. Elsner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

central aspect would appear to have been the citizenship status of the deceased. For instance, most of the inscriptions which accompany the tomb *imagines* give the deceased's *tria nomina*: an important mark of Roman citizenship, the form of which would probably be recognised even by an illiterate person.⁷² The other interesting fact is that the portraits are usually attached to half body or full bodied statues – and these invariably wear the toga – again a mark of Roman citizenship status.⁷³ Combined together, the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression, the *tria nomina*, and the toga must have presented to the viewer a complete statement of Roman citizenship of the deceased in its ultimate form: that of a man from the élite classes. If the individual concerned was a *libertus*, this would often be signified by the letter 'L' placed in conjunction with the name.⁷⁴

For the *liberti*, in addition to documenting the social and monetary success of the individual, it would seem that the tomb *imagines* served as an important declaration of their Roman citizen status which was specifically communicated by adopting the mode of facial expression typical of the *nobiles'* portraits and declaring that they possessed all the values pertaining thereto (such as *severitas* and *gravitas*). In relation to the tombs of *liberti*, such a monument served as a form of 'public ancestor gallery' in reverse, which became part of the *patrimonium* of their descendants and which becomes an irrefutable document attesting this citizenship status of the founder of the line in a public way.⁷⁵ Since a *libertus* was the first in his family to be both free and a citizen, this would be a significant improvement in his social status and would be worthy of public declaration. The fact is *liberti* would not have had any notable ancestors worthy of celebrating in a private ancestor gallery in their own *domi*, and the pretension of attempting to institute one may have brought about severe social disapproval. Therefore the *liberti* took advantage of the fact that in the semi-private/public context of a tomb monument, they could safely display themselves (and members of their family) in a way that proclaimed their worth as Romans citizens and confirmed this status for their heirs to come. For the children of *liberti*, who attained the full right of Roman citizens,

72 Hackworth Petersen, "The Baker, His Tomb, His Wife, and Her Breadbasket: The Monument of Eurysaces in Rome," 236.

73 So indicative of Roman citizenship status was the toga that its wearers were referred to (poetically) as the *gens togata*: Verg. *Aen.* 1.282 and Mart. *Ep.* 14.124

74 L.R. Taylor, "Freedmen and Freeborn in the Epitaphs of Imperial Rome," *AJP* 82.2 (1961), 121-22.

75 Such are the views propounded by D.E.E. Kleiner, *Roman Group Portraiture: The Funerary Reliefs of the Late Republic and Early Empire* (New York: 1977), 188; P. Zanker, "Grabreliefs römischer Freigelassener," *JDAI* 90 (1975), 279-80; and V. Kockel, *Porträtreliefs stadtrömischer Grabbauten: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und zum Verständnis des spätrepublikanisch-frühkaiserzeitlichen Privatporträts, Beiträge zur Erschließung hellenistischer und kaiserzeitlicher Skulptur und Architektur, Bd. 12* (Mainz: Zabern, 1993).

there may have been nothing preventing them displaying the *imago* of the deceased progenitor in the *atrium* of their houses – as a mark of honour for the man who was the first in the family to attain Roman citizenship and who was the ‘founder’ of the family line. An example might be the bronze herm bust found in the *atrium* of the house of Caius Caecilius Iucundus, the banker, in Pompeii (Ill. 89).

8.3 *Imago/imagines* in the funeral and the home: their materials and method of manufacture

There is some confusion as to what the sources actually mean regarding the precise way various *imagines* were displayed in the context of the funeral and around the home, as well as from what materials these *imagines* were manufactured, how they were made or replicated, and the form that these took.⁷⁶ The major problem lay in the fact that it is little recognised that the term *imagines* encompassed portraits made of diverse materials and which had differing functions.

One type of *imago* is that which the sources indicate was used in the funeral specifically in relation to the deceased person. The problem concerns whether it was the body of the deceased himself with an *imago* placed over the face which was laid out on view for the *collocatio*, or whether it was a manikin and *imago* representing the deceased; a similar question can be asked for the *pompa funebris*. As noted above, Polybios indicates that for the *collocatio*, it was the actual body of the deceased that was on display.⁷⁷ However, he is ambivalent as to whether this was the case for the *pompa funebris* – there are suggestions from later sources that the body was placed in a box beneath the funeral bier for the procession.⁷⁸ Polybios does not state that an *imago* was placed on the face of the deceased; all he states is that after the funeral an *imago* was made to depict the deceased both in appearance and colouring (Polyb. 6.53.4-5; cf. Diod. Sic. 31.25.2).

Instructive in this regard may be a passage from Tacitus: [19] Tac. *Ann.* 3.5. The phrase ‘*propositam toro effigiem*’ is ambiguous; the Latin verb *propono* encompassing diverse

⁷⁶ For example, Flower believes that while there may be a connection between the wax *imago* and portraits in other media, she believes it is a mistake to assume that depictions of busts and portraits, such as those on tombs of non-élite classes, reproduce them: Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 6-9.

⁷⁷ Procopius says that in more lavish funerals a pillow of ivory would be placed under the head of the deceased which was laid on a bed, and that the bier itself could be embroidered with gold: Procop. 2.13b.1-8.

⁷⁸ See references to Augustus Funeral: Dio Cass. 56.34.

meanings, such as 'to set or lay out', 'to place before', to display', or 'to expose to view'.⁷⁹ It could mean that an effigy bearing an *imago* was placed before or on the funeral bed. However, there is nothing militating against the interpretation that it was the body itself that was laid out on the bier and its face simply covered with an *imago*. The funeral of Augustus is described in terms that his body was placed in a box beneath the bier while an effigy bearing an image made of wax was placed upon it (Dio Cass.56.34).

If the deceased was in fact laid out on the bier, an *imago* may have been placed over the face to cover up any signs of decay and to give the body the appearance of being alive (or asleep). This is supported in some degree by some Etruscan funerary urns already referred to (Ill. 96) which appear to show a body laid out on a bier covered with a shroud and wearing what looks to be a face mask (which are not unlike the mask of the character named as 'phersu' on wall paintings from Etruscan tombs (Ill.3)). There is also a curious quote from Pliny (E) which may suggest that an *imago* was placed on the deceased's face at the commencement of the *collocatio*, and was removed just before immolation on the pyre for the specific reason – while he he not specific he tells us that it was *nefas* ("contrary to divine law") for living people to look upon the face or eyes of a dead person, but that it was *fas* ("in accordance with divine law") that when laid on the pyre, the eyes of the deceased should be "opened" so that they could look upon the gods: [20] Plin. (E) *HN* 11.58. It may be that the *imago* placed on the face of the deceased during the funeral served the added purpose of ensuring that spectators would not be inflicted with seeing the face or eyes of the deceased, and for this reason it was then taken before the body just before its immolation to ensure that the Gods could look upon the deceased properly – the *imago* being placed in the *armaria* in the *atrium*. Once in the *armaria*, a *titulus* outlining the career of the deceased would be attached to it whereupon it would serve as a memorial to the character and deeds of the deceased within the *familia* and *gens*. Given that such an *imago* had served as the face of the deceased in the funeral, may also go to explain why the doors of the *armaria* containing these *imagines* were

79 C. T. Lewis and C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980).

largely kept closed and only opened for special occasions.⁸⁰

There are further problems with the sources as to just how the *imagines* placed in the *armarium* were used in the funeral. Some scholars believe that because of a reference in Polybios (at 6.53.6), who (possibly) suggests that the *imagines* made of wax and stored in the *armaria* were used by actors in the funeral procession (*pompa funebris*)⁸¹ and by other references confirming that actors wore *imagines* representing the deceased ancestors, that this means that they were a form of mask that could be worn.⁸² However, while a few Latin sources directly attest to the fact that actors might be used in relation to the funeral, there is absolutely no mention by any source (except for Polybios) that these were identical with the wax *imagines* placed in the *armaria*, nor is there any mention by any Latin source that the wax *imago* itself was in the form of a mask that could be worn.⁸³ On the contrary, there are far more references in Latin sources which suggest that the wax *imagines* were carried or transported (perhaps on a *lectus*) before the bier carrying the body: Appian *Ib.* 89; Cic. *De Or.* 2.225-6; Cass. Dio 56.34; Pomp. Porph. *Comm.*; Livy *AUC* 38.56.12-13; Plin. *HN* 35.6; Plut. *Caes.* 5; Sil. *Pun.* 10.556-9; Tac. *Ann.* 2.32.1; Tac. *Ann.* 3.5; Tac. *Ann.* 3.76. Sometimes these sources indicate that these *imagines* could be full bodied effigies (particularly in reference to

80 Given that an *imago* communicated something of the character of the deceased, it may also have been regarded as potentially having a 'negative' (?) power to attract the deceased back to the house. In relation to this were the festivals of the *Parentalia*, on February 14, and the *Lemures* held on 9th, 11th, and 13th of May. It is alleged that the *Lemuria* was instituted by Romulus to appease the spirit of Remus (Ovid, *Fasti*, 473ff.). Ovid notes that at this festival it was the custom to appease or expel the spirits by the head of the household walking barefoot and throwing black beans over the shoulder at night while repeating nine times, "with these beans I redeem me and mine". Importantly, members of the household would then clash bronze pots while repeating, "Ghosts of my fathers and ancestors, be gone!" nine times. In relation to this it is interesting that when Cicero calls upon an *imago* of a *maior* as a means of rebuking the errant behaviour of a contemporary, he uses the verb *excitare* – meaning 'to rouse/raise up', or *evocare* – meaning 'to call up', as though the *imago* were the vehicle through which the spirit of the deceased would be called forth from the underworld to become animated: Cic. *Cael.* 34. I do not suggest, however, that this aspect of the wax *imagines* was consciously acknowledged by the Romans, but possibly explains later usage.

81 Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 2: 'Unlike death masks, the *imagines* were made during a person's lifetime and could be worn as real masks.'

82 Diod. Sic. 31.25.2 (quoted by Photius, *Bibliothèque* 383B); Plaut. *Amph.* 458-9; Polyb. 6.53.6; Suet. *Vesp.* 19.2.

83 In relation to this it is interesting to note that in Latin the facial representation of an individual Roman was referred to as an *imago*, the word for a mask (such as that used in the theatre) was a *persona*. Similarly the equivalent in Greek sources for *imago* was *εἰκών* f. (gen. -οῦς) which meant a 'likeness, image, whether picture or statue'; vis., Hdt. 2.130, 143, A.Th. 559; also a 'living image', 'representation'. The verb frequently used when one put on or wore an *imago* was *induo*, -ere: Cic. *Tusc.* 1.38.92; whereas the verb *pono*, -ere is more usual for putting on a *persona*: Cic. *Off.* 3.10.43; although on some occasion, *fero*, *ferre*, is used in the sense of wearing a *persona* or of taking the part of someone in a play: Livy *AUC* 3.36.1; Suet. *Vesp.* 19. The verb *fero*, *ferre*, (or its variant *praefero*, *praeferre*) which is that usually used in the Latin sources in connection of the *imagines* in the funeral procession, simply means 'to carry', and since this verb is usually used in the passive, it simply implies that the *imagines* were carried.

the deceased: Tac. *Ann.* 3.5.2), since they are described as wearing triumphal garb.⁸⁴ However, I dispute the interpretation that the verbs used in the texts, being *fero*, *ferre* (to carry, bear; and its variants, *praefero*, *antefero*) and *comito*, *comitare* (to accompany) (and the fact they are often in the passive form)⁸⁵, indicate that actors were wearing the *imagines* in the procession.⁸⁶

In relation to this, it is interesting to note that in Latin the facial representation of an individual Roman was referred to as an *imago*, the word for a mask (such as that used in the theatre) was a *persona*. Similarly the equivalent in Greek sources for *imago* was *εικων* (f.-ovoc gen.) which meant a 'likeness, image, whether picture or statue'; vis., Hdt.2.130, 143, A.Th.559; also a 'living image', 'representation'. The verb frequently used when one put on or wore an *imago* was *induo*, -ere; Cic. *Tusc.* 1.38.92; whereas the verb *pono*, -ere is more usual for putting on a *persona*: Cic. *Off.* 3.10.43. Although on rare occasion, *fero*, *ferre*, is used in the sense of wearing a *persona* or of taking the part of someone in a play: Liv. 3.36.1; Suet. *Vesp.* 19, this verb et al. and *comito*, *comitare* explicitly connote that the *imagines* were 'carried' in or 'accompanied' the funeral procession and in no way, *simpliciter*, imply that actors were used.⁸⁷ In fact it is noteworthy that when Suetonius refers to the actor, Favor, imitating the Emperor Vespasian at his funeral, he specifically uses *persona* in reference to the mask that Favor wore, and not *imago*.⁸⁸ What this suggests is that the wax *imagines* from the *armaria* were carried in the procession, and the actors wore other masks (*imagines* i.e., *personae*) made to resemble the deceased *maiores*.

As stated, there are references to the fact that an actor would be used to imitate the deceased at the funeral from the time of Plautus: [22] Plaut. *Amph.* 458-9; to that of Suetonius (Suet. *Vesp.* 19). There are also references to the fact that actors generally could be used to imitate other distinguished relatives of the deceased: Polyb. 6.53-54; Diod. Sic. 31.25.2. That these actors were wearing some form of *imago* seems beyond doubt.⁸⁹

84 Livy *AUC* 38.56.12-13; Dio Cass. 56.34.

85 Hor. *Ep.* 8.11-12; Cic. *De or.* 2.225; Tac. *Ann.* 2.32.1; Tac. *Ann.* 3.76.

86 Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 99-101.

87 Indeed, the verbs used in most of the Greek sources lend themselves to the same conclusions: e.g. Appian *Hisp.* 89: 'την εικονα την Σκιπωνα εν ταις ποθηταις μονου προφερουσιν εκ των καπιτωλιου...'; Dio Cass. 56.34: εικον δε δη τις αυτου κηρινη εν επνικιω στολη εξεφαινετο. Και αυτη μεν εκ του παλατιου προστων ες νεωτα αρχοντων, ετερα δε εκ του βουλευτηριου χρυση, και ετερα αυ εφ αρματος πομπκου ηγετο... και μετα ταυτας αι τε των προπατορων αυτου εφεροντο. Plut. *Caes.* 5; Val. Max. *Mem.* 8.15.1.

88 *Favor archimimus personam eius ferens imitatusque, ut est mos*: Suet. *Vesp.* 19.2.

89 Diodorus' knowledge may have been based on funerals of Emperors.

There are acute problems with the suggestion that it was the same wax *imagines maiorum* kept in the *armaria* were those worn by actors in the *pompa funebris*. Indeed there is nothing in the literary sources which supports the conclusion that they were the same as those used for the funeral procession (except for Polybios' comment) - the passages merely state that the *imagines* were 'brought out' or were carried before or accompanied the bier on which the deceased was carried, while some sources tell us that on occasion a form of *imagines* were worn by the actors taking part in the *pompa*.

Difficulties lay in the logistics and practicality of wearing a wax *imago* - was it a full face mask? If so how did the actor wear it when it would have been brittle and directly made to fit the deceased's face or moulded from a statue portrait of the deceased? How did the actor breathe while wearing it? This would mean it must have had respiration holes pierced through the nostrils; this would not have been a necessary feature had the mask been cast directly from the deceased as a death mask, and indicates it would have to have been added later. Sometimes the sources quote the *imagines*-wearing actors as speaking (Suet. *Vesp.* 19); again, how did they do so without breaking it and how did they project their voice from behind it? Neither of these things would have been easy if the *imago* worn by the actor at the funeral was made from wax - wax is plastic when warmed but it is brittle when solid and is particularly fissile. Indeed, if the *imago* was made of wax (and hence was brittle and could well have been very old) and was modelled on the face of the deceased directly (as a death mask - even one worked up by artistic rendering), it must have been a perfect or close fit to the dead man's face. It is remote that an actor with even a similar facial structure would have been able to wear such a wax *imago* with comfort or without breaking it. Importantly, if the funeral had taken place on a hot day (and there is evidence that funerals took place during the daytime: Cic. *Mil.* 33) then wax masks being worn by a warm bodied person would not likely to have lasted long enough to survive intact until the end of the funeral.

The use of the *imagines* in the *pompa funebris* in the way described by the sources already cited suggests that these were not the same wax *imagines* that were in the *armaria* in the *atrium* - nor that these were necessarily the same *imagines* made from diverse materials (such as bronze, terracotta, gypsum, or travertine, etc.) also on display in the *atrium*. It is far more likely these actor-worn *imagines* were copies, made of the same material from which actors' masks were usually constructed: leather, linen, cork, or a combination of these and other materials. These could be moulded to appear like the deceased and could be worn with

comfort. Given their skill in mask manufacture (and there is evidence that suggests the actors guilds were responsible for making their masks) these funeral masks may have borne a close resemblance to the *imagines* of the individuals concerned found contemporaneously in the city and in the homes of *nobiles* and hence were easily identifiable by the viewing public.⁹⁰ A reference in Plautus suggests that actors' masks were made of leather: [22] Plaut. *Amph.* 1.50.

What happened to these actor worn *imagines* after the funeral can be conjectured. Perhaps these, too, were kept in the *atrium* in some form of display or were placed in the *armaria* for use at later funerals.⁹¹

The textual evidence thus far discussed indicates that there could be several *imagines* for use in the funeral and the house. There is likely to have been an *imago* (possibly made of wax) that was placed on the deceased himself or on a manikin laid out on the bier which at the end of the funeral was placed in an *armarium* in the *atrium*; there were the *imagines* from the *armaria* which were carried during the funeral procession; there were also the *imagines* that were used by actors to imitate the deceased, and in lavish funerals, those of the other deceased distinguished relatives, which were made of materials usually used to manufacture actors' masks; and finally those other *imagines* that were on display generally in the *atrium* and around the house, made of diverse materials.

There is some dispute as to what form these various *imagines* took, what materials they were made from and how they were made. The main sources are not entirely explicit in this regard,⁹² Pliny (E) indicates that the one form of portrait of the deceased was placed in the *armaria* and was made of wax, as does Dio Cassius,⁹³ and this accounts for why, if this particular form of portrait was regarded as an *imago*, they are referred to as *cerae*, particularly in poetry.⁹⁴ He says that this *imago* was placed in its own individual *armarium* among the other *imagines* of deceased family members, where it could be viewed, and that these used to

⁹⁰ Suet. *Ner.* 21.

⁹¹ An *armarium* was used for more than just housing the *imagines*. It was originally a place for keeping arms, afterwards a store cupboard generally, which had folding doors, in which were kept not only arms, but also clothes, books, money, ornaments, pictures, and other articles of value. The *armarium* was generally placed in the *atrium* of the house: Dig. 33 Tit.10 s.3; Cic. *Cluent.* 64; Petron. *Sat.* 29; Plin. (E) *HN* 29.5.32, 35.2). The divisions of a library were also called *armaria*: Vitruvius *De Arch.* 7. Praef.; Vopiscus *Tac.* 8.

⁹² For a full discussion of what is known about the funeral and its process see Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture* 91-109.

⁹³ Plin. (E) *HN* 35.4-14; Dio Cass. 56.34.

⁹⁴ Wax *imagines maiorum* are also referred to in Sen. (Y) *Ben.* 3.28.2 and *Ep.* 44.5; Juv. *Sat.* 8.19-23; Mart. *Ep.* 2.90; Vitruvius *De Arch.* 6.3.6, and Suet. *Vesp.* 19.

accompany the funeral of deceased members of the family. As already noted above, the sources indicate that there were other types of *imagines* present in the *atrium*. These could also be full body statues with an *imago* or, at the least, busts with the head (and possibly even the shoulders or upper chest) of the *maior* represented.⁹⁵ The sources indicate that many of these were three dimensional portraits made of diverse materials.⁹⁶ Given the oft-damaged state of some of those on display and their age, it would seem that these were not made of bronze (although for some this cannot be discounted⁹⁷), but were of some material that could be worn or damaged – such as terracotta, or gypsum, or some soft stone such as tufa or travertine.⁹⁸ On occasion it is said that there could be so many of these *imagines* in the *atrium* that they appeared like an army ([23] Sall. *Hist.* 3 fr.48.18).

In relation to its manufacture Pliny (E) says it was '*expressi cera*'. Polybios, writing almost two hundred and fifty years before Pliny (E) stated that the wax *imago* was manufactured in order to resemble the deceased in appearance and *colouring*.⁹⁹ There is nothing explicit from either of these passages indicating that the *imago* was a 'photographic' representation (in our modern sense of the phrase) of the deceased or that it was moulded directly from the face of the deceased as a death mask – an assumption often made by modern scholars.¹⁰⁰ Wax has either a yellow or white colouring which does not look very 'life-like'. If the wax *imago* was simply cast directly from the face of the deceased person as a death mask, then, given the sagging of the features of the cadaver which occurs after death, the resulting mask would not appear very life-like.

If the deceased himself was placed on view for the *collocatio* and the *pompa funebris*, the wax *imago* may simply have been placed on the face of the deceased to give the appearance that he was still alive. If, as other interpretations suggest, the deceased was actually represented in effigy on the bier and that the actual body of the deceased was laid out in a box

95 Juv. *Sat.* 8.1-23

96 Polyb. 6.53.4; Cic. *Phil.* 2.26; Ov. *Fast.* 1.591; Val. Max. *Mem.* 5.8.3; Sen. (Y) *Ben.* 3.28.2; Sen. (Y) *Ep.* 44.5; Sen. (Y) *Ep.* 76.12; *Laus Pisonis* 8ff; Plin. (E) *HN* 35.6-8; Plin. (Y) *Ep.* 5.17.6; Mart. *Ep.* 2.90.5-8; 5.20; Juv. *Sat.* 8.1-5 and 19-20; Ov. *Am.* 1.8.65.

97 Pliny (E) states that the habit of *nobiles* keeping bronze portraits in their homes is of more recent habit – although he may be referring simply to works of art (*signa*) rather than *imagines*, which may have been also made of bronze as other sources indicate: cf Hor. *Od.* "*Exegi monumentum perennius aere...*".

98 Juv. *Sat.* 8.1-23.

99 Polyb. 6.53.5: ἡ δ' εἰκών ἐστὶ πρόσωπον εἰς ὁμοιότητα διαφερόντως ἐξεργασμένον καὶ κατὰ τὴν πλάσιν καὶ κατὰ τὴν ὑπογραφὴν.

100 In fact a quote from Cicero implies that an *imago* need not have been a recognisable likeness at all: Cic. *Somn.* 6.10.

underneath,¹⁰¹ then it is plausible that an *imago* would have been required for placement on this effigy so that it more closely resembled the deceased. An *imago* created for either purpose is not likely to have been a mere 'death mask'¹⁰² but was the product of an artistic process so as to achieve the desired result. However precisely it was used, the process for creating the wax *imago* was very much an 'artistic' one - requiring a certain amount of artistic interpretation to recreate the appropriate appearance of the deceased *as if he were alive*.

For the wax *imago* used for the face of the deceased in the funeral, there are, in fact, several ways in which it could have been made. If the *imago* was cast or moulded from the face of the deceased (alive or dead), then it could have been formed from a sheet of wax that had been heated - not so much that it was liquefied, but merely a sheet which had been heated enough to make it soft or malleable and then placed over the face of the person concerned and allowed to set. This implies that if it was to have any resemblance to the person concerned it had to be fairly thin - otherwise no physical features would be visible or ascertainable from it. Such a mask would require considerable work afterwards to present a reasonable, 'life-like' image of the person. Such a wax rendition could easily have been placed over the face of the deceased person (or a manikin representing the deceased) for use in the *collocatio* and *pompa funebris*. Failing this, whether the sheet was thick or thin, such a wax rendition could have been easily used for manufacturing a mould for placing over a gypsum or terracotta core for later casting in bronze in the *cire perdue* method. Such a mould could also have been used to replicate numerous copies of the wax *imago* by simply pressing a heated wax sheet into it and allowing it to set.

Alternatively, the wax could have been poured and moulded on the face which was then shaped to the general contours of the features and coloured, and then left on the body during the funeral (if indeed it was the actual body that was propped up on a couch or laid out) to be removed and placed in the *atrium* after the funeral. If it was made in this way, then firstly such a mask would require some reworking while it was setting on the face of the deceased to give a similar likeness in shape and colouring - again the result would not necessarily be an 'exact' physical likeness of the deceased, and would not appear like a typical 'death mask'.

A further alternative may have been that the *imago* was actually an impression in wax taken

101 Tac. *Ann.* 3. 5.

102 There is a wax mask found in a tomb near Cumae - now in the Naples Museum; however this appears to have been used because the head of the deceased was actually missing (Ill. 106).

from a gypsum master mould that could well have been made while the deceased person was still alive (hinting at a possible meaning for Cicero's *ius imaginis*) which was then coloured and placed either on the face of the deceased or the manikin for the funeral, or directly in the *armaria*. The process may be exactly that which he mentions was invented by Lysistratus of Sicyon for making *imagines* – that a plaster cast was first taken from a living face into which wax was poured and a clay bozzetto was then moulded to it, emendations or corrections being then made to the wax face. This model was then used to cast a bronze *imago* (using the *cire perdu* technique), or for making a master mould in plaster. It is interesting in relation to this that Pliny (E) similarly uses the verb *exprimere*, *expressus* to describe the process which is exactly the same he uses to describe – in what is obviously a shorthand manner – for making the *imagines* that were placed in the *armaria*.¹⁰³ If it was made in this way, the resulting wax *imago* was a worked replication of the subject's face. As with the other manufacturing possibilities mentioned above, such a plaster mould and wax *imago* may well have been used to manufacture other *imagines* of the deceased in diverse materials (including wax, terracotta, bronze, or later, in marble).

A final alternative is that the wax *imago* could have been made by applying a sheet of wax to an already existing three dimensional portrait in bronze, stone or terracotta – or by taking a plaster mould from such a statue and then pressing a wax sheet into it which was then placed over a clay core. The resulting wax *imago* would then have been coloured and placed on the face of the deceased for the duration of the funeral.

In considering this issue it is important to note that the sources state that each *paterfamilias* of the *familia* and *gens* would have their own set of *imagines* of the *maiores* - which must have all borne a resemblance to those possessed by other members (Cic. *Fam.* 9.21.2-3; Cic. *Orat.* 110; Mart. *Epig.* 2.90; Plin. (E) *HN* 35.8). This indicates that there must have been some mechanism by which *imagines* of worthy ancestors were reproduced, or by which damaged or lost ones were replaced. This also indicates that there were skilled people available to make

103 Plin. (E) *HN* 35.153: *Hominis autem imaginem gypso e facie ipsa primus omnium expressit ceraque in eam formam gypsi infusa emendare instituit Lysistratus Sicyonis, frater Lysippi, de quo diximus. Hic et similitudines rederre instituit; ante eum quam pulcherrimas facere studebat. Idem et de signis effigies exprimere invenit, crevitque res in tantum effigies, exprimere invenit, crevitque res in tantum ut nulla signa statuave sine argilla fierent.* ['However, the first who formed an *imago* in plaster on the face of a living man and then poured wax into the formed plaster in order to make corrections was Lysistratus from Sicyon, the brother of Lysippus about whom we have spoken. It was he who began creating actual likenesses, before him artists merely desired to make the face most beautiful. Similarly, he invented the practice of expressing effigies from artworks, and he created a skill that advanced to such a degree, that no artwork or statue would be made without first making a clay bozzetto.']

these *imagines* when required.

Corroboration for this view comes from the *senatus consultum* against Gnaeus Piso the Elder which called upon members of *gens pisonis* not to include Piso's *imago* among their *imagines maiores*: it is evident that this decree was issued after Piso had already had his funeral, so the members of the *gens* must have been in the process of having *imagines* of Piso created for placement in their *armaria* as well as those versions in other materials for placement in their *atria*. Furthermore, the recognition of the identity of wax *imagines* (and indeed of other *imagines* made of various materials - including bronze) by individuals who saw them in the *atrium* of *nobiles*' homes (attested to by Cicero and other sources; for instance, Cic. *Att.* 6.1.17; Plin. (E) *HN* 35.8) suggests that *imagines* - either in wax, plaster, terracotta, bronze or other material had a degree of uniformity in their appearance to make recognition possible. It appears that the uniformity in the appearance of *imagines* could be maintained for long periods of time, over generations and through different families, thus guaranteeing that they were recognisable (as Cicero says they undoubtedly were: Cic. *Att.* 6.1.17).

All these factors indicate that *imagines*, no matter what their material or context, were reproduced from an original prototype, or even master cast, that could have been used time and time again over successive generations for producing *imagines* in diverse formats.¹⁰⁴

These factors suggest that something durable or long lasting was being used by which to cast wax copies of the *imagines* whenever they were required for the *atrium* or the *pompa funebris*, as well as allowing a degree of uniformity for other portrait images set up of the same individual in the city whether of bronze, gypsum, terracotta or later of marble. This would not be possible if the wax *imago* were moulded or cast directly from the face of the deceased as a single copy. Based on such evidence, I would suggest that the wax *imago* was not a death mask, but actually cast from a master mould or prototype which was most likely made while the individual concerned was still alive – and this explains what Cicero meant

¹⁰⁴ Pliny (E) makes it clear that a likeness could be 'handed' down from the time a represented individual lived (Plin. (E) *HN* 35.9; and Juvenal attests to the fact that they could be old and in need of repair: Juv. *Sat.* 8.1-23.

when he talked about the duty to leave an *imago* for handing down to one's heirs.¹⁰⁵ This could well have been made from a plaster cast taken from the individual's face which was then moulded in wax over a terracotta core¹⁰⁶ and was subsequently worked up to include the appropriate *severitas/gravitas* facial expression and artistically rendered in the desired style. From this a further plaster cast could have been taken which thence served as a prototype mould for rendering portraits in diverse materials. From such a mould the process could have been repeated *ad infinitum*, a wax *imago* could easily have been made by pressing a heated wax sheet into it which then had a clay bozzetto shaped into it for placement in the *armarium*. It could also have been used simply to make a wax face mask, which was then coloured and placed on the actual deceased (or an imitative manikin) for the funeral. If this was removed before the end of the funeral, it could easily have had a clay bust base manufactured to support it for placement in the *armarium*. It was these busts that were carried in the subsequent funerals of members of the *familia* and *gens*. Simultaneously, many copies of this *imago* could also have been made from wax with a clay bust support in order to supply the demand of all those connected by marriage, blood or adoption for placement in their respective *armaria*. Such a mould could also be used for making wax impressions for casting a portrait in bronze using the *cire perdu* method¹⁰⁷ or for making a portrait in terracotta or gypsum. From such castings, portraits could have been manufactured in stone (tufa, travertine or marble) using various methods, including pointing.¹⁰⁸ Any resulting portraits could then have been artistically rendered to import the style desired (depending on the purpose of the

105 If a person had no such master mould made while alive, it is possible that just such a prototype could have been made once they were dead cast directly from their face, but again the result would have been artistically rendered so as to import to it the appropriate facial expression and to give it the appearance of being alive. Similarly, if the individual was long dead and there was no master mould surviving, then any identifiable statues of that individual which survived (either in terracotta, wax, bronze, marble or tufa etc.) could have served for the manufacture of a new master mould and the subsequent manufacture of wax *imagines* or *imagines* in other materials. Failing the existence of identifiable portraits, only then may the artist have been entirely free to construct an *imago* (and mould) based on memory or supposition – but supplying the requisite facial expression that communicated the proper *motus animi* (most particularly *severitas* and *gravitas*) and rendered artistically in the desired style.

106 Such as the terracotta head from Cumae (Ill.36).

107 As stated, the level of bronze casting using the *cire perdu* indirect method of casting was highly sophisticated by the early fifth century B.C., thereby providing easily available technology by which portrait images could be replicated. See S.M. Malone, *Bronze: A 3000 Year Old Tradition* (2003 [cited 25 March 2004]); available from http://www.unc.edu/courses/rometech/publiccontent/arts_and_crafts/Sara_Malone/BRONZES. On the bronze casting technique of Roman artists, see B.S. Ridgway, "Roman Bronze Statuary - Beyond Technology," in *The Fire of Hephaistos: Large Classical Bronzes from North American Collections*, ed. C.C. Mattusch, et al. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Art Museums, 1996). Indeed, portraits were not merely occasionally reproduced but already replicated in great numbers in the late Republic, as we know from the case of M. Marius Gratidianus, tribune of the Plebs in 87 B.C., whose image was set up *in omnibus vicis* (in all the districts) of the city (Cicero, *De off.* 3.80; Plin. (E), *HN* 34.27).

108 J. J. Pollitt, *Art in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986) 165.

display, materials used etc) and thus preserving the similarity of appearance in different *imagines* of the same individual (without necessarily making them stylistically identical) – which is exactly what the ancient sources and some variations in surviving portraits of the same individual suggest.

It has been claimed that the wax *imagines* housed in the *armaria* were in the form of a mask and that these were worn by actors in the *pompa funebris* – but as stated above, this is most unlikely to have been the case. It is far more likely that the actors themselves made their masks in traditional mask materials modelled on the extent *imagines* of the relatives to be portrayed.

While much of the above is based on supposition extrapolated from the ancient sources, there are one or two pieces of evidence which support my conclusions. The first is the fact that the sources use the single word *imagines* to refer to all portrait likenesses of an individual: including those stored in the *armaria* and those that were on general display in the *atrium*. The sources equally indicate that these could be large in number, were made of some fissile material which could be damaged or broken over time, and could become grimy due to the smoke from hearth fires in the *atrium*. The sources state that some of these had faces moulded from wax, but other materials are also mentioned in terms of their manufacture.¹⁰⁹ Importantly, the same ethical messages are drawn from the *imagines* no matter what their material of manufacture or the precise context of their display.

The other evidence supporting these conclusions are several depictions of *imagines* in art. It is often assumed that there are no representations of *imagines* (being the wax versions housed in the *armaria*) and that existing representations of portraits have little to do with them.¹¹⁰ There are, in fact, several representations of what I would suggest are *imagines* from the *armaria*: in particular, two statues in marble which depict individuals carrying portrait busts of deceased

109 This evidence alone suggests it is erroneous to view *imagines* as divided strictly into wax *imagines maiorum* proper, and portraits in other media. The evidence clearly indicates that the form of *imagines* (no matter what their context of display or material of manufacture) was the same and were they were regarded as the same by the ancient Roman viewer – this accounts for the vagueness of the sources in clearly delineating between the different utilizations of *imagines*. Hence a more appropriate division for Roman portraiture are those based on material of manufacture and of utilization or context of display – but even here it must be remembered that, to the ancient Roman viewer, an *imago* conveyed similar messages no matter what the context of its display or its medium of manufacture.

110 Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture* 5-9. The *kline* monument of Attia Iucunda in the Museo Nazionale Romano - Terme di Diocleziano, Rome, is an example of also what may be *armaria*.

relatives: the *Barberini togatus*, now in the Museo Centrale Montemartini, Musei Capitolini, Rome, showing a man supporting two busts of his ancestors (Ill. 107), and a sarcophagus lid in the British museum of a woman reclining on a bed and supporting a bust of her husband in her lap (Ill. 108). The size and elaboration of the details of these busts held by the main figures indicate that they are not simply made from wax – as being so large they would be extremely fissile. Nor are the original busts on which these representations are modelled likely to have been marble or bronze as the weight of such materials would make it unlikely that they could be handled in the way indicated.¹¹¹ While I am mindful that the composition of both statues may be a fantasy – symbolically associating the main figures with *imagines*, but not in a literal, real sense – it seems to me that the notion underlying the act of carrying or supporting *imagines* in the manner shown would not have seemed impossible to a Roman viewer, and is in concordance with the sources suggesting that they were carried in the funeral procession. If the *imagines* could be carried or balanced in the way shown in these sculptures, then it suggests that the original busts might have been hollow terracotta or gypsum renditions, with perhaps features rendered in wax.

A further piece of evidence supports the conclusion that the representations of *imagines* in these two statues are meant to be the *imagines* housed in the *armaria*, and this is the representation depicted in relief on some tombs of the non-élite classes.¹¹² Examples are no. 1187 in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek in Copenhagen¹¹³ and the tomb stone of Paconius in the Vatican Museum where *imagines* are shown, but not in *armaria* (Ill. 100).¹¹⁴ In light of the information from the sources that the wax *imagines* could be bought out and carried in the *pompa funebris*, and that we see representations in art of persons associated with bust portraits that they appear to be carrying, as well as images of bust portraits in cupboards that are clearly referring to *armaria*, it seems that these in fact are depictions of the wax *imagines*

111 The capacity to carry or support two heads (as suggested by the Barberini statue) or for a female to balance a portrait on her lap (as depicted in the British museum sarcophagus) militate against these being representations of marble or bronze busts.

112 G. Lahusen, "Zur Funktion und Rezeption des römischen Ahnenbildes," *MDAI-R* 92 (1985), 282.

113 I dispute Flower's interpretation of that these do not represent *imagines* in their *armaria*, because one of the *imagines* represented a woman, they are in bust form, and that the tomb was of freedmen. She sees the image as one developed as for the art of freedmen with its peculiar iconography and in no way reduplicates the practice of the *nobiles*: *Ibid.*, 7-8.

114 Cat. 2.435b, Musei Vaticani; Zadoks-Josephus Jitta, *Ancestral Portraiture in Rome and the Art of the Last Century of the Republic*, 43 and pl.5a; and *CIL* 6.23687.

as they appeared in the homes of the *nobiles*.¹¹⁵

8.4 Summary

Portraits were utilised in public contexts, as votive and honorary works set up in public and semi public contexts by the state, *clientes*, and private individuals. They were also created and displayed by individuals for various private settings. The word *imago* signified a representation of the face and head which thereby expressed the moral values of the individual portrayed. It encompassed different types of portraits, made of diverse materials and utilised for a variety of purposes.¹¹⁶ Once a person was deceased, then *any* portrait in existence of them might also be described as an *imago maioris*: a portrait of an ancestor. The word *imagines* is also used alone or with *maiorum* where a collective sense is implied - meaning all the *imagines* of the *maiores* (i.e., deceased *vires boni*) - no matter what the intended purpose of such portraits, the material from which they were made or the context of their display.

More specifically, there were certain type of *imagines*, typically made from wax, which possibly covered the face of the deceased during the funeral and were then reworked into bust form and housed in the *armaria*. The term *imagines maiorum* could also include portraits of other materials which were generally displayed in the *atrium* and which may have played some role in the funeral of the *nobiles*. There may also have been a set of *imagines* manufactured by actors which served as masks in the *pompa funebris* which may also have been housed in the *atrium*.

No matter what material an *imago* was made, or the precise context of its display, it is apparent that these *imagines* conveyed similar messages to the viewer – and I would suggest that it was the use of the *severitas gravitas* facial expression in particular through which this was primarily achieved. This will become particularly when we consider the uses to which

¹¹⁵ Flower rejects this based on her assumption that the wax *imagines* were masks that could be worn. But as shown above, there is only one source, Polybios, who indicates that this was the case. No other source, and importantly, no Latin source, indicates that this was so. Similarly, it seems inherently wrong that the non-élite classes would invent a form of depiction for such busts, but based on the *imagines* of the *nobiles*, which in no way reflected the reality of the *nobiles'* forms of *imagines* on which these images were supposedly based. It seems more logical that they were precise references to actual *nobiles'* practice and that these depictions on the tombs of the non-élite were references to the conservative traditions of funeral practice at Rome, including the iconography of death and burial derived from élite practice which were widely understood by all sectors of Roman society.

¹¹⁶ See Chapter 2, 37-44 *supra*.

imagines were put and the messages drawn therefrom in the following chapter. That the *imagines* were particularly associated with the élite classes will also be discussed, and this raises the issue of who could or would commission portraits in the context of Republican Rome.

CHAPTER NINE

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE *IMAGINES* AT ROME: WHO COMMISSIONED *IMAGINES* ?

9.1 Introduction

It may be easy to surmise from the close association of the uses of *imagines* and the contexts of their display, their embodiment of the values of *severitas* and *gravitas*, and the *nobiles* class throughout the late Republican period, that it was primarily they who commissioned and benefited from portraiture in both the public and private spheres. The significance of *imagines* to the élite classes, and in just what circumstances a *nobilis* (or any other person) could, or would, display a portrait statue of himself or of his ancestors thus becomes of crucial significance, since the answers may provide important information as to how the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression came to be applied to portraits and how the genre developed in the context of Roman society.

9.2 *Imagines* and *nobiles* identity

The importance of *imagines* as central to the identity of the *nobiles* class is attested by two important texts: [1] Plin. (E) *HN* 35.4-14; and the senate's decree condemning Cn. Calpurnius Piso on a charge of treason: [2] *S.C. de Cn. Pis.*

Pliny (E) laments that his contemporary *nobiles* would rather collect artworks (such as *signa* made from precious metals) than *imagines maiorum*, which the *maiores* ('ancestors') themselves used to place in the *atria* of their *domi* (at 35.6). Pliny (E) believes that symptomatic of the neglect of the *imagines maiorum* is a neglect of the *mos maiorum*¹ and as such the *nobiles* have abdicated their traditional duties of seeking public office and their role in the affairs of state. Instead of displaying *imagines* which convey the proper Roman virtues of *severitas* and *gravitas* and conducting his *negotium* before them, the contemporary *nobilis*

¹ It is interesting to note how Pliny laments that Romans of his day especially prefer to have the *vultus* of the philosopher Epicurus in their homes rather than the *imagines* and *vultus* of either themselves or their own *maiores*. This suggests in a sense that, instead of the face of the ancestors looking upon them and judging the standard of their behaviour, they prefer the faces of Greek philosophers to be the arbiters of their behaviour - placing these images even in the privacy of their *cubicula*, rather than in the public and most ancient part of the house, where they would be seen by anybody entering the house.

prefers to collect artworks in the privacy of his own bedroom that communicate nothing but his *luxuria*.² The decay and disintegration of the traditional life and customs of the *nobiles* as a class, something bemoaned by Pliny (E), signal their relegation to a purely social (and perhaps somewhat irrelevant) institution, at least in political terms.

The passage, however, still reveals the deep-seated consciousness of the Roman *nobiles* during the third quarter of the first century A.D. of the importance of their ancestors and the role their *imagines* had in advertising the achievements of the family, in providing a source of inspiration to members of the family to equal or excel those achievements through their continued involvement in the affairs of the *res publica* i.e., to seek election to public office, and in setting the moral standards that should govern the conduct of their public and private lives.

The centrality of ancestors as represented by the *imagines* within the élite class is confirmed by the *Senatus Consultum* of 20 December 20 A.D. condemning Cnaeus Calpurnius Piso on a charge of *maiestas*:³ [2] *S.C. de Cn. Pisone*.⁴ Piso had been tried before the senate⁵ but had committed suicide before the final judgement because it was an accepted part of Roman law that a person could avoid losing *caput* (and hence *infamia* or *ignominia*)⁶ and protect other

2 Pliny may have deliberately cited Epicurus because he was popularly perceived in the Roman mind to have advocated pleasure and self-indulgence as the highest good (hence it is appropriate that such an *imago* should be placed in the *cubiculum*), as opposed to the duty of public life expected of a *nobilis* as befitting his position and role in society.

3 Tacitus and other sources imply that people who were convicted of certain offences (such as *maiestas*-treason) had their property confiscated and were denied burial: Tac. *Ann.* 6.29. Banishment or execution (upon conviction) thus entailed confiscation of property and loss of certain civil and legal rights (such as instigating civil actions, taking one's place in the public office or in the senate etc), but importantly included removal of the right to make a will and the prohibition of that person's right to engage in the affairs of state - the *res publica* - something which was seen to be a right, duty and privilege expected of every *nobilis*.

4 A. Caballos, Eck, W., Fernandez, F., "S.C. de Cn. Pisone Patre: informe preliminar," in *Il congreso de historia de Andalucia*, ed. A. Fraschetti (Cordoba: 1991); W. Eck, "Das S.C. de Cn Pisone Patre und seine Publikation in der Baetica," *CCG* 4 (1993), 189-208. For a general discussion of its meaning and significance, see H.I. Flower, "Rethinking 'Memoriae Damnatio': The Case of Gn. Calpurnius Piso Pater in Ad 20," *ClAnt* 17, no. 2 (1998).

5 Tac. *Ann.* 3.10-18.

6 *Senatus Consultum*, line 71.

legal rights (most importantly, protecting his will and property for his heirs)⁷ by committing suicide before a verdict was delivered.⁸ The harshness of the senate's decree appears to stem from the its view that Piso's suicide was an attempt to escape the *pietas* and *severitas* of his judges (*pietate et severitatem iudicantium*).⁹ Interestingly, the senate's posthumous punishment of Piso was centred on his *imagines*: that there should be no grieving or mourning for him (75), that his *statuae* and *imagines* should be taken down wherever they may have been set up (75-76),¹⁰ that it should be 'rightly and properly done' that members of the *gens Calpurnia* (including those who are or will become related to them by marriage or blood) should not place his *imago* among the *imagines* of their *maiores* at their funerals (79-80), nor display them among the other *imagines maiorum* in their *atria* (81-82).

The decree thus deprived Piso of the very things that he as a *nobilis* esteemed as indicators of his *dignitas*, *auctoritas* and *virtus* and which should be celebrated by fitting *monumenta* after his death – viz. his *imagines*. It was through his *imagines* that his *fama* would be maintained, and that his and his family's *dignitas* would be proved to the viewing public.¹¹ In essence, by destroying Piso's *statuae ac imagines* in whatever context, he was to be obliterated from the

7 Tac. *Ann.* 2.32.1 and 3.50.6; Cassius Dio states that it was Tiberius who extended the law to cover wills: 57.22.5. The precise penalty laid down by law which Piso faced is in dispute. The law dealing with treason was Caesar's *lex Iulia de Maiestate*. Cicero implies that the original law prescribed *interdictio aquae et igni* – in other words banishment from Italy: Cic. *Phil.* 1.23 'Quid, quod obrogatur legibus Caesaris, quae iubent ei qui de vi itemque ei qui maiestatis damnatus sit aqua et igni interdicti?'; see also Tac. *Ann.* 3.38.2 and 3.50.4. From the time of Tiberius onwards it is also apparent that banishment to a specific place (*relegatio*) (such as an island) also occurred: Tac. *Ann.* 3.38.2 and 3.68.2. In the Imperial period death could also be imposed as a punishment by the *princeps* or the senate – however, just when this punishment came into effect and how often it was imposed is uncertain: Tac. *Ann.* 2.31.2 and 3.51. Whatever the case, it is clear that the penalty for *maiestas* involved social, civil and political 'death' to the person concerned.

8 On *infamia* or *ignominia* as the result of losing certain civil actions as well as criminal trials, see J. A. Crook, *Law and Life of Rome*, Cornell paperbacks ed. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984), 83-85.

9 *Senatus Consultum* line 71.

10 Tacitus states that the crowds had already commenced tearing down Piso's statues in anticipation of his conviction: Tac. *Ann.* 3.14.6.

11 The absence of details of the funeral from the decree indicates that the funeral had already taken place. For an earlier example of a person being tried who died before the verdict and the attempts to prevent a eulogy at the funeral, there is the account of the funeral of Appius Claudius by Livy where the Tribunes tried (unsuccessfully) to prevent the funeral oration being given at his funeral: Livy *AUC* 2.61.6: *idem habitus oris, eadem contumacia in uoltu, idem in oratione spiritus erat, adeo ut magna pars plebis Appium non minus reum timeret quam consulem timuerat...* ['Neither the threats of the Plebeians nor the entreaties of the senate could induce him – I will not say to change his attire and accost men as a suppliant, but – even to soften and subdue to some extent his wonted savagery of language when he had to make his defence before the people. There was the same expression, the same defiant look, the same proud tones of speech, so that a large number of the Plebeians were no less afraid of Appius on his trial than they had been when he was consul. He only spoke in his defence once, but in the same aggressive tone that he always adopted and his firmness so dumbfounded the tribunes and the plebs' that they adjourned the case of their own accord, and then allowed it to drag on. There was not a very long interval however. Before the date of the adjourned trial arrived he was' carried off by illness. The tribunes tried to prevent any funeral oration being pronounced over him, but the Plebeians would not allow the obsequies of so great a man to be robbed of the customary honours. They listened to the panegyric of the dead as attentively as they had listened to the indictment of the living, and vast crowds followed him to the tomb.']

public and private record.

A similar case is mentioned by Tacitus concerning Scribonius Libo Drusus who was condemned for *maiestas* after committing suicide in A.D. 16.¹² His *imago* was likewise banned from family funerals, an interdiction was placed on his name being used by the family, and a public ‘thanksgivings’ was decreed on the anniversary of his death – thus, in effect, stripping him of his citizenship and membership of the Roman community and relegating him to the status of *hostis* (public enemy).¹³

The importance of the link for the Roman *nobilis*, between his ancestry represented by the *imagines* and holding public office, finds expression in Latin literature throughout the Republican and early Imperial periods: [3] Sil. *Pun.* 4.493-7; [4] Sil. *Pun.* 17.11-12. Even in the early second century A.D. Suetonius prefaced each biography of the Caesars with a discourse on family origins and rank – in other words, each subject was introduced by a description of the distinguished career and *dignitas* of the *maiores*: for instance, [5] Suet. *Galb.* 2-3. Tacitus, too, frequently describes a person’s ancestry upon introducing them. He even refers to the *imagines* directly, claiming that they symbolised the best virtues of the Roman ruling classes, and he decries those who merely sought wealth and yet did nothing to maintain the *dignitas* of their *familia*: [6] Tac. *Dial.* 8.4.¹⁴ In this context the *imagines maiorum* were regarded as tangible *monumenta* which were to be handed down from generation to generation, as exemplars of an old fashioned moral code and representative of proper customs and practices: [7] Val. Max. *Mem.* 5.5.

That the *imagines* were particularly associated with the ruling élite is further confirmed by the fact that the literary sources often treat the *domus nobilium* and the *imagines* as synonymous: [8] (Pseudo) Quint. *Dec.Min.* 388.35;¹⁵ [9] Mart. *Epig.* 2.90.5-8; [10] Tac. *Dial.* 11.3; and [11] Val. Max. *Mem.* 3.3.7; [12] Asc. *Mil.* [43C = 37-8 KS]. In poetry the *imagines* often serve as symbolic of involvement in the affairs of state – often being rejected in a bucolic yearning for an uncomplicated, rustic life: [13] Prop. 2.13b.1-8).¹⁶ Similarly, in philosophical discourse the *imagines*, which fill the *nobiles*’ houses, embody the moral values considered

12 Tac. *Ann.* 2.27.32.

13 The term ‘*res publica*’ to denote ‘the State’ continued to be used throughout the imperial period.

14 Cf Plin. (E) *HN* 35.6-14.

15 Other examples can be found at Ov. *Her.* 16.184; Ov. *Met.* 1.172 and 13.968.

16 This passage makes it clear (as did the citation from Plautus *Amphitruo* above) that it was at the funerals of the *nobiles* where the *imagines* played a role, not those of the poor or those without social distinction.

worthy of emulation, but they make the point that it is not possession of *imagines* alone that is sufficient to prove an individual's true moral worth: [14] Sen. (E) *Controv.* 1.6.3-4; [15] Sen. (Y) *Ben.* 3.28.2; and [16] Sen. (Y) *Dial.* 12.12.6-7 *Helv.*

The emphasis on *severitas* and *gravitas* as the key values expected of magistrates, judges and senators, and the fact that the *nobiles* believed they embodied these key values, explains why their *imagines* were frequently exploited for political advantage. Any context in which *imagines* were displayed provided an opportunity to make important statements to the viewing public concerning the *nobilis*' moral value and his ancestors' deeds and achievements on behalf of the *res publica*, thereby presenting himself and his *imagines* as synonymous with the holding and wielding of power at Rome. This not only assisted the *nobilis* to stake his claim to greater influence (*dignitas* and *auctoritas*) vis à vis other *nobiles familiae*, but reaffirmed to the general viewing public the symbiotic identification of him and his *familia* with power in the *res publica*, as opposed to those of the non-élite class who were subject to it.¹⁷

The political power of the *imagines* is illustrated by the *pompa funebris*.¹⁸ On occasion it appears that the *pompa funebris* and the display of the *imagines* of the ancestors could be quite grand: [17] Tac. *Ann.* 4.9.2. That it was a particular mark of the *nobilis* funeral is confirmed by the Sosia's comment in Plautus' *Amphytrio*: [18] Plaut. *Amph.* 458-9; and slightly later by Polybios.¹⁹ Written sources indicate that *imagines* continued to play a central role in the aristocratic funeral for well over two hundred years: [19] Diod. Sic. 31. 25.2.²⁰ By displaying his *imagines* according to custom during the funeral, the *nobilis* effectively

17 The fact that in the *pompa funebris* the *imagines* of office holding relatives were accompanied by lictors bearing the *fascēs* was a highly charged statement concerning the *imperium* wielded by members of the *familia* to enforce the laws and to inflict punishment on other members of the community.

18 The mention by Dionysios of Halicarnassos that troupes of Satyrs performed the *Sikkinis* before the funeral bier and their connection with Roman comedy and theatre may suggest there is an historical link: Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 7.72.12.

19 The reference in the *Amphytruo* implies that the practice must have been current enough for the joke to be appreciated by the audience and, given that funeral practice is usually among the most conservative of social practices, it suggests that the use of *imagines* in the *pompa funebris* originated well before the date of the this play – maybe in the third or fourth centuries B.C.

20 Although still common practice in Cicero's day (Cic. *De or.* 2.225: *Quid illis omnibus, quorum imagines duci vides?*), by the early Imperial period the use of *imagines* in *nobiles*' funerals appears to have become increasingly rare, reserved mainly for the *pompa funebris* of dead Emperors or those connected with the imperial family: [20] Tac. *Ann.* 4.9.2; [21] Suet. *Vesp.* 19.2; and which of course contained a degree of theatricality. There is evidence that *imagines* were still being used in imperial funerals in the early third century A.D.: [22] Pomp. Porf. *Com.* The élite's practice of placing *imagines* in *armaria* and displaying them in the *atrium* still appears to have been common at the end of the first century A.D: Plin (E) *HN* 35.4-14; Juv. *Sat.* 8.1-20; but by the late second and early third centuries B.C. such displays merely marked the esteem of the owner, rather than a sign of blood relationship.

displayed his own moral worth, proper behaviour and filial piety.²¹

If the *imagines* were not present during the funeral, then this could be seen as a mark of shame for the deceased, or a failure to accord due respect to the deceased from his surviving relatives. For instance, Tacitus describes the lack of honours paid to Germanicus by his nearest relatives, including the Emperor Tiberius: [23] Tac. *Ann.* 3.5. Cicero also states how abominable (or ignominious) the absence of the *imagines* and proper funeral rites entailed: [24] Cic. *Mil.* 86; and [25] Cic. *Mil.* 33. However, this would not be the case if the individual was a *novus homo* – having achieved his own *nobilitas* through being elected to public office, thus making up for any absence or dearth of ancestral *imagines*: [26] Tac. *Ann.* 2.73.1; or the funeral of Hannibal²²: [27] Sil. *Pun.* 10.566-9. The *imagines* could also be absent if the deceased had failed to live up to the moral code set by his *maiores* in political or ethical terms. For instance, Valerius Maximus relates how Titus Manlius Torquatus forced his own son to commit suicide, and instead of conducting the funeral as befitting a *nobilis*, he chose instead to conduct his *negotium* seated in his *atrium* surrounded by his *imagines*. In this way Torquatus made it appear that his family *consilium*, formed from his own ancestors, had concurred in the judgement and sentence he had passed on his son. It is interesting to note how *severus* is employed in this passage, not only to describe the countenance of Torquatus, but also the expression and attitude of the *imagines maiorum* themselves: [28] Val. Max. *Mem.* 5.8.31.

Given the political power wielded by the *nobiles*, the display of *imagines* in the *pompa funebris* meant that their funerals were a decidedly political affair. This perhaps explains why in Imperial times, the *pompa funebris* and the display of *imagines* increasingly became the sole reserve of the Emperor and his immediate family. The political effect that the *imagines* in the *pompa funebris* could have, is illustrated by the action of Julius Caesar, who at the funeral of his aunt Julia displayed the *imagines* of Marius which had not appeared publicly since the dictatorship of Sulla,²³ an act which gained Caesar widespread applause (and a degree of

21 Plut. *Caes.* 5 concerning Julius Caesar's conduct at the funeral of his aunt Julia.

22 Although not a Roman *nobilis*, Hannibal is credited with similar values.

23 The reason reason why Marius' *imago* did not appear in the funerals of those related to him is curious. Despite Marius having been proscribed by Sulla, the ban does not appear to have been the result of any positive legal ruling, but was more likely due to members of the *gens* feeling that it was impolitic to display them.

notoriety) which served him well in political terms.²⁴ Despite Marius' proscription, it is likely that the *familiae* of Marius felt no duty to remove or destroy his *imagines* from their *armaria* or from public display in their *atria* – merely refraining from displaying them in the *pompa funebris* for political reasons.²⁵

Later there is evidence of laws or decrees actually banning the display of the *imagines* of certain individuals: such as that imposed on the *imagines* of Brutus and Cassius.²⁶ The need to prohibit the display of such *imagines* in the context of the funeral clearly indicates the potential social and political effect of the *imagines* on the viewers: [29] Tac. Ann. 3.76.²⁷ The best example is the decree of the senate banning the display of the *imagines* of Cnaeus Calpurnius Piso already mentioned.²⁸ Interestingly the *imago* of Gaius Julius Caesar was also prohibited by law (*lex sacrata*) from use in funerals after his death because he had been divinised by the State: [30] Cass. Dio 47.19.2. A similar fate befell the *imagines* of Augustus: [31] Cass. Dio 56.46.4-5B.

Augustus funeral is described by a variety of sources. During the *pompa funebris* the

24 Plut. *Caes.* 5. The fact that Caesar not only held a *pompa funebris* for his aunt, but included the *imago* of Marius among the crowd of ancestors in the procession, is a political statement of sweeping proportions. Since his aunt was an older woman, she no doubt had a eulogy delivered by Caesar, in which full reference must have been made to the career and honours that Marius had gained in his lifetime. Coming from a patrician such as Caesar, it must have been akin to publishing a political manifesto in which he hoped to accrue the *gloria* of Marius to himself. As the sources tell us Caesar's family, although Patrician, had not held high public office for some considerable time, and not to have referred to Marius' career would have diminished the relevance of his *familia* in political terms. It also confirms that the honours Marius had gained in his lifetime meant that, despite the fact he was a *novus homo*, he simultaneously (upon election to high office) became *nobilis* – since there was obviously no shame from including his *imago* in the *pompa funebris* of a patrician. An irony is evident in this, since the sources indicate that Marius despised the *nobilis* for their reliance upon the *imagines maiorum* as justifying their monopoly of the high offices of state; but in death, he himself became one of the *maiores* and his *imago* became one of the *imagines maiorum* included in the funeral rites of a Patrician.

25 Interestingly, the public immediately recognised Marius *imago* upon seeing it again, attesting to the fact that there was a degree of uniformity in the physical appearance of *imagines* of the same individual, no matter what materials they were manufactured or the contexts of their display, and that the public were well schooled in identifying them. The fact that Marius' *imagines* could be reproduced by Caesar for this funeral, also suggests that the *imagines* of Marius were not destroyed in the interim – or that if they had been destroyed, there was a mechanism available to recreate them, such that they would be recognised immediately by the spectators at the funeral.

26 Regarding the ban on the *imagines* of Brutus, it appears not to have worked – since the absence of his *imagines* caused a greater affect on the minds of the public than their appearance might possibly have. Yet despite the obvious political messages inherent in such a move, the regime felt it could not risk the fall-out from such a public display of the *imagines* in the funeral procession linked with illustrious *nobiles* clans. Later, sources indicate that Cassius Longinus was charged with *maiestas* (treason) for reinstating the *imago* of Cassius the assassin of Caesar on his family tree: Suet. *Nero* 37.1.

27 However, the sources state that the absence of the *imagines* of the Bruti caused more of a public sensation than their exclusion did. During the early Imperial period, such as during the reign of Tiberius and Caligula, it was enough for a charge of *maiestas* (treason) that one had displayed an *imago* of Brutus in a private context, thus advertising to one's Republican sentiment.

28 See pp. 253-254 supra.

imagines of all the notable heroes of Roman history appeared: thus in political terms indicating the Emperor, and more importantly his heir Tiberius, were the successors to the accumulated *dignitas* and *gloria* of the greatest men of Rome – a lineage which no other *nobiles* could hope to match²⁹: [32] Cass. Dio 56.34. Given the political potential of the *imagines* the need to limit their use to funerals of members of the imperial family was an attempt to prevent any individual who may have had pretensions to power from establishing a counter source of legitimacy to that of the Emperor and thereby destabilise the regime.

While the conduct of the funeral and display of *imagines* were matters governed by *mos* innovation could establish a new precedent if generally accepted: [33] Livy *Per.* 48. Such innovations are attested throughout the middle and late Republican periods. For instance, one special case concerned the *imago* of Scipio Africanus which was kept in the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitol and was brought from there to take part in the funerals of members of the *gens Cornelia*: [34] Val. Max. *Mem.* 8.15.1; [35] App. *Hisp.* 89; [36] Livy *AUC* 38. 56. 12-13. Caesar himself innovated funeral practice by delivering an eulogy at his wife's funeral, when such a thing had not previously been done for a young woman: [37] Plut. *Caes.* 5.

The *imagines* displayed in the home and during the funeral communicated everything essential about a *nobilis* in political and social terms: ancestry, offices, *dignitas* and *gloria*. The greater the number of *imagines*, and the cumulative offices held by the *familia*, the more distinguished in political terms the family became within the group of *familiae* forming the *nobiles* class, and hence more influential they were within the power structure of the state: [38] Hor. *Ep.* 8.11-12. The *imagines* also served to distinguish the heir from among the peer group of *nobiles* families, and would serve as a reminder to the general community of the debt owed to him and his ancestors stemming from the public benefits they had bestowed on the state.

The *imagines* thus served a particular political purpose – not only in advertising the individual *nobilis* in terms of his public achievements, family and gentile connections, but in

29 This willingness to exploit the *imagines maiorum* of others to benefit oneself in the political context had its greatest exemplar in Augustus, who in his new forum set up the *statuae et imagines* of the great figures of Roman history all focused on a statue of himself as the inheritor of all the virtues that had made Rome great. The forum in a sense served as the public *atrium* of the Emperor, declaring himself to be the heir of the *dignitas* and *gloria* and moral virtues of all the Republic's heroes. This, of course, is fitting when one remembers that among Augustus' titles was that of *pater patriae*, in effect, the *maior* of the entire Roman state.

electioneering for political office. In this sense the *commendatio* of the *maiores* was considered an important justification for election to public office. For instance, Livy reports that the plebeian Publius Licinius Calvus, a former military tribune with consular power who had been the first in his family to hold office, found it necessary to commend his own son for election to the Assembly since he had no *imagines* of previous office holders that could do so: [39] Livy *AUC* 5.18.5. Interestingly, Livy describes the younger Calvus as the *effigies atque imago* of his father, and hence through the literary device of 'resemblance' or *effictio* the son is inferred to bear the same moral qualities as his father (i.e., he is an *imago* of him, possessing the same *motus animi*) and therefore deserves election to public office.

This reliance on the *imagines maiorum* by the *nobiles* to commend themselves to the electorate was a particularly common practice during the middle and late Republic. That the *imagines* did impress members of the electorate is confirmed by Cicero: [40] Cic. *Planc.* 7.18. Just how closely associated one's worthiness for election to office with an office-bearing lineage was, is revealed by the fact that it was still common to remark on a lack of office-bearing ancestry even in the Imperial period for individuals who attained high office: [41] Suet. *Vesp.* 1.1. However, a person could still be considered worthy despite not having 'senatorial *imagines*': [42] Suet. *Aug.* 4.1.³⁰ This did not prevent Augustus from manipulating the *imagines* of other illustrious Romans (even claiming a divine ancestry for the Julian family), drawing on many of the precedents established by the utilisation of the *imago* of Scipio Africanus: [43] Cic. 4.37 81. Upon his death Augustus became the *maior* without equal – hence it was imperative for his successors to control the use of his portrait images: [44] Ov. *Fast.* 1.589-92.

It was established practice that a newly elected magistrate, particularly the Consul, would make particular reference to his *maiores* in his first speech delivered *ad populum* upon taking up office. This speech would invariably outline the achievements of his ancestors as well of himself (thus showing himself to be worthy of his ancestors and the office to which he had

30 Admittedly, Suetonius is describing the lineage of Augustus who may well have been an exception to the normal rules governing the *nobiles* class. His success in military and political terms meant that his lack of an outstanding ancestry of notable achievers was not a problem, even though he had been adopted into the Patrician *gens* and *familia* of the *Julii Caesares* – for he was viewed as having obtained through his own effort more *nobilitas*, *dignitas*, and *auctoritas* (as well as real *imperium*) than a whole crowd of notable ancestors put together. These *imagines* of the Roman people may have had their genesis in the ancestor galleries appearing in Rome from the late second century B.C onwards set up by various noble families; see G. Lahusen, *Schriftquellen zum römischen Bildnis*, vol. 1 (Bremen: B.C. Heye, 1984); H.I. Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 53.

been elected). For *novi homines* this was problematic. Cicero, elected Consul in 63 B.C., took advantage of this fact to exploit the *imagines* of other *nobiles* by accrediting to himself the virtues that they possessed and through which they had achieved greatness: [45] Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 2.1; [46] Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 2.100. Marius is reported as having done a similar thing, although in much more disparaging terms of the *nobiles* and their reliance on the *commendatio* of their *imagines maiorum*: [47] Plut. *Mar.* 9. 2; [48] Sall. *Iug.* 85. 10; [49] Sall. *Iug.* 85.21-5; [50] Sall. *Iug.* 85.29-30; and [51] Sall. *Iug.* 85.38;³¹ [52] Sall. *Hist.* 3 fr. 48. 18.

The *nobiles* themselves appear to have been aware of the dangers in relying too heavily upon their *imagines* as the sole justification for election – and wished to present themselves simultaneously as possessing those same values that made them worthy of office in their own right. In the *Panegyricus Messalae* the aristocratic virtues and achievements of the young Messala are said to be without equal: [53] *Pan. Mess.* 28-34. In this context the *imagines* serve as an incentive to Messala to utilise his virtues to seek election and so obtain *dignitas* for himself and therefore to maintain the *dignitas* of his family. The *Laus Pisonis*, dating perhaps to the mid-first century A.D. also illustrates this: [54] *Laus Pisonis* 1-24, presenting the dichotomy between the expectations placed on a young *nobilis* to attain high office through his own capacity but at the same time showing that he deserved to do so by virtue of his lineage. For this reason (as with the *Panegyricus Messalae*) one of the greatest praises to bestow on a member of the *nobiles* class was to say he had equalled or surpassed the achievements (and hence the *dignitas*) of his *maiores*.³² This represents intense pressure on the young *nobilis* to attain his own level of *dignitas* in comparison with his ancestors in competition with other *nobiles* – and not merely to rely on his ancestry. By achieving success, his *imago* would be placed upon his death among the *imagines maiorum* where it would become the patrimony of his future heirs: [55] Sen. (Y) *Clem.* I.9.10.³³

The reliance of the *nobilis* on his *imagines*, meant they could equally be used as a political weapon if he failed to live up to their moral standards: [56] Cic. *Planc.* 18. In this sense, the

31 It might seem strange that at this early stage of his career, Marius would be so keen to disparage members of the *nobiles*, since he no doubt relied on certain members of that class for his own position. This may well indicate that the sentiments Sallust attributes to Marius in the speech were reworked by him in light of subsequent events – particularly Marius' defeat by Sulla in the civil war, when Marius' anti-aristocratic feelings may have found true expression. That Marius may have attempted some usurpation of the *nobiles*' virtues which the *imagines* of the *nobiles* class represented, owing to his *novus homo* status is probably accurate – especially given the fact that Cicero seems to do the same some 40 years later. However, the speech was probably not as anti-aristocratic as Sallust represents.

32 See inscription from the *Tomb of Scipiones*, CIL 311.

33 This is a sentiment expressed on tomb inscriptions, such as those from the *Tomb of the Scipiones*.

moral virtues displayed and communicated by the *imagines* (particularly *severitas* and *gravitas*) served as a barometer for judging the individual who relied upon them. In one extreme (and rare case), Cicero even suggests that a *nobilis* rival should go home and look at his own *imagines* if he wished to see examples of bad moral and ethical behaviour, thereby impugning the man's entire ancestry as embodiments of *adrogantia* or *superbia*, and negating his rank as a *nobilis*: [57] Cic. *Sull.* 9.27.

The Latin poets in the early Imperial period utilised the *imagines* for similar purpose, emphasising not wealth, office-holding and *imagines per se*, but the virtues these represented: [58] Hor. *Sat.* 1. The Emperor Claudius similarly commends a young provincial to the senate by claiming that he embodies all the requisite virtues and that his ancestry was in fact notable and worthy of high office despite having no *imagines*: [59] Claudius, *CIL* 13.1668.2.25. Livy himself, by transferring the social conditions of his own day back to the regal period, notes that some of the Roman Kings were 'self-made men' who, without *imagines*, attained high office through their own moral valour: [60] Livy *AUC* 1. 34. 6. The Roman histories are littered with instances of noble deeds performed by individuals who possessed no notable ancestors: [61] Val. Max. *Mem.* 3.8.7. In this sense the Romans appear to have been well aware of the limits of relying on *imagines* as a justification for holding office, but clearly understood their power to act as a physical symbol through which (any) person should be exhorted to moral excellence, and to be exploited for political gain by those who possessed them: [62] Sen. (Y) *Ep.* 76.12.³⁴

The fact that the *imagines maiorum* could be used to attack the moral failings of the *nobiles* shows well the didactic, exhortative and admonitory function of the *imagines*.³⁵ As stated, all the important public or private business transacted by the *dominus*, as well as the coming and goings of members of the household, were conducted in the *atrium* under the 'gaze' of the

34 See also Plin. (Y) *Ep.* 2.7.7; 3.3.6; 5.17.6; and 8.10.3, which amply illustrate the didactic and exhortative effect of the *imagines*. That the *imagines* served a serious political and social purpose is revealed by Latin poets, who decry the fact that the *imagines* have no influence to commend an individual in less serious, non-political pursuits: especially in questions of love. This confirms that the messages the *imagines* conveyed were considered serious moral, ethical and political ones, not the kind that would aid in *affaires du coeur*: [63] Prop. *El.* 1.5.23-4.

35 The fact that *atrium* was the focus for undertaking important business is confirmed from an early date. There is an inscription from Teos concerning a decree of Abdera dating to 166 B.C in which the envoys are recorded as having achieved success on a mission to Rome, part of which involved the daily visiting of the *atria* [SIG 656.26]. Seneca also records the importance of the *salutatio* but also mentions changes made to it by Gaius Gracchus and Livius Drusus of which he does not approve [Sen. (Y) *Ben.* 6.34.1-2]. Marius is recorded as moving closer to the Forum to facilitate greater number of morning visitors to his *atrium* (Plut. *Mar.* 32.1), and Cicero did the same after his quaestorship (Cic. *Planc.* 66; Plut. *Cic.* 8). Cicero still continued to receive large numbers of visitors during the time of Caesar's dictatorship (Cic. *Fam.* 9.203; Cic. *Att.* 12.21 and 23).

imagines. The *tituli* these *imagines* bore served an important didactic function regarding the history, achievements and deeds of notable ancestors within the *familia* and *gens* to members of the family itself and to the wider Roman community:³⁶ [64] Livy *AUC* 10.7.11; [65] Tac. *Ann.* 4.35.2. Furthermore, the physical appearance of the *imagines* physically communicated the standard of ethical behaviour expected of individual family members and for the broader Roman community.³⁷ There is textual evidence that the *imagines* served this function from at least the beginning of the second century B.C.: [66] L. Afranius, *Vopiscus* 12.364-5 = Nonius 790L; also Polyb. 6.53-4. Cicero says that the *imagines* of the great men from the past provided even himself with a source of inducement to proper behaviour and moral excellence in his public life: [67] Cic. *Arch.* 14. Pliny (Y) also mentions the exhortative and didactic of the *imagines* on young people in his letters: [68] Plin. (Y), *Ep.* 2.7. 7; [69] Plin. (Y), *Ep.* 3.3.6; and [70] Plin. (Y) *Ep.* 5.17.6. These sources attest to the longevity in aristocratic circles of the *imagines maiorum* and the importance that these played to their social class in communicating their quintessential values: [71] Sall. *Iug.* 4.5-6.

Two important elements confirm the power of the *imagines* in the domestic sphere: the fact that *imagines maiorum* often portrayed office holding members of the family, and the fact that the *dominus* of the house held his private (or public) *consilium* and waged his *negotium* in the *atrium* where his *imagines maiorum* were on display. In this sense the *imagines maiorum* formed a standing *consilium* or 'senate' of the deceased *maiores*, 'advising' the *dominus* on every aspect of his private and public life. If the *dominus* was an office holder, he might hold his magisterial *consilium* in the *atrium* in the presence of his *imagines*, which thereby would 'take part' or be privy to the discussions. In this way the *imagines* continued to perform the role of judges or advisers (in essence, continuing their role as *senators* which they had in life) on the conduct of the *dominus* and other members of the household.

In this way each individual member of the family was required, either consciously or not, to account for his or her actions directly to the *maiores* upon entering or leaving the house. The *imagines* with their facial expression communicating *severitas* and *gravitas* induced a sense of shame and encouraged proper, ethical behaviour in members of the household, as well as those who entered the *atrium* to undertake business with the *dominus*: [72] Cic. *Planc.* 51;

³⁶ See pp. 252-253 *supra*.

³⁷ See p. 262 *infra*.

[73] Cic. *Vat.* 28.³⁸

This accounts for the frequent reference to the *imagines* in forensic and political oratory to admonish the behaviour of errant descendants: [74] Cic. *Cael.* 33.³⁹ In this speech, Cicero invokes the *imago* of one particular *maior* who points to the *imagines* of other *maiores* as a means of rebuking his descendant, Clodia Pulchra, and to shame her regarding her behaviour: [75] Cic. *Cael.* 34; also [76] Cic. *De Or.* 2.225-6. Such a reference the *imagines* should be more than enough to shame an individual, confirming to him or her and to the audience his or her moral failings: [77] Cic. *Planc.* 21.51. In one memorable passage, Cicero rebukes Piso by cleverly drawing a direct comparison his physical appearance and his *imagines*, noting that Piso's attempt to feign the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression in fact reveals that he has nothing in common with them except their smoky pallor, thus proving the untrustworthiness of his character: [78] Cic. *Pis.* 1.1. Interesting in this context is the frequent application of *gravitas/severitas* to describe the *imagines* – thus indicating that they communicate these values by their mere presence, but also that they are active in judging the behaviour of those who should view them.

It is evident that on occasion *nobiles* failed to live up to the standards set by their *imagines*. Juvenal bemoans the decline of the aristocracy who have given themselves over to self-indulgence and *luxuria*, and their complete failure to take note of the precedent of these deceased ancestors. They have become deaf and blind to the faces of their own *imagines* – a clever irony, in effect, because the *imagines* themselves are described as far more capable of communicating via their physical presence proper values than are their living descendants: [79] Juv. *Sat.* 8.1-23. We are even told of incidents where the *imagines* themselves became an incentive for the most perverse and un-aristocratic like behaviour: [80] Tac. *Ann.* 6.1.2. Nothing was considered more abominable as a failure to live up to the example of the *maiores*: [81] Val. Max. *Mem.* 3.5. If a formal charge was brought against a *nobilis* before the courts, Cicero observes that conviction brought shame not only to the individual, but to the *dignitas* and standing of the family as a whole, including the *imagines maiorum*: [82] Cic. *Mur.* 88. The loss of *caput* and *dignitas* as a result of a trial could be centred on the *imagines*

38 For a discussion of 'shame' as an emotion enforcing proper ethical behaviour induced by viewing the *imagines*, see Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 12-15.

39 Cicero's speech also suggests that there were *imagines* dating to around 300 B.C. (the date when barbers traditionally appeared at Rome) which similarly communicated *gravitas* and *severitas* through their physical appearance. In relation to this one is reminded of the bronze portrait of 'Brutus' in the Capitoline museum and its facial expression (Ill. 33).

– and is clearly exemplified by the senatorial decree issued against Gnaeus Piso the Elder as already mentioned. However, a *nobilis* could call upon his *imagines* in order to defend himself against an allegation – or he could call upon his *imagines* to persuade the judges that he was worthy of forgiveness as an act of gratitude to his *maiores*: [83] Cic. *Sull.* 31.88.⁴⁰ Cicero also makes it clear that the *imagines* will rejoice (and be decorated) should the accused be found not guilty – as opposed to the shame and ignominy that the family, the accused and the *imagines* will suffer in the event of a conviction: [84] Cic. *Sull.* 88.⁴¹

The exhortative role of the *imagines*, and their political and integral importance to the identity of the *nobiles*, is clearly evident in the case of the two Bruti, who were inspired by the *imagines* of their *maiores*, Brutus the Tyrannicide and Ahala, to murder the Dictator Caesar: [85] Cic. *Phil.* 2.26. Brutus himself appears to have promoted this ancestry for his own political purposes – since he placed *imagines* of Ahala and Brutus on coins in 54 B.C.⁴² He also used his *imagines* after Caesar's murder as justification for it: coins and pamphlets were issued all referring to his ancestors' deeds.⁴³ By contrast, there are recorded instances where a *nobilis* had been induced into an incorrect course of action by the unscrupulous manipulation of his *imagines* by others: [86] Tac. *Ann.* 2.27.2; and [87] Tac. *Hist.* 4.39.3.

On a more personal level, the *imagines* could also serve as a mechanism for consolation – being a memento of the deceased: [88] Mart. *Ep.* 7.44.

9.3 Manipulation, falsification and fabrication of *imagines*

The emphasis on *imagines*, ancestry and social position within the *nobiles* class at times led to a great deal of pressure for self promotion and could lead in some instances to deliberate manipulation or even fabrication of the family lineage and the achievements of one's

40 Also Sen. (E) *Controv.* 2.3.6.

41 From this it is evident that when there was celebration in the *domus*, the *armaria* doors in the *atria* (where the *imagines* were traditionally stored) would be opened and the *imagines* themselves would be festooned with garlands. In direct contrast, Cicero states that, should the accused be convicted, the condemned will be deprived of the things which a proper Roman held dear to himself, not only because he will have to go into exile but because his sense of shame will prevent him from looking at his *imagines maiorum*. In this circumstance, the sight of their faces would bring home to a *nobilis* the extent of his shame in failing to live up to their standards; the *severitas* of the judges is one thing, the collective *severitas* of one's *maiores* is another. Indeed, upon a conviction the *imagines maiorum* remained locked away in their closed *armaria*, as would the other *insignia* and *ornamenta* of rank and standing.

42 M. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 433. with H. Zehnacker, *Moneta. Recherches sur l'organisation et l'art des émissions monétaires de la République Romaine (289-31 Av. J.C.)*, 2 vols. (Paris: Bibl. des écoles franç. d'Athènes et de Rome 222, 1973), 511.

43 Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* 506.; Cass. Dio 44.12.2; Cic. *Att.* 13.40; Cic. *De or.* 2.225.

ancestors.

An individual appears to have had a deal of genuine discretion as to which *imagines* he might include in his family display. Indeed, we have a letter from Cicero to a friend advising him exactly on this point: [89] Cic. *Fam.* 9.21.2-3. It is also evident that an individual was permitted to display the *imagines* of any relatives acquired through birth, adoption or marriage⁴⁴ - and this at times could result in a great deal of confusion in the documentation concerning the lineage and careers of individuals.⁴⁵

The process of selection gave a great opportunity for the individual to arrange his *imagines* to the best effect: [90] Sen. (E) *Contr.* 2.1.17. This shows that those ancestors who were of low birth or not quite up to standard in their achievements should be purposefully omitted from the display, and that they would be omitted from the funeral procession. If a person represented by an *imago* were not of high enough standing compared with those of the other ancestors, then shame could be cast on the heir or bring discredit to his other *maiores*: [91] Tac. *Ann.* 2.43.6. Pliny (E) cites the case of Scipio Pomponianus who had placed the *imagines* of the Salvittones among the Scipiones Africani in his *atrium* in order to increase the *gloria* of his original family name: Plin. (E) *HN* 35.8. In this case we should note the reaction of Messala the elder - that this caused a detriment to the reputation of the Scipiones Africani and Pomponianus himself because the Salvittones were not equal to the *Scipiones* in *fama* or *dignitas*.

Sometimes pressure to achieve high office and to maintain the *dignitas* of one's lineage led to downright falsification or usurpation of the *imagines* and their *tituli* from other families - despite forming no part of an individual's rightful *patrimonium*. This may have been a common practice among the *nobiles* as a class. Cicero refers to the frequent abuse of the *imagines* by people claiming noble descent, even the fabrication of the *imagines* or inclusion in their number of people who were not truly related to the person concerned: [92] Cic. *Sest.* 69. However, a person engaging in such dissembling ran the risk of being caught out. Overall, this manipulation and falsification of *imagines* caused difficulties in carrying out historical research, something attested to frequently by Livy: [93] Livy *AUC* 8.40.3-5; [94] (Livy *AUC* 22. 31.8-11; [95] Livy *AUC* 30.45.6-7; [96] Livy *AUC* 4.16.4.

44 Sen. (E) *Contr.* 2.1.17.

45 Livy *AUC* 8.40.3-5; 10.7.11; 22.31.8-11; 30.45.6-7.

Flagrant falsification aside, the sources reveal a certain amount of elitism with regards to the selection as to who would be represented among the *imagines* and in the funeral procession. This means that the *imagines* of one's family presented a conscious opportunity for manipulation as a means of social and political advertising. That the choice could have political consequences is amply shown by Cicero: [97] Cic. *Rab. Perd.* 9. Tacitus reveals a similar danger in political terms regarding whose *imagines* one displayed in one's *atrium* and what kind of *titulus* might be inscribed upon it: [98] Tac. *Ann.* 16.7.

That manipulation was a matter of course is clearly shown by a quote from the fourth century A.D. but by this time a person was more free to pick who to represent with such portraits. In this later period, inclusion was a mark of esteem and not necessarily indication of a relation by blood, marriage or adoption: [99] S.H.A. *Alex. Sev.* 29. 2. Cicero, however, attests that this practice was already common in the middle of the first century B.C.⁴⁶

9.4 Who commissioned portraits in the Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* style ?

The issue concerns whether there was a legal, specific *ius imaginis* or general *ius imaginum* reserved for members of that élite class or whether it was a 'right' generally available. If not, it must be asked whether there were controls (legal, social or economic) on who could commission portraits and where these could be displayed? According to Mommsen the *ius imaginis* ('right to an *imago*') (a phrase found in only a few Latin sources) was an actual right bestowed by law which made it one of the defining elements of *nobilitas* in Republican Rome.⁴⁷ Accordingly, once a man was elected *aedilis* he obtained the rank of *nobilis* and hence the 'right' to display his *imago* after death and to have other portraits and statues erected in his honour in public and private contexts. In this context the *imago* thus represented the status of the individual in relation to his family, and thence of his family in relation to the

46 There is a reference by Cicero to seeing a bronze *imago* of Demosthenes among the *imagines* of a correspondant's *atrium*: Cic. *Orat.* 31.110.

47 T. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht.*, 3rd ed. (Leipzig: 1887) 442-7. However, the use of the phrase '*ius imaginum*', unattested by the ancient sources, has been traced back to the work of the sixteenth century scholar Sigonius (A.N. Zadoks-Josephus Jitta, *Ancestral Portraiture in Rome and the Art of the Last Century of the Republic*, *Archaeologisch-Historische Bijdragen I* (Amsterdam: Allard Pierson Stichting, 1932), 97-110.) and was viewed as a general law permitting portraiture by Lessing (G. Lahusen, *Untersuchungen zur Ehrenstatue in Rom: Literarische und epigraphische Zuegnisses* (Rome: G. Bretschneider, 1983), 113-27). See Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 53-54.

wider *nobiles* class.⁴⁸

Discounting this theory is the existence of the portraits of the non-élite classes in public and semi-public contexts from the island of Delos dating from the mid-second century to early first centuries B.C. and the portraits from the non-élite tombs at Rome – many of which are traditionally dated from the early first century B.C. through to the mid/late Augustan period.⁴⁹ If a so-called *ius imaginis* had existed during the late Republican period, it would be most improbable that these portraits, in such public and semi-public contexts, would have been permitted.

The Latin sources in fact indicate that there was no general right to erect statues in *public* places at all. For publicly erected *statuae* (i.e., outside of grave/tomb monuments, the *domus*, and perhaps certain temples) permission had to be granted either by the senate or the people – such statues, since they were legally *res publica* (public property), then passed under the care of the *aedilis curulis* (whose *provincia* included the maintenance of public edifices and staging of public events within the city).⁵⁰ That permission was required is confirmed by a

48 That there was a definite *ius imaginis* was rejected earlier by Lessing (G.E. Lessing, "Über Die Ahnenbilder Der Römer," in *Römische Porträts*, ed. H. Von Heintze (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1974), and later by Zadoks-Josephus Jitta (A. N. Zadoks-Josephus Jitta, *Ancestral Portraiture in Rome and the Art of the Last of the Republic* (Amsterdam: N. v. Noord Hollandsche uitgevers-mij., 1932), 97-110) but was later re-endorsed by Hopkins (K. Hopkins, "Death and Renewal," *Sociological Studies in Roman History* 2 (1983), 255-56). The term is still used by a variety of scholars such as Nicolet, Rollin, Lahusen and Brunt: C. Nicolet, *Rome et la conquête du monde méditerranéen 264-27 avant J.-C.*, *Nouvelle Clio* 8 (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1977); J.P. Rollin, *Untersuchungen zu Rechtsfragen römischer Bildnisse*, vol. XLVII, *Habelts Dissertationsdrucke: Reihe klassische Archäologie* 11 (Bonn: 1979); G. Lahusen, "Zum römischen Bildnisrecht," *Labeo* 31 (1985); P.A. Brunt, "Nobilitas and Novitas," *JRS* 72 (1982).

49 The view has been expressed that these portraits were not *imagines*, which are strictly defined as those made of wax and displayed in the *atrium*: see D.E.E. Kleiner, *Roman Group Portraiture: The Funerary Reliefs of the Late Republic and Early Empire* (New York: 1977), 84-87; Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 7-8. However, as Latin used a blanket term *imago* for all portrait representations of an individual, no matter what the material or context of display, it is difficult to see how they would not have been imbued with similar connotations as any other portrait, including the wax *imagines*. All the more so when the portrait images of the non-élite classes are to be found on tombs which directly echo or refers to the funeral practice of the élite classes and their use of *imagines* in the *pompa funebris* which were then displayed in the *atrium*.

50 The duty of the *aediles curules* to maintain and restore publicly erected *statuae* and *imagines* must have entailed a considerable task and a great cost to the public revenues, given the literary references to the large numbers of statues in Rome by the late Republican period. Interestingly, this indicates that there was potentially a continuous updating, renovation or restoration of public statuary that was taking place within the city – a factor overlooked by many modern scholars. This on-going renovation implies that the context of display of statues (and their accompanying inscriptions) could have changed considerably over time, even perhaps resulting in the attribution of new identities or explanations for works whose original identity or purpose had long been forgotten, or which had become misunderstood because of archaic language or disrepair of any accompanying (or remaining) inscription, or which was purposely altered to suit the propaganda needs of the responsible *aedilis*. There is evidence of individuals taking advantage of their office as *aedilis* to restore or 'update' monuments created earlier by family members.

few recorded instances of the Censors clearing away illegally erected statues that had encroached on public spaces.⁵¹ For statues dedicated in religious locations or for religious purposes at least, these may have fallen under the jurisdiction of the college of pontifices, since textual references indicate that if these statues were improperly dedicated (meaning, without the authority of the senate or people) then the college of pontifices could order that such dedications be removed, or at the very least that the inscriptions be erased – in obedience to which senate might commission a responsible magistrate to remove the offending statue: [105] Cic. *Dom.* 136. Whether a similar mechanism existed for statues or monuments erected in non-religious public spaces within the city is not certain – perhaps it lay within the jurisdiction of the *censores* or a responsible magistrate (such as the *praetor urbanus*) who could rely on their own *imperium* to remove an offending work or to refer the matter to the senate.⁵² Given the evidence that publicly erected statuary required the approval of the senate or Assembly, any law granting a general ‘legal’ right of portraiture in public contexts specifically to an office holder would have been largely redundant.⁵³

While in the public context there were some legal limitations on which *imago ac statua* would be permitted, in the private context it would seem it was left very much to the individual concerned. The sources amply attest to the fact that private individuals could (and did) have portraits of themselves made and displayed in certain semi-public/private contexts – such as votive offerings in temple precincts, on tombs, and in the environs of the house. Of particular importance was the collection of “*imagines maiorum*” displayed in the *atrium*.

Legally, *imagines* in the context of funeral rites and display in the home or on the tomb were *res privata*, despite the semi-public context that such displays could sometimes have. Display on a tomb was also a *res privata*, even though the tomb itself as a *locus religiosus* fell under the jurisdiction of the *pontifices*. However, the *pompa funebris* was a public event, permission

51 Plin. (E) *HN* 34.30; Livy *AUC* 40.51.3.

52 In recording the details of one incident, Pliny (E) says that in the consulship of Marcus Aemilius and Gaius Popilius (i.e., 158 B.C.) the censors Publius Cornelius Scipio and Marcus Popillius had all the statues round the forum of men ‘who had held office as magistrates’ (‘...*qui magistratum gesserant*...’) removed, except those which had been set up by decree of the people or the senate: Plin. (E) *HN* 34.30. This does suggest that when acting as a magistrate, an individual might take advantage to erect a statue in a public location such as the forum – but without state sanction, these risked being removed.

53 Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 54-55.

for which had to be granted by the curule *aedilis*.⁵⁴

On the whole, the creation of a portrait and the context of its display were matters governed by *mos* (custom), and this dictated whether an individual should be considered (or should consider themselves) worthy enough for such an honour. Interestingly, *mos* was identified from the practice or precedent established by the *maiores* ('ancestors') – hence, the phrase *mos maiorum* ("the custom, practice or precedent established by the ancestors") – and was frequently relied upon in the Roman political and social context to justify a certain mode of behaviour, or, on the contrary, as a standard by which to chastise or rebuke those who acted contrary to it. This Roman respect for ancestral precedent is also pertinent to the *imagines maiorum*, since these evoked and embodied the values and status of the *maiores*.

Given the high reverential regard paid by the Romans to tradition it can be assumed that the creation and display of portraiture was a rather conservative affair. However, an individual with sufficient status could always establish a new precedent in the creation or display of a portrait which, if generally accepted, could then become an example of the *mos maiorum* for the future.⁵⁵

For *public* honorary and votive portraiture, at least, *mos* dictated that such a grant should be considered a singular honour to be reserved for those who had distinguished themselves in some way in the service of the state. This would usually mean, in the Roman social and political context, those persons who hold (or had held) magisterial positions at Rome and where hence members of the senate. According to *mos* it was an individual's social status and the holding of public office that made him notable and worthy of a portrait. Of course, to get oneself elected to and in conducting oneself in public office one should display the requisite virtues, particularly *severitas* and *gravitas*.

In the private context, it seems that a male was considered (or considered himself) worthy enough to commission an *imago* (for private use or public display) after being elected *aedilis*.⁵⁶ It is in reference to the office of *aedilis* that we have two isolated references by

⁵⁴ It would seem logical that the *aedilis curulis* would grant permission for a *pompa funebris* to at least those who were equal in rank to himself (meaning those persons who had obtained the aedileship or above) – and this in itself suggests that the *pompa funebris* and the display of *imagines maiorum* in this context was reserved to members of the ruling senatorial order or those closely connected to them.

⁵⁵ See the examples of innovation by C. Julius Caesar, discussed in Chapter 8, 255-256 *supra*.

⁵⁶ Originally it seems the office of *aedilis curulis*, but later it seems, the Plebeian aedileship as well.

Cicero where he does infer some link between office holding and portraiture: [100] Cic. *Verr.* 5.14.36. Superficially it might be concluded that Cicero meant there was an actual *ius* (a right sanctioned by law) for a person to create and display an *imago* (singular) of himself for handing down to his heirs once he attained the aedileship. However, closer analysis of his statement does not bear this out. The verb *prodere* often encompasses the meaning of ‘handing something down to posterity’, either a memento, items from the estate, or even customs, habits, duties etc., all things which were considered ‘inheritable’ *per se*.⁵⁷ The noun *posteritas* (-atis, f.) means ‘future ages, succeeding generations, future time’⁵⁸ and is broad in its possible connotations. It can imply all successive generations collectively, or one’s own immediate heirs or descendants.⁵⁹ *Ius* (*iuris*, n.) means ‘that which is binding or obligatory’ or that which is binding by its nature, a ‘right’, ‘justice’ or ‘duty’.⁶⁰ It can also mean the rights, obligations and duties imposed by law itself (as in the phrase *ius civile*).⁶¹

Furthermore, the passage is punctuated by gerundives – thus comprising a list of things one must do (or has a duty to do) that flow from being elected to the office of *aedilis* – and in this sense *prodendae* has a highly injunctive sense. Importantly, the *ius imaginis* is part of a list of customary benefits (*fructus*) Cicero claims he will earn from being elected *aedilis* (*in senatu sententiae dicendae locum, togam praetextam, sellam curulem*, etc.). In Cicero’s mind it is therefore the *dignitas* obtained from holding public office that makes him worthy of commemoration via a portrait which will afterwards provide a permanent record of his achievement for his heirs.

This interpretation is supported by another passage of Cicero where he mentions the honour of an *imago*, but again as the culmination of a successful public career: [101] Cic. *Rab. Post.* 7.16. In both passages the *ius imaginis* comes as the final and specific honour commemorating the individual who becomes worthy of being remembered through the fact of holding public office. Also important is that Cicero uses *imago* in the singular genitive case (viz., *imaginis*), thus indicating that it is one *imago* he is thinking of – possibly the *imago* used in connection with the *pompa funebris* and which would be placed in the *armaria*, or possibly a bronze or terracotta *imago* to be displayed in the *atrium* among the other *imagines*

57 Cic. *Planc.* 94; Cic. *Tusc.* 1.100; Cic. *Verr.* 1.48; Cic. *Mil.* 8.

58 C. T. Lewis and C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980).

59 Cic. *Mil.* 83; Caes. *B. Gal.* 5.12.1; Livy *AUC* 23.47.6.

60 Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary*.

61 Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.42 §109.

maiorum. There an *imago* made a potent statement of the *dignitas* of the ancestry of the *dominus* and attested the *nobilis* status of the family and would have served as a model for the manufacture of other *imagines* of the deceased for the future.⁶²

In an extended sense, the *imagines* of a *familia* potentially formed part of the *patrimonium* of the entire Roman people, stemming from the fact that they most often represented persons who had held public office. The *imagines* displayed in any context would remind the populace of the benefits bestowed on them by the deceased (and his family), and these benefits would constitute a debt that the people owed to the family which might be requited by supporting the candidature of the heir in seeking public office. This social and political nexus between the portrayed, his heirs and the *populus* would be reinforced by displaying the *imagines* of deceased family members during funeral and via the eulogy delivered from the *rostra* – as part of which their collective achievements in the service of the *res publica* would be reiterated. Thereafter the display of the *imago* in the *atrium* (or any *imago* of the individual concerned in whatever context within the city) would continue to convey the deceased's moral excellence, his contributions to the state, and his *nobilis* status – all of which would be inherited by the heir and justify his election to public office.⁶³

Problematic is the fact that some literary references suggest that at times *imagines* of non-officeholders could be included in the display in the *atrium*. This suggests that *mos* permitted that the *imago* of any person who was of a certain standard of wealth or status connected with the *dominus* to be included among the *imagines maiorum* on display.⁶⁴ However, if the subject of the *imago* were not of comparable *dignitas* to those of the other *imagines*, shame could be cast on the more illustrious deceased members of the family or on the living inheritor

62 The placement of the *imagines* in the *atrium* is no coincidence, but seems to have been part of a long tradition. Essentially the *atrium* was the part of the house where the familial religious rites were conducted by the *dominus*, the place where he held his morning *salutatio*, where he conducted his private and public *negotium*, and where his *consilium* would meet to advise him on private matters, or if he were an office holder, on affairs of state. All these activities, and the comings and goings of every member of the house would thus be conducted 'under the gaze' of the *imagines*. In relation to this the *atrium* was usually the first room accessed upon passing through the front door (*ianua*) – and since these large and elaborate doors were most often left open (making the homes of the great men of the state potentially accessible) and were adjoined directly to the street, any person passing by could also witness the display of *imagines* contained in the *atrium* – thus blurring any distinction between the private and public functions of the *domus nobilium* and of the private and public roles of the *dominus* and his *imagines*.

63 Cic. *Phil.* 2. 39.101: *in populi Romani patrimonio*.

64 I note the view of Flower, that the wax *imagines* were only of those distinguished through holding curule office; however textual references to the *imagines* of non-office holders would seem to indicate otherwise: Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 6-7.

of the estate.⁶⁵ It was therefore particularly important to members of the *nobilis* class to decide exactly which of their relatives to include in the display of their *imagines maiorum* in the *atrium* and at the *pompa funebris* – often selecting only those of their most illustrious office holding ancestors and omitting others: [102] Cic. *Fam.* 9.21.2-3; [103] Tac. *Ann.* 2. 43. 6)].

The importance of the *mos maiorum* in governing the private context in which individuals would display portraits⁶⁶ is supported by a reading of the *senatus consultum* against Gnaeus Piso. Piso committed suicide before being formally condemned by the senate and so there was nothing in law which prevented his family from honouring him with a private *imago* displayed in their *atria* or even in representing him in the *pompae funebres* of other members of the *gens*.⁶⁷ In its *consultum*, the senate explicitly exhorted members of the *gens Pisonis* to act contrary to the dictates of *mos* and not to include the *imago* of Piso in the procession of the *maiores* at their funerals nor among the *imagines maiorum* displayed in their *atria*. In asking the family to do this, the senate wished to reassure the family that it ‘would be done correctly and in order’ (...*recte et ordine facturos...*) and would accrue to them no mark of dishonour. Since the Pisones were still an illustrious family in the affairs of the Roman State, the senate’s concern is to ensure that the Pisones are not tempted to publicly celebrate (or rehabilitate) the disgraced Piso by allowing his *imago* to appear in their funerals or in their *atria*. The wording of the senate’s decree indicates that the creation and display of portraits in the private context were a social duty imposed and expected of an individual and his descendants by custom and tradition.⁶⁸ In direct contrast, the senate was explicit regarding the statues of Piso in public places, simply ordering them to be taken down and removed.

The display or use of *imagines* would have been most uncommon among people of lower social status for a number of reasons.⁶⁹ If one was not of the requisite social or political status then to display an *imago* of oneself (either when alive or after one’s death by one’s heir) may have shown a want of *modestia* and might not have been tolerated socially, or it might have

65 Tac. *Ann.* 2.43.6.

66 Crook, *Law and Life of Rome*, 27-31.

67 It is interesting to note that by the time the senate issued its decree, Piso had already had his funeral – and one wonders whether the dead Piso received a *pompa funebris* himself, which, as an office holder and member of one of Rome’s most illustrious Republican families, he would no doubt have been entitled in more normal circumstances. However, given the political circumstances of Piso’s trial, death and subsequent condemnation it would seem unlikely that the family would have requested a *pompa funebris* for him.

68 Flower, "Rethinking "Memoriae Damnatio": The Case of Gn. Calpurnius Piso Pater in AD 20."

69 Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 8.

left a person of such pretensions open to ridicule. Even if an *imago* of a person of low social standing was made, there would have been little opportunity at Rome for such an *imago* to be displayed publicly or privately. Even within the home the display may not have been possible, since *imagines* were traditionally displayed in the *atrium*, and to possess an *atrium* suggests a certain level of wealth and social status. As already stated, in order to hold a *pompa funebris* and an *oratio* from the *rostra*, one had to obtain the permission of the *aedilis curulis*, and since he was a senator (and therefore most likely a member of the *nobilis* class), it would be remote that anyone of inferior social standing would be granted permission or would have had the audacity to apply. This is exemplified in Plautus' *Amphitruo* by the remark of Sosia upon meeting an *imago* of himself (the God Hermes disguised as him)⁷⁰ – the joke being that he was not of requisite social standing to warrant either an *imago* or a *pompa funebris* and it indicates that the audience did not expect it either. Furthermore, a person of low social status is not likely to have had many *clientes* or associates who would have been impressed by an *imago* – so even if it existed it would have served no real purpose. Perhaps the only context for displaying an *imago* available to individuals outside of the élite classes who could afford the cost was in the *atrium* (if they had one) or on their tomb or as a temple dedication.

It thus appears that there were strong social (and some legal) controls as to who should and who should not, have portraits made of themselves or their ancestors and in what contexts they could be displayed or viewed. In the period around 300 B.C. during the middle Republic, when we first have firm textual evidence of the *nobiles* as a class, this means that the predominant class to benefit from and to utilise portraiture, in both public and semi public contexts, were the *nobiles* themselves. Over time, because the rules governing the creation and display of portraiture was a matter of *mos*, the circumstances according to which individuals did have portraits made and in what contexts these would be displayed changed.

By the end of the second century B.C. the customary rules regarding portrait display had developed so that portraiture was no longer the social preserve of the office holding élite, but had grown to include members of the *equites* class. This may have occurred from the fact that many of the customs and practices of the *nobiles* had 'seeped' down and been adopted by the *equites* so as to express their rising social aspirations, at least in the privacy of their own homes, on their tombs, or in public contexts outside of Rome. This could have been facilitated

⁷⁰ Plaut. *Amphit.* 459-459: *nám hic quidem omnem imaginem meam, quae antehac fuerat, possidet/ vivo fit quod numquam quisquam mortuo faciet mihi.*

by the fact that many of the older, legally defined *equites* families were connected with the class of *senatores* by marriage, birth or descent and therefore felt themselves equally justified to have their *maiores* celebrated in a display of their *imagines maiorum* in their *atria* and then, perhaps, to have included themselves in their own galleries.

This process might have been accelerated by the increasing wealth of greater numbers of people from outside the *nobiles* class during the late second century B.C. and the concomitant widening of the *equites* to include not only those persons granted a public horse *in strictu sensu*, but also those emerging from the Plebeian or non-élite classes whose wealth was equivalent to that station in the *census*. Indeed, given the rise in status, wealth and power of the *equites* class (and the social and political dislocation which this caused to the ruling *nobiles* class) it is understandable that they wished to express their social aspirations by imitating the traditions of their social superiors so as to place themselves on a level of social and moral equality with them.

This of course brings us perhaps to the greatest limitation on the commissioning of portraits: cost. To have an *imago* created in a more permanent material (such as tufa, travertine, marble, or bronze) and then the opportunity to display it would imply wealth - and only the élite classes, or those connected with them, would have had such resources. It is to be assumed that the cost of creating a portrait was not cheap - and was probably well out of the price range (and desire) of most ordinary people. Cost would also largely determine the availability of display spaces for such portraits as well - as noted above, an individual who was poor and of low social status is unlikely to have had an *atrium* or a tomb where portraits could be displayed. This again suggests that those who had portraits commissioned were those with the requisite social standing and/or the money to do so - unless of course the portrait was an honorary work commissioned by a grateful *cliens*, or a votive or honorary statue granted at

public cost.⁷¹

The textual evidence considered above suggests that honorary portraiture probably developed from votive statuary, and was a means of cementing the nature of the relationship between the *cliens* and a *patronus*. Obviously the *cliens* had attained some benefit from the *patronus*, who is thus honoured with a portrait. Setting up a portrait in their honour in a semi public place, was a physical manifestation of the relationship and a sign of the hope of further future benefits from the *patronus* – or even from the descendants of the *patronus* who could be assumed to have inherited the obligation.⁷²

However, for a person to be considered worthy of such an honour usually required that the putative donee had held some public office or was of sufficient wealth or status to have bestowed significant benefits on the *cliens*. This would be the case of honorary or votive statues erected by grateful cities and provinces to honour a patron who had rendered them some civil benefaction, and whose protection that community might seek if needed.⁷³ Such patrons would usually be Roman proconsuls, propraetors, and other leading members of the senate, or perhaps even non-senatorial wealthy Roman benefactors. Cicero provides an example; he served as *quaestor* in Sicily early in his career, and due to his good offices, it was to him that the municipalities of Sicily went to seek help in their prosecution of their former governor, Verres. Likewise, after his term as proconsul in Cilicia, Cicero continued to render many services on behalf of the province in Rome before the senate.

That a wide variety of organisations, social and political, set up portrait statues to honour individuals attests to the type of social relationships that were the core reason behind the

71 The nature of the *cliens/patronus* relationship was fundamental to Roman politics of the middle and late Republic. Given the personal way in which high politics at Rome were conducted, with its competitive struggle between senatorial factions formed by shifting alliances based on *amicitia* ('friendship'), it seems that persons of lower social status required the protection of an influential *patronus*, in official dealings at least, a debt which could be repaid to the *patronus* when it came to election time. The more *clientes* an individual had, the greater his *dignitas* and *auctoritas* within the political establishment. For instance, it is commented upon by the extant Latin sources that a man's social standing and importance could be judged by the numbers of *clientes* at his morning *salutatio* which would be held in the *atrium* and would comprise all his *clientes*, even ambassadors from cities or provinces who were in Rome conducting official business. *Clientela* could thus encompass those of lowly rank (such as *liberti* and members of the *plebs*) to those more illustrious, such as whole cities and provinces. Given the fact that the *atrium* was the place in which the *dominus* of the house would conduct his private and public *negotium* (including the morning *salutatio*) as well as display his own *imago* and those of his *maiores*, these portraits must have provided a powerful reminder to the *cliens* of the status and prestige of their *patronus* in the social and political context of Rome.

72 J. Tanner, "Portraits, Power, and Patronage in the Late Roman Republic," *JRS* 90 (2000).

73 Pliny (E) says that the first statue erected in the honour of a Roman by a foreign state was that erected in honour of Gaius Aelius, tribune of the people, by the people of Thurii in around 289 B.C.

grant. Cicero remarks on what he regards as an infamous case, when L. Antonius was honoured by a statue dedicated by the *equites* class bearing a *titulus* which read 'for the *patronus*'.⁷⁴ Cicero is affronted, because he feels that he has rendered more services for the benefit of the *equites* than the individual so honoured – and he reminds his listeners that the *equites* will receive no more benefits from the donee due to his disreputable character, despite the gift of the statue. For these non-state sanctioned honorary statues (such as set up by an *ordo* or a group of artisans or other *clientes*), if they encroached too closely on public space they were liable to be cleared away by order of the *censores*. However, the Latin sources suggest that non-state sanctioned dedications were more often than not set up in semi-public spaces, such as in temple precincts (and hence were more in the tradition of votive offerings than truly honorary portraits) or in contexts outside of the city boundaries.

Statue dedication and *clientela* may even have included relationships with the state and the senate, the *cliens* par excellence, which could decree a statue to honour an individual in return for great service rendered by that individual for the benefit of the *res publica* – which would, most of the time, be someone from their *ordo*. However, *mos* governed even where public statues should normally be placed and what form they should take. Such portraits would be paid for by the state revenue, would invariably be of bronze, and would be set up in an illustrious position: the most illustrious of which was on the *rostrum* or on the *capitolium* (Cic. *Deiot.* 43). A publicly decreed statue thus served as a public attestation of the services received by the state from that individual and could be pointed to with pride by his descendants as proof of benefits bestowed on the state by his *familia*, a debt which could be requited by a grateful populace by supporting his (i.e., the descendant's) candidature for public office.⁷⁵

Outside of Rome there was probably more opportunity for Roman citizens to display *imagines* of themselves – including those of wealth but of not so illustrious ancestry. For instance, there is evidence that *duovires*, as the leading magistrates of a Roman *oppidum* or *municipia* (as all towns in Italy south of the Po became in 90 B.C.), felt entitled to have portraits of themselves displayed. This is confirmed by Cicero concerning the *duovires* in

⁷⁴ Cic. *Phil.* 6.13.

⁷⁵ The frequency of state dedicated statues during the Republic has been disputed: A. Wallace Hadrill, "Roman Arches and Greek Honours: The Language of Power at Rome," *PrCPS* 16 (1990): 170-73. Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 55. cf. P. Stewart, *Statues in Roman Society: Representation and Response* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003) 23-128.

Capua: [104] Cic. *Sest.* 19. Further afield, perhaps the mere possession of Roman citizenship status coupled with wealth and some civil benefaction may have been considered enough for an individual to commission a portrait of himself (if he had the money and incentive to do so) or warrant a dedication from a grateful *cliens* from that community – and this perhaps explains the portraits in the Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* style found on the island of Delos.

In light of this evidence, it cannot be stipulated (at least by the end of the second century B.C.) that an *imago* was the sole preserve of the office bearing class – the *nobiles*. It is rather a question of one's wealth, status, and importance within one's class relative to the rest of society, and the purpose and context of the intended display of the portrait.⁷⁶ This would explain why there are references in the Latin sources to members of the *equites* class displaying *imagines* of relatives in their *atria*, to *nobiles* who display *imagines* of relatives who were *equites* only, and why to the *nobiles* the display of *imagines* of low ranking relatives should preferably be omitted.

By implication, this also means that if a Roman *eques* was suitably well connected by marriage or relationship with a *nobilis familia*, then it may warrant that individual having *imagines maiorum* on display in his *atrium* or present at his funeral – although whether the funeral generally would be a less public affair and would include a *pompa funebris* (given the deceased's own lower, non-office holding station) would seem unlikely.⁷⁷ At the very least it seems that reference would be made to such an illustrious lineage on the tomb epitaph of a non-office holding individual.

These factors largely explain why the tomb decoration of members of the non-élite classes (Plebeian: *ingenui* and *liberti*) from the beginning of the first century B.C. started to display 'pseudo' *imagines maiorum* (usually in travertine or tufa, although sometimes in marble) depicting the actual person whose tomb it was, sometimes accompanied by other members of

76 Thus an individual in the first century B.C. who was an *eques* may have thought himself worthy of being celebrated (or been thought worthy of celebration by others) with an *imago* (of whatever material) whereas to a person of the *nobiles* with their elitist traditions, such a person may have seemed distinctly unworthy.

77 It is apparent from the Tomb of the Scipiones that less illustrious members of the family were celebrated in public funerals with full use of *imagines maiorum*, despite themselves never having obtained great offices: Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 167-71; especially the inscription of Scipio Hispanus (Praetor in 139 B.C.) who is said to have earned the praise of his *maiores* and the fact he attained the praetorship is suggested as sufficient to have renewed and maintained the family's *dignitas* and *nobilitas* (ILS 6 = ILLRP 316). But it should be noted that the Cornelii Scipiones were a *familia* of the *nobilis* class.

their *familia* (both living and dead).⁷⁸ For the *liberti* specifically, the fact of being manumitted meant they became part of the *familia* of the master who had freed them - and hence bore his *nomen*. Upon manumission the *libertus* became a *civis Romanus* and *paterfamilias* who had the power of life and death over his wife and children. This was a substantial rise in the *dignitas* of the ex-slave; indeed, an achievement worth celebrating. It is also a fact that many non-*nobiles* (Plebeian *ingenui* and *liberti*) amassed great fortunes through trade and other mercantile activities during the last half of the second century B.C. - sometimes even becoming wealthier than members of the senatorial élite.⁷⁹ No doubt, many of these would have met the property qualification for admittance to the *equites* class *in strictu sensu* although many of the *liberti*, and no doubt some of the *ingenui*, may have been barred from formal admission because of strictures on those not of freeborn descent.

In order to proclaim publicly their value as Roman citizens in moral and economic terms within the social structure, and to serve as a public document of these facts for their *posteritas*, it is not difficult to understand why these *nouveaux riches* adopted many of the customs and values of the *nobiles* class - including the inclusion on the tomb of an *imago* bearing the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression. In essence, the tombs of these non-élite members of society became a 'public' ancestor gallery portraying the *maior* absolute of the family, and proclaiming their wealth, citizenship status and their social claims. That this was still the case in the mid-first century A.D. is shown by the bronze portrait of Lucius Caecilius Iucundus from Pompeii (Ill. 89), and indeed may be one of the many complex reasons that the Emperor Vespasian adopted the *severitas/gravitas* expression for his portraiture.

9.5 Summary

The evidence concerning the use of portraits and the context of their display and form at Rome indicates that the genre probably originated and developed within the elite and wealthy classes during the middle Republican period (and thus that portraiture at Rome was traditionally more likely to represent individuals belonging to the élite class of Roman

⁷⁸ Such as the portraits of Eurysaces and his wife from their tomb (now lost): L. Hackworth Petersen, "The Baker, His Tomb, His Wife, and Her Breadbasket: The Monument of Eurysaces in Rome," *ABull* 85, no. 2 (2003). It should be noted, however, that there is no evidence from this monument that Eurysaces or his wife Antistia were in fact ex slaves or *liberti*.

⁷⁹ One need only recall Trimalchio and his extravagant wealth from Petronius' *Satyricon*. It may be suggested that many senatorial families conducted business through rich *equites* who were related to them by marriage or blood, or through their *liberti* - since it was forbidden for senators to engage in business *per se*; the only suitable profession of a senator was farming.

society). However, it appears that by the end of the second century B.C. a widening circle of persons extending down into the *equites* (and by extension, the wealthy Plebeian classes) started to display *imagines* of themselves in at least semi-public and private contexts.⁸⁰ Outside of Rome these social strictures on the creation and display of portraiture would not have operated, and the capacity to commission or display an *imago* may only have depended on the social standing or wealth of the individual vis à vis the social context of the intended use of the portrait. Given the connection between the *imagines* and vested power and economic interests at Rome, it should not be surprising that the style of portraiture adopted by the élite should permeate down to other classes and individuals within Roman society.

The fact that the *atria* of the great houses were filled with *imagines* and *tituli* and that Rome was full of statues attesting to the *nobiles'* ancestors was a powerful statement for equating in the mind of the populace the members of the *familia* and *gens* with the offices of state and with power at Rome (*imperium* and *auctoritas*).⁸¹ Dedicated *imagines* in temples, victory arches, columns and coinage would serve as constant reminders to the public of the family's previous services to the *res publica*: including social, political, religious and military deeds. The *imagines*, expressing through their facial expressions *severitas* and *gravitas* consonant with the values of magistrates, judges and senators, were thus too visible an image to be ignored.

80 As noted in Chapter 2, *imagines* were made of diverse materials, including wax, wood, terracotta, bronze, marble. Etc: (See appendix 3 - Chapter 2 at [56] Cic. *Fam.* 5.12.7; [57] Cic. *Orat.* 31.110; [58] Plin. (E) *HN* 35.12.44. §153; [59] Cic. *Fin.* 1.6.21). See also Tac. *Agr.* 46.3; and Tac. *Dial.* 11.3.

81 Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 60.

CHAPTER TEN

THEORIES CONCERNING GREEK ORIGINS FOR ROMAN PORTRAITURE

10.1 Introduction

From the close association of the *imagines* with the ruling élite at Rome and its values of *severitas* and *gravitas*, it may seem self-evident that Roman Republican portraiture (in its form and contexts of display) had its origins within Roman culture. However, various theories claim that Roman Republican portraiture was developed by Greek artists working within the traditions of Greek art; or originated as a reaction of Greek artists to a barbarian people based on perceived differences in physiognomy between Greeks and Romans, or as portraying the 'ugly'; or originated in the portrait style of the Hellenistic kings and that it was transferred to Italy via contacts of Roman merchants and generals operating in the Greek east (particularly, the island of Delos). These theories are discussed below.

10.2 Greek sculptural traditions and Roman portraiture

Richter proposed that it was the breaking away from the strict frontality evident in Greek art at the end of the Archaic period which permitted 'movement' in sculptural art¹ and freed Greek sculptors to develop an ever increasing 'realism' which had its logical conclusion in the verism of Hellenistic (and Roman) portraiture.²

1 G. M. A. Richter, "Origins of Verism in Roman Portraits," *JRS* 45 (1955), 44-46. Such a theory is the result of the application of an Hegelian and Darwinian view of art and art history predicated on the belief that art and culture can be described as a progressive phenomenon which develops continually towards an ill-defined perfection. As a result of this teleology, all subsequent developments can be viewed in terms of the form of its predecessors, and that all stages of the chain must be consciously or subconsciously striving towards the end object. Heavily influential is the Hegelian view of art as a product of nationality or ethnicity (*volkskunst*) - according to which the Greeks and Romans, viewed as distinct peoples both socially and racially, must have had their own culturally distinct artistic expression. Also evident is the influence of Winckelmann, in that such a theory presumes Greek art is 'superior', and hence any Roman art forms must have been subsumed into it as a product from it or as a degeneration of it. In essence, this is an error of hindsight or 'parallax error' (as Bückhardt would have described it), as well as being a simple error of interpretation of fact.

2 Ibid., 43: "[T]hus, naturalistic representation in Greek art began after 500 B.C.; that is at the end of the archaic period. From that time one can observe a continuous development also in portraiture. In the period of the Ptolemies, in the third and second centuries B.C, this realistic representation had been fully realised."

Such an explanation is highly teleological³ – viewing the end product as the result of an inevitable process of development evident from the beginning – and is valid only in so far as the definition of portraiture adopted permits, which in Richter's view was the belief that Greek artists from the Archaic period were striving for physiognomic 'realism' or verisimilitude⁴ which was realised with the Hellenistic and Roman portraits⁵ – i.e., Roman portraits depict their subjects in a 'veristic' ('warts and all') manner akin to photographic realism. Yet exactly what constitutes this 'verism' or 'realism' is rarely defined, and whether such terms can be used in relation to an art-form such as portraiture, which inherently involves an artistic interpretation of the subject and sometimes makes only the loosest reference to an individual's physiognomy, is rarely addressed.⁶

The truth is we have absolutely no way of knowing whether *most* portraits (until the advent of

3 The reason for this is because Classical archaeological theory is heavily predicated on the universal model of art proposed in the theories of Winckelmann and Hegel, which ultimately tend to deny the existence of a definable 'Roman' art *per se*.

4 It is more satisfactory to explain the changes in Greek sculptural style as a result of shifts or changes in conceptualisation among the Greek artists during the Archaic period from a formulaic geometric understanding for rendering the human figure, to a more holistic view of the subject as a working organism of muscle, tissue and blood which could in fact be represented. This change was possibly influenced by changes in social and economic structures which were occurring at this time, the greater observation and understanding regarding the human form and improvements in technique. Yet even in the Classical period 'Greek' artists never fully abandoned the use of formulae: evident in the appearance of sculpture and a formulaic or canonistic approach to the theorising of representations of the human body. The fact that Polykleitos wrote a canon concerning correct proportions shows this to have been true.

5 Richter, "Origins of Verism in Roman Portraits," 44-46. See also G. M. A. Richter, *Roman portraits* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1948), 1: "As late Greek and late Etruscan portraits were realistic, it was natural that the same style should be maintained in the early Roman heads. Realism, moreover, was stimulated by the old Roman custom of making waxen images of the faces of the dead. And it suited the temper of Republican Rome. In comparing these heads with the realistic portraits of Hellenistic Greece we are struck by fundamental differences, as well as a general likeness. The Greeks were philosophers, idealists. The Romans were men of action, realists. They were laying the foundation of the Roman Empire, whereas the Greeks had founded European philosophy, art, science, and scholarship--achievements which almost make us forget their conquest of the East."

6 R. P. Hinks, "Review of the 'Hadrianic School; A Chapter in the History of Greek Art' by Jocelyn M.C. Toynbee," *JHS* 54 (1934), 232: "...realistic' is a subjective term (in relation to the artist); 'veristic' is an objective term (in relation to the work). They are bad words, but they express an important distinction. The Hellenistic artist may be called a realist because he works toward the real effect of an organic whole by using plastic metaphors which represent the appearance of nature by analogy. The Italic work may be called veristic because it aims at reproducing the original by literal attention to detail..."

photography) resembled the actual physiognomy of the individual depicted.⁷ The references in Latin literature of the Republican period are contradictory⁸ – and there is some positive evidence to suggest that Roman portraits did not necessarily closely resemble the individuals portrayed.⁹ I would suggest that a desire for photographic realism had very little to do with any ancient portrait art – including the Roman so-called ‘veristic’ style – because, in respect of Greek and Roman portraiture, a simple desire for photographic realism does not accord with their specific beliefs regarding physiognomic communication which took precedence over merely replicating reality.¹⁰ That the portraits had some reference to the physiognomy of individual persons, though, should not be ruled out, particularly in light of the suggested method of manufacture of *imagines* discussed in Chapter Eight.

Placing Roman portraiture within Hellenistic traditions necessitates that the artists who originally produced Roman portraits were Greeks – and accordingly, the identities and ethnic backgrounds of the artists who created them become important.¹¹ Richter believed that most artists working in Italy and Rome could be shown to have had Greek names,¹² *ipso facto* Greeks made Roman Republican portraits, and hence the genre lay within the portrait

7 I am mindful of reconstructions of physical appearance based on skulls – such as that of Phillip II of Macedon (J. Prag and R. Neave, *Making faces: using forensic and archaeological evidence* (London: The British Museum Press, 1997), 125-170) and Seianti Hanunia Tlesnasa (Ill. 109)(J. Prag and R. Neave, *Making faces: using forensic and archaeological evidence* (London: The British Museum Press, 1997), 172-200; J. Prag, "Seianti and Etruscan Portraiture," in *Seianti Hanunia Tlesnasa: The Story of an Etruscan Noblewoman*, ed. J. Prag and J. Swaddling, *The British Museum Occasional Papers* (London: The British Museum, 2002), 53-58, 59-66. However, I am suspicious of the conclusions of such studies, particularly since there were portraits of those individuals towards which any facial recreation might resort, and that hair texture and fat tissue, etc., are largely left to the conjecture of the person undertaking the recreation. For Seianti, even if it is apparent that the terracotta image on her sarcophagus depicts her, it is a highly classicized and only superficially refers to her physiognomy. See J. Prag and J. Swaddling, eds., *Seianti Hanunia Tlesnasa: The Story of an Etruscan Noblewoman, The British Museum Occasional Papers* (London: The British Museum, 2002).

8 There are references in the plays of Plautus to a person appearing like their *imago* on signet rings: Plaut. *Amphit.* 131. But this might be a joke in aligning a physiognomical representation of the character by a mask is similar to that on a signet ring.

9 Cic. *Som. Scip.* 6.10.

10 Simply because Roman Republican portraiture is so distinguishable from other portrait styles focusing as it does on older, more mature men and incorporating into their physiognomies faults and the visible signs of age, should not beguile the modern viewer into thinking that these portraits were intended to be ‘photo-realistic’. Roman Republican portraits are, in reality, little more than a crafted juxtaposition of lines, planes and surfaces, making any perceived ‘realism’ simply illusory. Just how faithful Roman Republican portraits were to a living individual, or whether they merely present a tangential reference to reality, and to what degree, cannot really be ascertained. However, as suggested in Chapter Eight, the fact that the *imagines* were possibly modelled from a plaster cast taken from a living face, indicates that some similitude to the person portrayed is likely.

11 J. D. Breckenridge, "Origins of Roman Republican Portraiture: Relations with the Hellenistic World," *ANRW* 1.4 (1973), 849. Also R. R. R. Smith, "Greeks, Foreigners, and Roman Republican Portraits," *JRS* 71 (1981).

12 I. Rizzo, "I Romani e l'arte greca," *L'Urbe* 10 (1947); O. Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik*, 2 vols. (Lund, Leipzig: C. W. K. Gleerup, O. Harrassowitz, 1941), 46; J. M. C. Toynbee, *Some notes on artists in the Roman world, Collection Latomus*; v. 6 (Bruxelles: Latomus, 1951); F. Poulsen, "Die Römer der republikanischen Zeit und ihre Stellung zu kunst," *Ant* 13 (1937).

tradition of Greek art.¹³ As proof, she cited a gold ring from Capua (now in the Museo Archaeologico Nazionale, Naples) (Ill. 41) which she believed depicted a Roman, Scipio Africanus, and which was engraved with the signature of the artist - Herakleides.¹⁴ Another gem, an aquamarine, in the Archaeological Museum in Florence, bears a portrait signed by Agathopous.¹⁵ This evidence, combined with stylistic parallels drawn between Hellenistic Royal and Roman portraits, confirmed to Richter that the origin of Roman Republican portrait style lay with Greek artists, who adapted the portrait style of Hellenistic kings to Roman needs via centres such as Delos and the Greek cities of southern Italy.¹⁶

For several reasons, I am not of the opinion that the ethnicity of the artist has anything to do with the manner or style of Roman Republican portraiture. In fact, the evidence suggests that there were equally capable local artists at Rome working from the Regal period, and that these local artists were probably responsible for the bulk of art which was made and displayed at Rome including the surviving portraits in the *severitas/gravitas* style.¹⁷

However, there main problem with this view is that it falsely links ethnicity with inherent expressions of artistic form.¹⁸ Such a link is not supported by any empirical evidence.

One of the primary literary sources for the identity of artists working at Rome in the Republican period is Pliny the Elder. However, as with nearly all the other ancient literary sources, Pliny (E) was mostly concerned with notable or 'great' works of art in Rome and the artists who created these – not with the minor arts or those pieces he did not consider as

13 Richter, "Origins of Verism in Roman Portraits," 40.

14 J. C. M. Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1978), 18, ill.4. Richter claims it is a portrait of Scipio Africanus from Capua, dating to the late third or early second century B.C.

15 From epigraphic evidence and stylistic analysis the gold ring is dated to the late third to early second century B.C. while the aquamarine is dated to the early first century B.C.: A. Furtwängler, *Die antiken Gemmen: Geschichte der Steinschneidekunst im klassischen Altertum*, 3 vols. (Leipzig; Berlin: Giesecke & Devrient, 1900), 179, and 68 no.2; A. Furtwängler, *Studien über die Gemmen mit Künstlerinschriften*, vol. [Offprint], *Jahrbuch des Kaiserlich Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1888), 208 & 11-15. Richter, "Origins of Verism in Roman Portraits," 40. Another two gems, which are unsigned, (now in Boston and London: Beazley Lewes House Gems no. 101 pl. 6; H. B. Walters, *Catalogue of the Engraved Gems and Cameos, Greek, Etruscan and Roman, in the British Museum* (London: British Museum, 1926), no. 1190.) bear a stylistic resemblance to the first two signed rings.

16 G. M. A. Richter, "Late Hellenistic Portraiture," *Archaeology* 16 (1963), 45.

17 Furthermore, this theory over-emphasises the role of 'the artist' as the true 'genius' in the development of the Republican (*severitas/gravitas*) portrait style. The evidence concerning the context of display and communicational value of *imagines* as a traditional art form, indicates that it was not necessarily the artist who determined which stylistic elements should be utilised to constitute Roman portraits. It is far more likely that the purpose of the work and the traditions regarding context and display of portraiture in Republican Rome were more determinative in this respect. See Appendix 6.

18 Suggestive of the Hegelian model of Aesthetics which is predicated on the existence of the *volkskunst*.

falling within his definition of art *per se*. This leaves a considerable gap in our knowledge of who it was that produced the portraits in the Republican *severitas/gravitas* style that we now possess.

Pliny (E) well attests that foreign artists were brought to Rome in order to execute specific commissions from the earliest years of the Republic,¹⁹ if the story concerning the Etruscan sculptor Vulca is correct.²⁰ The fact that Rome frequently imported foreign artists bespeaks several things – a demand for artworks, the money and resources to spend on such commissions, and that Rome was very much connected with the wider cultural traditions of Latium, Etruria and the Greek cities of southern Italy and Sicily, if not of Greece itself. The presence of foreign artists would no doubt have contributed greatly to the skills of the local artists at Rome, and it should not be surprising that locally produced Roman artwork was of a high quality, as the archaeological finds from the city dating from the Regal period onwards amply attest.²¹

A further stimulus to the local art community at Rome was the fact that from the early third century B.C. large quantities of marble and bronze statues were brought to Rome from conquered Greek cities and territories to adorn public monuments and places.²² These included many famous Classical sculptures, some of which were dedicated on the Capitol or in other temples and shrines at Rome.²³ For instance, M. Fulvius Nobilior after defeating the Aetolians in 188 B.C. constructed a temple to Hercules Musarum in 187 B.C. in which he dedicated statues of Hercules and the Muses made by the Greek artist Zeuxis.²⁴ After the defeat of Perseus of Macedonia by Aemilius Paulus at Pydna in 168 B.C.²⁵ and the sack of Corinth by L. Mummius in 146 B.C. further artworks were deported to the city.²⁶

Concomitant with direct importation of Greek artworks, the sources indicate that throughout

19 Plin. (E) *HN* 35.154-158.

20 Plin. (E) *HN* 35.157.

21 See Appendix 6 for an overview and discussion of the textual and archaeological evidence concerning the sophistication of the local art industry at Rome from the regal period.

22 Such as from Syracuse (212 B.C.) (Livy *AUC* 25.40.2; Cic. *Verr.* 2. 4.54.); Tarentum (209 B.C.): Livy *AUC* 27.16.7-8; Plin. (E) *HN* 34.40; Macedonia (197 B.C.): Livy *AUC* 33.11; Polyb. 18.40-43; and Ambracia (189 B.C.): Livy *AUC* 38.9.

23 Cicero mentions that the plundering of Greek cities went on well into the first century B.C. although by this time the practice was not actively condoned: Cic. *Pis.* 96.

24 Plin. (E) *HN* 35.66; Livy *AUC* 39.22.2.

25 Livy *AUC* 45.33.

26 CIL 1. 2nd ed. No. 626= Dessau no. 20; Livy *AUC* 45. 27.11, 28.5; Polyb. 30.10.5-6; Plut. *Aem* 28.2. For instance, the plunder of Corinth is described – Strab. *Geog.* 8.6.23; Vell. Pat. 1.13.4; (Pseudo-)Dio Chrys. *Or.* 37.42. Mummius placed some of these in the new temple he dedicated to Hercules the Conqueror.

the second century B.C. many well known Greek sculptors continued to be brought to Rome to execute specific commissions. In 180 B.C., L. Scipio brought Greek artists to Rome to create adornments for a celebration he had vowed at the time of the war with Antiochos.²⁷ Another was Polykles who is believed to have been largely responsible for the revival in Neo-classicism at Athens in 156-152 B.C.– the appearance of whose artwork at Rome may explain Pliny (E)'s cryptic statement *...cessavit deinde ars ac....revixit*.²⁸ It appears that in this period there was a particular demand at Rome for Athenian artists and for works in the 'Neo-classical' style utilising bronze and costly imported marble.

Interestingly members of Polykles' family appear to have had a relationship with Rome for some 60 years – especially his son, Timarchides the Elder (I).²⁹ It is known that he made the statue of Juno for the Temple of Juno Regina built by Marcus Aemilius Lepidus between 187-179 B.C. – although it was possibly not commissioned until the late 150s or 140s B.C. when the temple was incorporated into the *Porticus Metelli*.³⁰ The latter date is supported by the family genealogy of the sculptor.³¹ Also, other members of Polykles' family were involved when Q. Metellus Macedonicus confiscated the Granikos monument from the city of Dion

27 Livy *AUC* 39.22.9-10.

28 Plin. (E) *HN* 34.52.

29 Although there appears to have been a couple of sculptors belonging to this family who bore the same name, and who was precisely who is a matter of some confusion: J. J. Pollitt, *Art in the Hellenistic age* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 173-74; also A. F. Stewart, *Attika: Studies in Athenian sculpture of the Hellenistic age* (London: Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, 1979), 43. While Timarchides (I) clearly worked in Rome, there is no evidence he actually emigrated there, since in 149/130 B.C. he is recorded on coins as having held magistracies in Athens. Evidence suggests that Timarchides (I) collaborated with his brother Timokles on works in Greece (Paus. 10.34.6-8).

30 Plin. (E) *HN* 36.35.

31 Torso of C. Ofellius Ferus (inscription IG IV/III 4302): C. Michalowski, ed., *Les portraits antiques: Les portraits hellénistique et romaines*, vol. XIII, *Délos* (Paris: Exploration Archéologique de Délos, 1932), 21; J. Marcadé, *Recueil des signatures des sculpteurs grecques*, 2 vols. (Athens: l'école française à Athènes, 1953 and 1957), vol. 2, 41-44, 107-8, 31-2, 34. Stewart supports the proposition of Marcadé but modifies the dating, Stewart, *Attika: Studies in Athenian sculpture of the Hellenistic age*, 65, Pls. 18-20 & 22. But Coarelli (following Becatti) conflated the two Polykles and so raised the chronology: F. Coarelli, "L'ara di Domizio Enobarbo e la cultura artistica in Roma nel II secolo a.C.," *Dialoghi di archeologia* 2 (1968), 331-35; F. Coarelli, "Polykles," *StMisc* 15 (1969-1970).

(which had been created by Lysippos for Alexander) and transported it to Rome.³² Interestingly, Timarchides and Dionysios are also named as the sculptors of the statue of C. Ofellius Ferus (Ill. 65) dedicated to Apollo by the Italian community on Delos which has been given a date of around 100 B.C. – but which I prefer to see as dating between 125 and 115 B.C. Sadly for this study, the Ferus statue is missing its head, and it would have been intriguing to know whether it sported a portrait in the *severitas/gravitas* style. If so, then the family would have been well placed, given their work at Rome itself, to know the demands of Roman patrons concerning the form required for their portraits – and this might provide evidence of the transference of the *severitas/gravitas* style from Rome to Delos.

Pliny (E) tells us that the use of polished marble for architectural decoration and statuary only commenced at Rome on a big scale in the first century B.C. with the local availability of the material.³³ Pliny (E) mentions three artists for this period in particular – Pasiteles,³⁴ Arcesilaos,³⁵ and Coponius, whose name suggests he was most probably a Roman citizen. He was responsible for the statues of the 14 nations that were placed in the theatre of Pompey.³⁶ Pasiteles was also a Roman citizen – possibly coming from a Greek city of southern Italy – and his works were displayed within the *Porticus Metelli* with other works by Philiscus.³⁷ It seems that many of these artists worked in a Neo-classical or a variety of Hellenistic styles appropriate to the taste of their patrons and the context for which the work was

32 Pollitt, *Art in the Hellenistic age*, 158. To house the display Metellus constructed a portico around an area in the Campus Martius, which became known as the *Porticus Metelli* incorporating the older temple of Juno Regina and constructing another, the temple of Jupiter Stator: Vell. Pat. 1.11.2-5. Timarchides is also said by Pliny to have produced an 'Apollo Citharoedus' at Rome on his own in the 140s B.C. which was displayed near the Porticus Metelli (Plin. (E) *HN* 36.35) although whether this was the Elder Timarchides (I) or his grandson is in dispute. Timarchides' (I) sons, Polykles the Younger (II) and Dionysios, created the statues of Jupiter Stator for the Jupiter Stator temple (which we are told was the first fully marble temple in Rome: Plin. (E) *HN* 36.35; Vell. Pat. 1.11.2-5; Plin. (E) *HN* 34.64) and it is possible that these same two had a hand in the cult image (or some other statue) of Juno Regina for the temple built earlier by Lepidus and mentioned above: Plin. (E) *HN* 36.35. It is preferable to accept that M. Aemilius Lepidus commissioned the cult image of Juno Regina for the temple of Juno Regina in 147 B.C.

33 Plin. (E) *HN* 35.2-3. Although the Temple of Jupiter Stator, built by Metellus Macedonicus in 147 B.C. already mentioned is stated to have been the first all marble temple at Rome.

34 Plin. (E) *HN* 36.39-40; M. Borda, *La scuola di Pasiteles* (Bari: 1953).

35 Plin. (E) *HN* 35.155-6; he was a friend of Lucullus and his clay model for the statue of Venus Genetrix Pliny (E) specifically mentions.

36 Plin. (E) *HN* 35.156-157.

37 Plin. (E) *HN* 36.40.

commissioned.³⁸

For local artists there is the evidence of the epitaph from the tomb of Publius Licinius Demetrius [note the *tria nomina* – an indicator of Roman citizenship !] from Tusculum (Ill. 102). His tomb contains a portrait of himself with another, both decidedly in the *severitas/gravitas* style, dressed in togas and surrounded by the tools of his trade.³⁹ Demetrius' *cognomen* is Greek, but it is noteworthy that as a Roman citizen (whether a *libertus* or not – and there is no indication from the epitaph that Demetrius himself was a *libertus*) he used traditional Roman visual language to assert and announce his citizenship status to his fellow citizens: facial expression, toga, and inscription containing his full Roman name.⁴⁰ Whatever the truth regarding Demetrius' ethnic origins, he was undoubtedly a Roman citizen producing works for a local market.

The mere fact that some artists, such as Demetrius, had Greek names and the conclusion that from this fact they were of Greek ethnicity and possessed Greek cultural values, does not automatically follow. Indeed, the evidence is largely absent or non-existent that these people were 'ethnically' Greek, or that they were born in Greece, *Magna Graecia* or any other Greek place. Indeed, artists bearing Greek names cannot be used to rule out the possibility that they were from diverse ethnic backgrounds and places who learned their trade or craft in Italy or Rome itself, either having been brought there (or their ancestors) as slaves (from any place within the Roman dominions and hence given their Greek names by their Roman masters), or that they were born to *liberti* in Italy or Rome (of Greek descent or otherwise), or that they may have been freeborn Roman citizens of several generations coming from any of the

38 Pollitt, *Art in the Hellenistic age*, 161 & 72-75. Interestingly, there is literary evidence suggesting that just as Greek artists came to Rome, Roman artists and technicians also went to the East. For instance, Antiochos IV Epiphanes of Syria in 175 B.C. initiated reconstruction of the Olympeion at Athens using Cossutius, a Roman Architect: Paus. 1.21.3; 5.12.4. He also built temples to both Zeus Olympeios and Jupiter Capitolinus at Antioch employing the same man. In fact this king had been sent as a hostage to Rome as a child - indicating he would have had a great knowledge of Roman society and culture: Livy *AUC* 42.6; In 173 B.C. He sent an embassy to Rome to seek friendship and to pay the final installment of the indemnity of Antiochos III: Livy *AUC* 42.6; 42.26,7 and 45.13.2. He quarrelled with Egypt in 171 B.C. and appealed directly to Rome: Polyb. 31.3, but when Rome did not respond, he invaded Egypt and captured Memphis: Polyb. 27.17. He again invaded Egypt in 168 B.C. and was on the point of conquering it when a delegation headed by Caius Popillius Laenas came to Alexandria and ordered Antiochos to withdraw, which he immediately did: Polyb. 29.11; Livy *AUC* 45.12. Furthermore, he imitated the Roman Games held by Lucius Aemilius Paullus, at Amphipolis to mark his victory over Perseos of Macedon, even holding a massive triumphal procession in which elephants took part: Polyb. 31.3; Ath. 194c-195. This suggests clearly that Roman attitudes and tastes were having an affect in the Hellenistic East, as much as Greek influence conversely may have had at Rome.

39 A. H. Smith, *A Catalogue of Sculpture in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum*, vol. 3 (London: British Museum, 1904), no.1749; London BM Sculpture 1954.12-14.1

40 Richter, "Late Hellenistic Portraiture," 40.

municipia in Italy or from Rome itself.⁴¹

Pertinent to this issue is the fact that the few foreign artists mentioned by the sources as having come to Rome could not have been responsible for the bulk of art from the city which survives. Indeed, there is literary evidence which suggests that the traditional form of portraiture at Rome, *imagines*, were not viewed as 'works of art' by the Romans, but were manufactured by unknown local artisans for specific social and political purposes unconnected with mere connoisseurship.⁴² For instance, Pliny (E) specifically contrasts the traditional *imagines* kept in the homes of the *nobiles* with works of art (*signa*) in bronze and marble which he says were created by *externii* - i.e., non-Roman artists.⁴³ If the bronze and marble artworks were produced by *externii*, it is logical to conclude that those who produced the traditional *imagines* were artisans working within the Roman community.⁴⁴

This has direct bearing on the bulk of Roman Republican portraits that we now possess, including the portraits found on the tombs of the non-élite classes at Rome dating from the late Republican and early Imperial periods.⁴⁵ Their very existence indicates a couple of

41 For instance, there is a pottery sherd with an inscription bearing the name of be a Greek resident of Rome dating to the sixth century B.C.

42 Plin. (E) HN 35.6: (6) *aliter apud maiores in atriis haec erant, quae spectarerunt; non signa externorum artificum nec aera aut marmora: expressi cera vultus singulis disponebantur armariis, ut essent imagines, quae comitarentur gentilicia funera, semperque defuncto aliquo totus aderat familiae eius qui umquam fuerat populus.*

43 This accords with his general outline of art at Rome, whereby until the time of the mid-second century B.C. there was very little in the way of marble statuary produced at Rome (being mostly imports from Greek cities) and that the genre only became popular in the first century B.C. He also affirms the view that the earlier portraits were in wax, but they also could have been, on public honorary or votive statues in terracotta or bronze - since Pliny in this instance appears to be talking only about domestic images. The fact he used the blanket term '*imagines*' to denote these traditional images (no matter what their material or function) - implies that they may have had a similar appearance in stylistic terms and served similar cultural purposes. It also supports the conclusion that any portrait of a notable man of public affairs (whether private or public) could be referred to as an *imago* - and of course, once that man was deceased, then it would become a portrait included within the term *imagines maiorum*.

44 This is a view consonant with Cicero's, where he emphasised the differences between an *imago* and the *persona* of an actor.

45 The fact these people chose to be depicted wearing togas and with the traditional *severitas/gravitas* form of expression, were for the same reason that the style was utilised by Roman businessmen in Delos: they were publicly declaring their Roman status and values. For *liberti* such funerary reliefs publicly proclaimed the fact of being a Roman citizen and this meant that the individual had adopted a Roman attitude, way of life and moral values - but more importantly that they now possessed all the legal rights and obligations of Roman citizenship, including the protection of the laws. For those *ingenui* who utilised the style, it represented their success within the Roman social context through the wealth they had won through their professions. It is also apparent that many of those depicted on these tombs were excessively rich - wealth equalling that of many 'native' born Romans in the *equites* and senatorial class. Hence, while perhaps not formally of the *equites* class and undoubtedly being excluded by their lower status from holding public office, they could still lay claim to the virtues of the class whose ethics and views they had adopted - and which they no doubt wished that their children might be able to enter as fully fledged members.

points: that there was a wealthy market for such portraits in the city itself (a market which was keen to adopt the traditional imagery of the ruling élite for themselves), and that there was a reserve of competent artisans who could meet this demand. Because these portraits appear to have been made and displayed in a traditional format expected of *imagines* they were not regarded as *signa* and are rarely mentioned by the sources.⁴⁶

The evidence already mentioned indicates that many of the artists working in Rome, even some of the well-known ones, were Roman citizens. From this fact it could just as reasonably be suggested that most sculptors were thoroughly 'Roman' or 'Romanised', responding to the particular demands of their patrons in producing portraits consonant with Roman cultural expectations, rather than simply importing predetermined Greek cultural attitudes and tastes in creating portraits and then imposing these on their Roman patrons.

Even if a large number of artists working at Rome could be shown to have been 'Greek', brought to Rome themselves or their ancestors as slaves, and while *some* 'Greek' slaves may have had an important cultural heritage which had a great influence on the education and sophistication of Romans with whom they came in contact, not all such slaves would have been erudite, sophisticated beacons of their cultural traditions. Many would simply have adapted (or been forced to adapt) to Roman society for their own self-survival and in order to gain the benefits that their position potentially offered: manumission and the acquisition of Roman citizenship.

In a 'multi-cultural' environment it is also evident that people migrating from different backgrounds to the host country do not keep their traditions and cultural values intact – free from the influence of the host culture. There is in fact a great deal of assimilation in attitudes and practices that occurs with each succeeding generation. Nor does the culture of the host country remain unchanged by the influx of people from diverse backgrounds. In this context, culture is dynamic and fluid and the attitudes to taste and culture resulting from such cultural interactions cannot easily be defined merely by categorising an artist working within that

46 Unfortunately, most of the surviving portraits are either of marble or appear on coins – and many of these are traditionally dated to the first century B.C. This is largely to accord with what Pliny (E) said about marble sculptors working permanently at Rome not appearing until this period and from the evidence concerning the opening of the Luna marble quarries and the wider availability of marble.

specific environment by his or her ethnicity.⁴⁷

Likewise, it must be said, the traditions and customs of the ruling élite (which tend to be the most conservative in their value system, yet dynamic or learned in their appreciation of culture and economic capacity to acquire it) did not necessarily remain impervious to contact with foreign cultures. That the Roman élite consciously acquired Greek culture (at least in the second century B.C. as indicated by the literary evidence concerning the importation of Greek artworks to Rome and the reactionism of Cato the Elder against all things Greek) merely suggests that the Roman élite may have taken Hellenistic stylistic elements and incorporated these into their portraits. It by no means indicates that these Hellenistic styles completely supplanted or replaced the traditional Roman expectations of what a portrait should essentially convey – and from the evidence discussed in earlier chapters, this appears to have been the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression and the contexts in which portraits were utilised and displayed.

Indeed, some scholars have seen certain tools and techniques of stone carving as particular to the local Roman or Italian body of artists.⁴⁸ For example, the use of the rounded chisel as a finishing tool and a complementary tendency in many marble sculptures not to smooth away tool marks from the flesh of the figures.⁴⁹ The reasons given for this are that the local artists were more habituated to work in tufa and travertine, rather than marble. Another technique is 'contour chiselling'⁵⁰ which is considered characteristic of late Republican funerary reliefs.⁵¹ This produces a wide, concave depression around the heads of figures carved in relief, and is very different to the narrow drilled channels with which contemporary sculptors in the Greek

47 Nor by an overzealous analysis of the resulting artworks into fragmentary and individual stylistic elements and attributing these to diverse cultural traditions. Such an approach fails to recognize the innovative quality which an artifact possesses, by reason of being formulated from diverse cultural influences, and its uniqueness as expressive of the culture of the place where it was produced.

48 Gazda for instance cites the tomb reliefs of the 'liberti' as evidence of a local vernacular art at Rome taken over from the nobiles class with the breakdown of their social control in the beginning of the first century B.C. onwards: E. Gazda, "Etruscan Influence in the Funerary Reliefs of Late Republican Rome: A Study of Vernacular Portraiture," *ANRW* 1.4 (1973), 856.

49 D. A. Conlin, *The Artists of the Ara Pacis: The Process of Hellenization in Roman Relief Sculpture* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 57-62.

50 Ibid.

51 Ibid. Gazda also sees local artistic elements in their production and style: 'their descriptive down to earth appearance and paratactic arrangement reflect little, if any, Greek idealisation, organic structure and compositional subtlety. Their technique appears crude in comparison to that of the Greek pieces. Only in two respects can these Roman reliefs be said to depend directly upon Hellenistic prototypes. Their deep frames are anticipated in Hellenistic stelai, and the garments worn by these figures are essentially derived from the Greek pallium and palla. Otherwise the average Roman reliefs have little in common with Hellenistic art': Gazda, "Etruscan Influence in the Funerary Reliefs of Late Republican Rome: A Study of Vernacular Portraiture," 856-57.

East often outlined their figures.⁵²

Regarding the claim that it was Athenian artists in particular who developed and transmitted the Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* style through Delos and Athens to Rome, one need only state the fact that until the head of the Priest of Isis from the Agora at Athens (S333) (Ill.91) which is generally dated to the time of Caesar, there is not one surviving example from Athens that is in the style before this time.⁵³ In fact, the time-gap between pieces appearing in the Caesarian/Augustan period at Athens which are supposedly in the *severitas/gravitas* style, and those on Delos (which date almost definitively from around 166 B.C. to 88 B.C.), and the appearance of pieces in the style from Rome,⁵⁴ which I have suggested are contemporaneous or predate the Delos heads, shows that Athens (or Delos) is unlikely to have been the source of the style.

Regarding Delos specifically, Stewart states that after 166 B.C. the island became a "Mecca for Roman businessmen and almost obligatory port of call for her [sic] statesmen and generals on their way to the east."⁵⁵ From this time Athens revival as a 'mini-Empire' under Roman patronage led to an increase in wealth and prosperity on Delos and an increase in the market for Athenian sculptors in Rome and Delos. This rise in prosperity was contemporary with the revival of Classical style in Athenian and Delian statuary where the main cult and votive

52 However, these technical elements may just as much have originated from economic reasons (to lower the price), from the material used (since many of the tomb portraits are in the softer travertine or tufa), the technical skill of the artists concerned, or the context of display – in that these statues were generally displayed in niches high up from the line of sight of the viewer, and hence a proper finish was not necessary.

53 As Stewart noted: "The vacuum was not immediately filled; though the new verist style, developed by Athenians on Delos from 130's was by now in full cry we have no direct evidence...for its acceptability at Athens before the time of Caesar.": Stewart, *Attika: Studies in Athenian sculpture of the Hellenistic age*, 143. Crucially, the head from Athens depicts a priest of Isis, and this indicates that it is in an Egyptian traditional format unconnected with the Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* portraits.

54 Such as a head in Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Firenze, Inv. 14111 (Papini, *Antichi volti della Repubblica* 2004, fig. 486); a head in Stockholm, Throne-Host collection (Papini, *Antichi volti della Repubblica* 2004, fig. 487); a head in the Musei Capitolini, Museo Centrale Montemartini, Ant. 3366 (Papini, *Antichi volti della Repubblica* 2004, fig. 495); and a head in Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Inv. 6141 (Papini, *Antichi volti della Repubblica* 2004, fig. 496)

55 Ibid., 66.

statues show an amalgam between the Hellenistic and Classical styles.⁵⁶ This amalgamated style, as noted above, was also popular at Rome and remained so through to the first century B.C.⁵⁷ It may be that this shift in taste was in direct response to the demands of the market which at this stage was predominantly Roman.⁵⁸

For a number of the artists working in Delos throughout the period of Roman activity on the island there is some information. The family of the Athenian sculptor Polykles who also worked at Rome during the second half of the second century B.C. has already been mentioned. From the late fourth and early third centuries B.C. to the first half of the first century B.C., there are surviving references or signatures of 40 or more sculptors working in Delos. Almost all of these are recorded to have made portraits, while many are known for nothing else.⁵⁹ Twenty five of these are known from the epigraphic evidence to have worked between 166 B.C. (when the island was declared a free port) and 88 B.C. (when the island was sacked by Mithridates); half of these sculptors were Athenian.⁶⁰ It is these artists who are often credited with transferring the style of the Hellenistic kings to the Romans on the island.⁶¹

B.C	Signed	Unsigned
166-150	1	5
149-125	5	23
124-100	19	75
99-88	10	44

⁵⁶ At first there were the early or free Neo-classicists (of early to mid-second century B.C.) who recreated the style evident in works by famous sculptors such as Pheidias; then in the second half of the 2nd century B.C. developed the Neo Attic school, predominantly based in Athens, which produced works in close imitations of specific Classical works - they also developed the contemporary copying industry, in whose works classical models are combined in new ways, and sometimes slightly varied. The last development were the 'adaptors' who modelled their works closely on classical works so as to be 'quotations' of them but differed them enough to make them original works. Among the last group were Pasiteles and Arcesilaos who worked in Rome in the first century B.C.: Pollitt, *Art in the Hellenistic age*, 164-65. For an overview and discussion of the art of this period from Delos, see Appendix 7.

⁵⁷ see A. W. Lawrence, *Greek and Roman sculpture*, Rev. ed. (London: Cape, 1972).

⁵⁸ M. Bieber, *Ancient copies: contributions to the history of Greek and Roman art* (New York: New York University Press, 1977), 157. It has also been suggested that the revival of Classicism was stimulated, as Stewart described it, by Athenian nostalgia for the past, which became particularly acute after 229 B.C. (Stewart, *Attika: Studies in Athenian sculpture of the Hellenistic age*, 35.) based on an increasing awareness by Athenians of their self-perceived 'cultural superiority': A. F. Stewart, *Attika: Studies in Athenian sculpture of the Hellenistic age* (London: Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, 1979), 37.

⁵⁹ Stewart, *Attika: Studies in Athenian sculpture of the Hellenistic age*, 5.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 66.

⁶¹ See especially G. M. A. Richter, *Three Critical Periods in Greek Sculpture* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951); Richter, "Origins of Verism in Roman Portraits."

88-69	4	12
69-0	1	20

Table 1. frequency of signed and unsigned statues from Delos⁶²

From the table it is noticeable that the bulk of statues date between 149 and 88 B.C., steadily increasing from 166 B.C. and reaching a highpoint between 124 and 100 B.C., as do the bulk of artists signatures that survive. Logically this suggests that most of the 14 portrait heads from Delos bearing the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression should also fall within this time period. Far from suggesting that it was these Athenian artists who invented the genre, the evidence that the portraits possess the *severitas/gravitas* expression, that they combine a range of stylistic elements in their execution, and that some of these can be directly associated with Romans who actually lived on the island,⁶³ just as plausibly implies that the sculptors on Delos, skilled as they were in Hellenistic styles of portrait sculpture and working with material such as marble, were devoted to a Roman clientele and were responding to their tastes and demands with regards to the form and stylistic content of their portraits, rather than simply imposing their artistic tastes on their patrons.

In relation to this it must be noted that the Romans held the political, economic and military power. They were an erudite people aware of the attitude of the peoples they ruled and dominated. They were hence most unlikely to have permitted themselves to be ridiculed or satirised by Greek artists (in that the Republican portrait style has been attributed to the typical manner of how Greeks examined non-Greek and barbarian people or is similar to the genre of images of deformed people). Likewise, while there is a 'similarity' in appearance between the Republican portraits and the portraiture of some Hellenistic kings, this is superficial only: the fact that Roman portraits display certain 'Hellenising' traits⁶⁴ can be explained by precise political reasons or as matters of taste, rather than by a conscious desire of Romans to adopt the method of representation of Hellenistic kings (the majority of whom they professed to despise).⁶⁵ The fact is Hellenistic Royal images and Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* portraits conveyed very different political and social messages to their

62 Stewart, *Attika: Studies in Athenian sculpture of the Hellenistic age*, 66.

63 Inscriptions voting priesthoods to Romans IG.ii.1945; CIL vol. I, 2nd ed. No.2239=ROL 4:118-119; P. Roussel and M. Launey, *Inscriptions de Délos*, vol. IV, *Délos* (Paris: Exploration de Délos Archéologique, 1934), vol. 4, nos. 1526, 27, 645, 688, 725.

64 See pp. 316-321 *infra*.

65 See pp. 321-324 *infra*.

respective audiences, and the evidence regarding Greek and Roman physiognomic beliefs, indicates that the Romans would not have wanted, nor appreciated, a mere translation of the Hellenistic Royal portraits for their own images.

What the Delos heads show is that when Romans travelling or living in the East wished to commission a portrait, they expected specific Roman values to be communicated through it to their audience, and it is logical that they would draw on their own portrait traditions, embodied by the *imagines* of the ruling élite in Rome, in order to do this. After all, nothing would better communicate to subject people the imperial, privileged position of Roman citizens. The fact that these Roman patrons might commission Greek artists to make their portraits and they might draw on elements of the Hellenistic Royal portraiture, is all the better for the Roman patron, because by so doing the resulting image would communicate profoundly diverse messages simultaneously to both Greek and Roman viewers regarding their status.

This largely explains the statues combining Roman facial expressions with youthful, athletic bodies - such as NM 1828 from Delos (Ill. 64), or the Tivoli General in the Palazzo Massimo, Rome (Ill. 66). The nude type of honorary or votive statue may have been a Hellenistic creation, celebrating the king in terms of divine imagery or in terms of everlasting youthful, idealised beauty - but it is a tradition that had long currency among the Etruscans, and presumably, the Romans.⁶⁶ But unlike the Greek tradition where youthful beauty was required for depicting the face, Roman society and the influence of the Roman portrait tradition as represented by the *imagines maiorum*, meant that the Romans demanded their portraits heads conjoined to these torsos should convey their values; and this is exactly what they received. It made no matter whether such a statue was commissioned as a temple dedication, as an honorary piece destined for a public space, or for display in the patron's home. The same applies to statues in other formats, such as an individual wearing a toga (as in the 'arringatore'), or even a cuirassed figure (particularly outside of Rome), or an equestrian statue in either toga or military clothing, especially for public honorary or votive works.

⁶⁶ For instance, the bronze votive statue formerly in the Palazzo Sciarra in Rome dating to ca460-450 B.C. now in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek in Copenhagen [O. J. Brendel, *Etruscan Art, Pelican History of Art* (New York: Penguin Books, 1978; reprint, 1996), 307, ill. 225 and 26.]; the statuette of a nude athlete from Monte Capra dating to the late fifth century B.C. in the Museo Civico Archeologico in Bologna [Brendel, *Etruscan Art*, 316, ill. 236.]; and the bronze statuette dating from the second half of the fourth century B.C. in the Museo Nazionale Archeologico, Florence [Brendel, *Etruscan Art*, 329, ill. 251].

To the Roman mind there appears to have been no incongruity in the conjunction of the Greek idealising torso utilised often by the Hellenistic kings with the Roman head communicating *severitas* and *gravitas*. If there had been a problem obvious to the Roman patron, then such portrait statues would not have been commissioned in the numbers in which they survive. In fact, such a statue is a powerful statement - especially to the Greeks since nothing could better convey who their masters in fact were. This suggests that far from the Romans merely adopting the portrait style of the Hellenistic kings, they were consciously manipulating a traditional formula used for representing those kings by supplanting the royal facial image communicating his 'beauty' and strength with their own Roman image communicating *severitas* and *gravitas*: values by which they dispensed justice and meted out punishments or granted favours within their dominions.

These factors indicate that, rather than Greek artists being responsible for developing the Roman Republican portrait style, it was a style demanded by the Roman patrons with which the artists, Greek or otherwise, were happy to comply.⁶⁷

10.3 Romans as barbarians: Roman Republican portraiture as a product of Greek physiognomic attitudes

An alternative explanation is that based on Physiognomics.⁶⁸ According to this thesis, the Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* portrait style can be analysed in similar terms to those Hellenistic works based on traditional Greek attitudes to non-Greek, barbarian people (such as Africans and Scythians) – or in the infatuation of Hellenistic artists for depicting people with physical disabilities as being the opposite of true beauty. Roman Republican portrait style is thus explained as the response of Greek artists to their barbarian conquerors, representing the Romans' different physiognomy (which the Greeks perceived as 'ugly'), and not the result of any indigenous Roman tradition.

There are several flaws in this argument. It assumes that Greek artists were solely responsible for creating Roman art, which as shown above is not a sustainable argument. Furthermore, it

67 As D. Strong commented: "The Greek artist, in his Roman context, has to serve new ideals, but not a fundamentally different sense of form: he modifies his own artistic traditions to express an unfamiliar allegory and symbolism. This is one reason why the archaeologist and the art historian can take fundamentally different views of Roman art and why the problem of the originality of Roman art is so much discussed." D. E. Strong and J. M. C. Toynbee, *Roman art, Pelican History of Art*. (Harmondsworth; Baltimore [etc.]: Penguin, 1976; reprint, 1988), 14-15.

68 Smith, "Greeks, Foreigners, and Roman Republican Portraits."

suggests that there was an identifiable physiognomic difference between the Greeks and Romans during the middle and late Republican periods. Finally, this theory does not explain why certain Hellenistic kings from the Greek East utilised this 'veristic' style for their own portraits – as being 'Greeks' there should be no physiognomic difference worthy of portrayal or differentiation, even accepting an element of 'eastern intrusions' in their backgrounds which is sometimes used as an explanation.⁶⁹

There is no evidence that there was any physiognomic difference between the Greeks and Romans in this period. The fact of living in close proximity in a fluid social situation over a long period of time militates against it. In fact, there are textual references to the very period we are discussing which have bearing on Republican style portraits such as the Delos heads: namely the massacre of Roman citizens living on the orders of Mithridates in 88 B.C. During the carnage, in which Valerius Maximus says that 80,000 Roman citizens were murdered,⁷⁰ it is recorded that P. Rutilius Rufus (Cos. 105 B.C.) cleverly shed his toga and donned a Greek cloak and that by so doing, and through his ability to speak Greek fluently, he was able to escape the massacre.⁷¹ This suggests that Rufus did not look noticeably different from Greeks (otherwise his disguise would have been futile), and by extension that there was no obvious physiognomic or 'racial' difference between 'Greeks' and 'Romans'.

What the episode in fact suggests is that there were certain *cultural* differences between Greeks and Romans in this period which could be seen as distinguishing the two peoples and which it was necessary for Rufus to hide in order to save his life - namely that Romans wore traditional *Roman* garments (i.e., the toga - even when they were in the Greek east) and they insisted on speaking Latin (although some were educated enough to be able to speak Greek fluently).⁷² With a different language and vocabulary comes different social concepts, moral values, attitudes, etc., and hence, a distinct (subjective) ethnic identity. The implication is that the Romans regarded themselves as *non-Greek* and were usually proud to advertise this fact.⁷³

69 Richter, "Late Hellenistic Portraiture," 25.

70 Val. Max. *Mem.* 9.2; App. *Rom. Hist.* 12.4.22-23; 12.9.61-63.

71 On the ability of upper class Romans to speak Greek see J. N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 10-11.

72 In fact the story suggests that wearing the toga and speaking Latin were considered *de rigeur* for Roman citizens when traveling in Greek areas, otherwise the story of Rufus method of escape (i.e., shedding his toga and refraining from speaking Latin) would not have been considered extraordinary. Indeed the story suggests that Rufus was exceptional, and that perhaps many Romans were identified and killed during the massacre because they refused to shed their togas, and could not speak Greek so fluently.

73 See pp. 321-324 *infra*.

This episode also reveals an irony in the suggestion that the Romans were so thoroughly Hellenised in cultural terms they no longer possessed an identifiable 'Roman' cultural identity of their own, but that such Hellenisation did not extend as far as the clothes that Roman men wore nor, more importantly, to the language by which they expressed themselves.⁷⁴

Furthermore, by the first century B.C. the Roman citizen body was ethnically mixed. In fact all Italians (including Greeks, Etruscans, Samnites, Oscans, Latins etc.) south of the Po were Roman citizens by 90 B.C. as a result of the Social War. Some of these people may well have been bi-lingual (although the inscriptions later from Pompeii were predominantly in Latin, there are a few Oscan inscriptions still dating to our period),⁷⁵ many continuing to speak their local language (Greek or some other Italian language), they also actively acquired Latin. However, the unifying factor was that all were acutely aware of their Roman citizen status and the Roman moral values that this entailed,⁷⁶ and this would no doubt have been especially so when they were travelling outside Italy. The evidence suggests that even from the second century B.C. all Romans, whether they came from a former Greek city of southern Italy, or from Etruria or Rome itself, were proud of their citizenship, and they willingly advertised this fact by wearing the *toga* and speaking the *lingua latina*.⁷⁷ Of course, there was a self-serving reason to do so – especially when one was travelling and doing business in the conquered or subject territories, since *toga* wearing and speaking Latin advertised one's social and political superiority. If this had not been the case, the fact that P. Rutilius Rufus had successfully escaped the massacre by imitating a Greek would not have been worthy of mention as being exceptional.

74 One is reminded of the dismay which Suetonius records the Emperor Augustus felt at seeing so many Roman men wearing Greek *palliata* in the Forum – that he requested the *Aediles* to forbid Roman citizens from entering the Forum without a *toga*. Also interesting in this passage is the esteem with which Roman citizenship was held: Suet. *Aug.* 40.

75 J. B. Ward-Perkins et al., *Pompeii AD 79: treasures from the National Archaeological Museum, Naples and the Pompeii Antiquarium, Italy* (Sydney: Australian Gallery Directors Council, 1980), 13.

76 Interestingly, it appears that one of the motivations for the Social War itself was the refusal by the senate to permit the extension of citizenship to the allied towns in Italy that did not possess it – i.e., the Social War was in essence a struggle for *admittance* to citizenship by the Italian *oppida*.

77 Livy *AUC* 45.29 – when L. Paulus announced the punishments decreed by the senate (as well as his own decision with the advice of his own council) to the Macedonians after the defeat of Perseus in 168 B.C. he did so, as was the custom, in Latin; the judgment was then translated by the Praetor who was present into Greek. Also the senate insisted on addressing all envoys in Latin, even in their home cities: Val. Max. *Mem.* 2.2.2. The success of Romanisation in the Italian peninsula is suggested by the fact that Latin came to supplant the local languages, including Greek. In the Greek East, although Latin was used as the official language, it appears that the élites at least learned Latin but never to the extent that Latin threatened Greek as the main language. By the end of the first century A.D. this produced a largely officially bi-lingual empire divided on an East – West basis represented by Greek and Latin respectively, under which were the various local languages. If Hellenisation had been so strong in Rome, it would be remarkable that the Latin language remained so strong.

Another fact militating against this theory is that the textual and archaeological evidence indicates that there had been a long history of direct contact between Greeks and Romans possibly as far back as the seventh or sixth century B.C.⁷⁸ Just why the Greeks should suddenly be struck by the barbarity of the Romans' appearance in the mid-second century B.C., such that they would want to create a new veristic style of portraiture by which to depict them, is not explained.

One final point on the ethnic or racial appearance of Greeks and Romans needs to be made. In the years following the conquests of Alexander there had been a great mixing between the peoples of various parts of the Hellenistic world with the Greeks themselves. Greek language had become the *lingua franca* in the Eastern Mediterranean. However, merely because a person spoke Greek did not mean they were 'ethnically' or 'racially' Greek (whatever these terms may mean). Overall, it would have been very difficult to ascertain the difference between 'native born Greeks' and 'non-Greeks' who happened by this time to speak Greek and lived in an 'Hellenistic' city, let alone between 'Greeks' collectively and 'Romans', who as stated above had extended their citizenship (as the true distinguishing mark between them and others) to non-Latin peoples *including* the Greeks of Southern Italy. This also suggests that by the first century B.C. there would have been little or no ascertainable physiognomic differences that would account for the origins of Roman Republican portraiture.

In analogous terms, the link suggested between Roman 'veristic' portraiture and the Hellenistic 'grotesque' genre - exemplified by works such as the 'drunken old woman' or the collection of works depicting dwarfs and deformed people (Ill. 110)⁷⁹ - is in fact a confusion of substance with form. The two genres are entirely different in their stylistic elements and composition and are completely different in their effect, context and communicational values. They are clearly not related genres, given that it was the facial expression (representing *severitas* and *gravitas*) which was essential to a Roman Republican portrait - not generic images of drunkenness, old age or ugliness. Such iconistic portrayals are more expressive of Greek Physiognomic principles concentrating on the contrast between 'beauty' and its

78 R. R. Holloway, *The archaeology of early Rome and Latium* (London; New York: Routledge, 1994); T. Cornell, *The beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c. 1000-264 BC)*, Routledge history of the ancient world. (London; New York: Routledge, 1995).

79 Such as the dwarfs from the Mahdia shipwreck made of bronze, dating to around 150-100 B.C (Tunis Bardo Museum); the ivory statuette of a hunchback, late second century B.C., British Museum: Pollitt, *Art in the Hellenistic Age*, ill. 148, 49; or the *drunk old woman* in the Munich Glyptothek: Pollitt, *Art in the Hellenistic Age*, ill. 154. See Ill. 110)

opposite, than specific Roman physiognomic values communicating specific elements of an individual's *motus animi*.⁸⁰ That the Romans would not have understood the contextual origins of their portraits had the grotesque genre been its true source seems incredible; that they would have permitted it would be astonishing.

Essentially this raises the question of why the Romans, who were well-educated, sophisticated people who held the military and economic power in the Mediterranean during the second and first centuries B.C. would have lamely adopted a style for portraying themselves which was supposedly based in negative or unflattering perceptions of them – either as barbarians or as grotesques – by a people over whom they held power. The simple answer is that they would not have.⁸¹

10.4 Hellenistic Royal Portraits

As already mentioned, it is claimed that the Roman portrait style was derived from that of the Hellenistic kings.⁸² which was imposed upon them by Greek artists in the late second, early first century B.C. through transference points at Athens and Delos.⁸³ The portraits of certain Hellenistic kings (such as those of 'Euthydemus I' of Bactria, Antiochos III of Syria and some coin portraits of various minor kings) as well as certain late portraits from Athens are cited as proof of this theory.⁸⁴

On a superficial viewing it might appear that there are certain similarities between some Hellenistic Royal images and some Roman Republican portraits. However, the crucial difference between them is that the Roman portraits, even where they may employ certain Hellenistic stylistic elements, bear the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression, whereas the Hellenistic Royal portraits never do; the exceptions being a few portraits of kings who can be

80 See Chapter Three and Appendix Three.

81 Particularly given Roman traditional attitudes to Greeks generally; see pp.121-126 *infra*.

82 O. Vessberg, "Roman Portrait Art," ed. J. N. Madvig, *Acta Congressus Madvigiani Hafniae MDMLIV* (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1957); J. C. Balty, "Groupes statuaire impériaux et privés de l'époque julio-claudienne," in *Ufficiale e Ritratto Privato, Atti della II Conferenza Internazionale sul Ritratto Romano, Roma, 26-30 Settembre 1984*, ed. N. Bonacasa and G. Rizza (Roma: Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Quaderni de "La Ricerca Scientifica", 1988), 35-36.

83 Richter, *Three Critical Periods in Greek Sculpture*; Richter, "Origins of Verism in Roman Portraits," 39-46; and Smith, "Greeks, Foreigners, and Roman Republican Portraits," 24-38.

84 Richter, "Late Hellenistic Portraiture," 45. Cf. the thesis proposed recently by C.B. Rose, who cites 'veristic' style heads from Kedesh in Israel which have been dated according to *bullae* seal impressions to around 200 B.C.: C. B. Rose, "The Origins of Roman 'Veristic' Portraiture: New Evidence from the Excavations at Kedesh (Israel)" (paper presented at the Role Models: Identity and Assimilation in the Roman World and in Early Modern Italy: 17-19 March, American Academy in Rome; British School at Rome, 17 March 2003).

proved were Roman clients, and who frequently bore titles such as *philorhomaioi* or were connected in some way with Roman power for their legitimacy.⁸⁵ Of those Hellenistic royal portraits claimed to be of kings unconnected with Roman power, but said to evidence the Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* style (such as the portraits of Euthydemus I (Ill. 112) and Antiochos III (Ill. 113), a closer examination of these portraits casts doubt on the identification and dates attributed to them. More importantly, an analysis of the broad range of Hellenistic Royal portraits show that they differ from the Roman Republic portraits, not only in form and overall physical appearance, but also in the context and purposes for which they were created.

Despite these facts, it is accepted by many scholars that Roman Republican portraiture evolved from the Hellenistic Royal image.⁸⁶ However, apart from some superficial similarity and some technical borrowings, (and the possible influence from Hellenistic honorary statuary on the context of display and form of bodily representation of Roman honorary and votive statues) that is where I would suggest the similarities between the Hellenistic Royal image and Roman Republican portraits end.⁸⁷

As indicated, the dating and identification of pieces (based largely on stylistic analysis) has been of crucial significance in this debate.⁸⁸ However, the methodology employed to identify and date the Hellenistic Royal portraits has been problematic. First and foremost, the

⁸⁵ For a fuller discussion, see pp. 316-321 *infra*.

⁸⁶ As Smith comments: '[T]hey also assume that, in the second century, as a whole, portraits of Roman Dynasts were modelled on those of Hellenistic kings and are often in fact indistinguishable from diadem-less royal princes. This proposition has become a fully accepted general rule in the modern literature on Greek and Roman art; but as a general rule of which there is not a single documented instance.' R. R. R. Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 125.

⁸⁷ R. R. R. Smith, "Philorhomaioi: Portraits of Roman client rulers in the Greek East in the 1st Century B.C.," in *Ufficiale e Ritratto Privato, Atti della II Conferenza Internazionale sul Ritratto Romano, Roma, 26-30 Settembre 1984*, ed. N. Bonacasa and G. Rizza (Roma: Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Quaderni de "La Ricerca Scientifica", 1988), 493: "The precise beginnings of this portrait image remain unknown and controversial, but its use by Romans can be traced from at least the late 2nd century in sculpture on Delos and through the 1st century on coins and sculpture at Rome, these portrait styles continued in parallel through most of the 1st century. In the later 2nd and 1st centuries, then, Hellenistic royal style and Roman Republican style were quite different; they were in fact radically opposed. There is no evidence that leading Roman dynasts adopted this kind of royal image, as some scholars have asserted."

⁸⁸ Richter concluded that the Greek portraits of Royal Hellenistic individuals in the incipient 'veristic' style were made by Greek artists long before the late Republican period when most of the Roman portraits from Italy have been traditionally dated, the various heads found in Hellenistic sites around the Aegean (including the Delos heads) are cited as proof of this contention: Richter, "Origins of Verism in Roman Portraits," 45.

archaeological database for Hellenistic Royal portraits is extremely limited.⁸⁹ Very few of the bronzes survive; there are some portraits from coin series and a few later marble copies. Those that do survive are mostly disembodied heads without bodies; thus further distorting the evidence.⁹⁰

Hence, the only evidence for identifications remains a few marble copies made, perhaps, centuries after the originals,⁹¹ which are then compared with coin portraits.⁹² From such identifications an attempt has also been made to create a framework for the stylistic development of the Royal portraits - resulting in a circular use of evidence.⁹³ Among these surviving Hellenistic portraits, there is also a great divergence in appearance and styles which further complicates dating and identification.⁹⁴

Ultimately, this means that identifications and dates for many Hellenistic royal images, previously declared to be firm, are in fact merely tentative suggestions and nothing more.

As for arguments proposing a course of stylistic development, or of evolution in the style of the Hellenistic Royal image through to Roman Republican portraiture, or even of creating a stylistic framework for securely dating relevant pieces, the evidence does not support such

89 As R.R.R. Smith noted, if one takes the number of kings of the Hellenistic period from the main Hellenistic kingdoms (only counting main dynasties and smaller ones for which there are coin portraits) between 300-30 B.C., there are approximately 80 kings (not counting 'undiademed' Diadochs, princes, usurpers, etc). There are only approximately 60 coin portraits for this same period. Of diademed portraits (those that securely represent a 'king') there are about 120 pieces. Hence, there are far more kings than can be evidenced either in their coin or marble/bronze portraits.

90 Portraits in the Hellenistic world were (except for those found on herms) nearly always full bodied works: Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 19.

91 In a critique of these methodologies, Smith observes: "Both stand condemned by the too frequent and too wide a divergence in the results they produce by supposedly objective methods. If the same procedure applied by different, honest and accomplished scholars to the same portrait produces confidently ascertained identifications and dates centuries apart, there must be something wrong with the procedure.": Ibid., 3.

92 Ibid.

93 Stylistic analysis is used to confirm a coin date already established, or is used to date the stylistic similarities between a work and a securely dated piece within a 10-20 year period, which thus narrows the field to be examined in order to secure the identification.

94 This suggests strongly that the Hellenistic rulers did not exercise strong central control over the end product of sculptural production; unlike the case, say, of Roman Republican and Imperial portraits. The limited data-base also affects the methodology for dating Hellenistic ruler portraits stylistically. Stylistic dating is formulated on the basis that all portraits and works of art develop *pari passu*. For stylistic analysis to work there needs to be a large body of homogeneous material and a considerable number of examples precisely dated by external means within which to set the undated examples. There are, however, few examples of Hellenistic ruler portraits which are precisely datable. While there may be some more securely dated portraits of philosophers and poets, or more securely dated monuments (such as the friezes of the Great Altar of Pergamon) these do not assist in establishing a secure data base, as these friezes served very different functions and were utilised in a different context than the ruler portraits. They therefore do not convey the same stylistic elements, or the same communicational messages as the ruler portraits - hence any similarity in stylistic elements which suggests a similar chronology may well be illusory.

conclusions. As discussed in Chapter Seven, no head from Delos or any place in the Hellenistic East in the Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* style can be conclusively shown to be earlier than examples from Italy.

One more crucial point is that the theory fails to explain why only *certain* Hellenistic kings adopted the Roman Republican portrait style, while most of those who remained in power (even into the Julio-Claudian period) still largely used the traditional Hellenistic Royal portrait style.

10.4.1 Hellenistic kingship and physiognomic communication

The greatest problem in seeing Hellenistic Royal portraiture as the origins for Roman Republican portraiture lay in the differences in the physiognomic beliefs and the political and social institutions of the Hellenistic kingdoms and the Roman Republic.

In Greek physiognomics⁹⁵ there was a link between what were considered 'good looks' or 'beauty' and a 'good character'. This is evident from as early as the time of Homer, where gods and heroes were constantly referred to as 'καλὸς κ' ἀγαθός' – which is contrasted with the base character and appearance of Thersites who is described as αἰσχρὸς and κακός: Hom. *Il.* 2.210-220.⁹⁶ Furthermore, there was a strong physiognomic concept among the Greeks which manifest itself in popular, general attitudes to handsome people,⁹⁷ and in linking the physical characteristics of barbarian peoples with their respective (un-Greek) characters.⁹⁸ This has its most cogent and developed form in the theories of the physiognomicists themselves, which linked either physical appearance with geography and climate,⁹⁹ or purely in terms of the appearance of the physical body as a manifestation of the general character (and *vice versa*).¹⁰⁰

95 See Appendix 3 for an overview.

96 J. W. Tatum, "The Regal Image in Plutarch's Lives," *JHS* 116 (1996), 136.

97 Plut. *Alc.* 16; Plut. *Pomp.* 2.1

98 E. Hall, *Inventing the barbarian: Greek self-definition through tragedy*, Oxford classical monographs (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 172; J. Jouanna, "Les causes de la défaite des Barbares chez Eschyle, Hérodote et Hippocrate," *Ktema* 6 (1981).

99 Hippoc. *Aer.*; cf. E. C. Evans, "Physiognomics in the Ancient World," *TAPhS* 59.5 (1969), 17; W. Backhaus, "Der Hellenen-Barbaren-Gegensatz und die Hippokratische Schrift *peri aeron hydraton topon*," *Historia* 25 (1976).

100 T. S. Barton, *Power and knowledge: astrology, physiognomics, and medicine under the Roman Empire* (Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press, 1994), 95-131; M. W. Gleason, *Making men: sophists and self-presentation in ancient Rome* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1995), 55; Gal. *Mixt.* 2.6.

To the Greeks portraiture was intended to portray the 'good' character and hence beauty of the individual – a view which is confirmed by Plutarch in his *Life of Cimon* where he stated that "...we believe that a portrait which reveals character and disposition (το ηθος και τον τροπον) is far more beautiful than one which merely copies form and feature..."¹⁰¹ However, whether these elements of character could be represented physiognomically in art seems to have been a debatable point.¹⁰² Plutarch was aware of the limitations of some artists to properly portray the 'true' character. In his *De Fortuna Alexandri* he observed that "Lysippus was the only one who revealed in bronze the *ethos* of Alexander and who at the same time expressed his virtue along with his form".¹⁰³

The Greek view of kings and kingship during the Hellenistic period has been studied extensively.¹⁰⁴ Kingship was the dominant political form of administration in the Greek East for nearly three centuries following Alexander the Great. The reinvention of what monarchy stood for during this time created an opportunity for artists and philosophers to explore the nature of the institution and what constituted the good ruler, and this remained the case even in the Imperial period, as the content of Dio Chrysostom's *Peri Basileias* (περί βασιλείας)

101 Plut. *Cim.* 2.2. See Tatum, "The Regal Image in Plutarch's Lives," 137: "Still, whatever the failings of various artists, the second century of our era was dense with paintings and statuary, coins and gems, all promulgating the likenesses of famous men, especially of past rulers and the current emperor, images which were wrought with the express intention of signifying one or several aspects of the ruler's character and which consequently required deciphering by the multiple constituencies of the viewing public."

102 See *Ibid.*, 136-37: "Physiognomic tendencies had their effect on Greek art as well, though not without some controversy." In Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, Socrates and the painter Parrhasius debate whether it is possible for portraiture to imitate the *ethos* of the soul. Parrhasius rejects this contention by asking: "But how could a thing be represented, Socrates, which has neither symmetry nor colour... and which, in fact, is not even visible?" (Xen. *Mem.* 3.10.3). Yet during the Hellenistic period, artists claimed to employ not simply mimesis but to be able to convey a deeper insight into their subjects' characters, *phantasia* (φαντασία), which transcended mere physical appearance: J. J. Pollitt, *The ancient view of Greek art: criticism, history, and terminology*, Yale publications in the history of art 25 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), 52 and 293. Hence Lysippus' claim that he was able to represent men 'as they appeared', whereas others sculpted them 'as they were': Plin. (E) *HN* 34.65: *ab illis factos quales essent homines, a se quales viderentur esse*; Pollitt, *Art in the Hellenistic age*, 47.

103 Plut. *De Alex. Fort.* 2.2=Mor.335B

104 Tatum, "The Regal Image in Plutarch's Lives," 139-40; E. R. Goodenough, "The political philosophy of Hellenistic kingship," *YCS* 1 (1928); K. Scott, "Plutarch and the ruler cult," *TAPhA* 60 (1929); G. F. Chestnut, "The Ruler and the Logos in Neopythagorean, Middle Platonic, and Late Stoic Political Philosophy," *ANRW* 2, no. 16.2 (1978); A. Henrichs, "Loss of self, suffering, violence. The modern view of Dionysus from Nietzsche to Girard," *HSCP* 88 (1984), 243; S. R. F. Price, *Rituals and power: the Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984); F. W. Walbank, "Monarchies and Monarchic Ideas," in *CAH*, ed. F. W. Walbank, et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984); Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 49; S. M. Sherwin-White and A. Kuhrt, *From Samarkand to Sardis: a new approach to the Seleucid Empire, Hellenistic culture and society* 13 (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1993), 113-40; K. Bringman, "The King as Benefactor: Some Remarks on Ideal Kingship in the Age of Hellenism," in *Images and Ideologies: Self-definition in the Hellenistic World*, ed. A. Bulloch, et al., *Hellenistic Culture and Society* (Berkeley; London: University of California Press, 1993); L. Koenen, "The Ptolemaic King as a Religious Figure," in *Images and Ideologies: Self-definition in the Hellenistic World*, ed. A. Bulloch, et al., *Hellenistic Culture and Society* (Berkeley; London: University of California Press, 1993).

demonstrate (Dio Chrys. *Or.* i-iv). Under the influence of the philosophers and the physiognomicists the physical appearance of the king's image became an important tool for communicating the legitimacy and moral standing of the monarch.

While the Royal portrait image could give the king a recognizable 'individuality' (whether based on his actual physiognomy or not), this was not the portrait's primary purpose. The real purpose was to convey visual messages concerning kingship: i.e., the role, duties and power of a βασιλεύς, not information about his individual personality or character.¹⁰⁵ The Royal portrait visually presented the king in a manner which he himself wished to be seen, but also in a way that the viewer would wish to see him. The king's image particularly served to 'heroize' the individual ruler - relying on common physiognomic principles which were widely understood by the Greek viewer.¹⁰⁶

There are many references in Greek literature from the time of the fourth century B.C. as to best type of king. The sources state that a good king must possess every excellence; he should thus be superior in bodily appearance, like Isocrates' Evagoras¹⁰⁷ or the ideal king described by the neo-Pythagorean, Diotogenes.¹⁰⁸ Linked with this is the king's military capacity - something considered crucial to his success. Consequently, an imposing physique which evoked awe, even fear, became the expectation of the 'good king' both in the (explicit) opinion of intellectuals and in the view of ordinary subjects (see Ill. 114, the 'Therme Ruler' which is an excellent example).¹⁰⁹ 'Justice' however, was considered to be the universally recognized, overriding virtue. This is made clear in Plutarch's fragmentary *Ad Principem Ineruditum*,¹¹⁰ where it is said that the good king must be the 'living *logos*' (ἐμψυχός λογός)¹¹¹ and the champion of justice.¹¹² This is an interesting comment, as it suggests that

105 Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 1.

106 Balty, "Groupes statuaires imperiaux et privés de l'époque julio-claudienne," 32-33: «La deuxième moitié du IV^e siècle allait connaître, avec la naissance des principales monarchies hellénistiques, un très net et rapide développement des groupes statuaires, lié aux différentes manifestations du culte du souverain et notamment au culte dynastique. Deux formules ont alors la faveur des dedicants: celle qui associe, en un même hommage, les différents membres d'une même famille à un moment donné (synchronie) et celle qui les insère dans une sorte d'arbre généalogique, dans une perspective chronologique plus longue (diachronie).»

107 Isoc. *Ev.* 22-23.

108 On 'justice' as an essential virtue of a king, see: Goodenough, "The political philosophy of Hellenistic kingship," 57-59; Wallbank, "Monarchies and Monarchic Ideas," 82; On Diotogenes, see Chestnut, "The Ruler and the Logos in Neopythagorean, Middle Platonic, and Late Stoic Political Philosophy," 1313.

109 See however the interesting suggestion that it in fact represents a Roman general: Papini, *Antichi volti della Repubblica* 2004, 439-441

110 Plut. *Mor.* 779D ff.

111 Plut. *Princ. Iner.* 3 = *Mor.* 780C.

the artist's role was to convey the king's appropriate values through his image, but simultaneously the king, by conforming his character to these ideals, will come to physically project these values physically in the same way a statue should.

These psychological aspects of the king's character can be inferred clearly from the physiognomic appearance of extant royal portraits in sculpture and on coinage. The typical artistic representation of the Hellenistic king is frequently youthful, vigorous, strikingly handsome, and adorned with heroic and even divine attributes (Ills. 114 and 115).¹¹³ It mattered little how old the king was when the image was made or what he may have actually looked like, the essential thing was that his image should conform to these expectations. Diotegenes confirms this explicitly.¹¹⁴ Indeed, the Greek sources even go so far as to suggest that a particular individual could be deemed worthy of kingship due to his physical appearance alone.¹¹⁵

The ideal king, then, ought in principle to incorporate these virtues, for reasons both philosophic and practical, which will (or should) be projected through his physiognomic appearance and in representations of him.¹¹⁶ That the king's image served as a tool of propaganda was widely recognised by the Greeks themselves. Even if a king's portrait physiognomically conveyed the requisite values, there was an awareness that one had to be careful as to how far one could trust the image to accurately represent the values which the

112 Plut. *Princ. Iner.* 3 = Mor. 780 E: "Now justice is the aim and the end of law, and law is the work of the ruler, and the ruler is the image of god who orders all things. Such a ruler needs no Pheidias nor Plycleitus nor Myron to model him, but by his virtue he forms himself in the likeness of god and thus creates a statue most delightful of all to behold and most worthy of divinity."

113 Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 46.

114 Diotegenes *apud* Strob. *Anth.* iv 7.62 = 266. [Hense]; trans. E.R. Goodenough in Goodenough, "The political philosophy of Hellenistic kingship," 71: "...besides issuing public decrees the good king should present to the state proper attitudes in the body and mind. He should impersonate the statesman and have an appearance of practicality so as not to seem to the mob as either harsh or despicable, but at once pleasant and yet watchful from every angle. And he will succeed in this if first he make an impression of majesty by his appearance and utterances, and by his looking the part of a ruler; if secondly, he be gracious both in conversation and appearance, and in actual benefactions; and third, if he inspire fear in his subjects by his hatred of evil and by his punishments, by his speed of action and in general by his skill and industry in kingly duties. For majesty, a godlike thing, can make him admired and honoured by the multitude; graciousness will make him popular and beloved; while the ability to inspire fear will make him terrible and unconquerable in his dealings with enemies, but magnanimous and trustworthy toward his friends. ... He must wrap himself about with such distinction and superiority in his appearance, in his thought life and reflections, and in the character of his souls, as well as in the actions, movements, and attitudes of his body. So will he succeed in putting into order those who look upon him, amazed at his majesty, at his self-control, and his fitness for distinction. For to look upon the good king ought to affect the souls of those who see him no less than a flute or harmony."

115 For instance, it is reported that Antiochus III judged Demetrius, the son of Euthydemus I of Bactria, worthy of being a king on account of his appearance, demeanour, and bearing: Polyb. 11.39; also 27.12; 30.18; 26.15. Interestingly the coin image of Demetrius I looks far from this idealized description.

116 Tatum, "The Regal Image in Plutarch's Lives," 140-41.

king possessed as a person. This admonition is stated by the sources where less skilled sculptors are accused of mistaking the external signs of dignity and majesty for their substance,¹¹⁷ or when certain kings have themselves represented in painting and sculpture with the attributes of the gods without possessing the requisite virtues in reality.¹¹⁸

The physiognomic messages thus conveyed by the image of the Hellenistic king were fundamentally different to the status, role, and ethics of the Roman *nobilis* during the Republican period as demonstrated in previous chapters. When one considers examples of Hellenistic Royal portraits compared with examples of Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* style portraiture just how entirely different the genres are in terms of their communicational imagery becomes manifest.

10.5 The contexts of display of Hellenistic Royal images

10.5.1 Statues

A further argument for rejecting Hellenistic Royal portraits as the source for the Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* portrait style is perhaps to be found in the purpose and context of display of the kings' portraits. These portraits, which date from the late third/early second centuries B.C. to the end of the first century B.C., catered to the needs of the successor rulers after Alexander the Great.¹¹⁹ These successor kings and dynasts became the greatest patrons of public works for most of this period, in the process creating dedications to themselves (or becoming the subject of civic dedications) in bronze and marble in sanctuaries, shrines, cities and citadels. Of the honorific statues that were dedicated during this period, most were in honour of the kings.¹²⁰

The Hellenistic Royal images had two main purposes: honorific and cult. They were made from a full range of materials, though most frequently in bronze - these being described as 'εἰκὼν χαλκῇ'. Statues were referred to generally by the words ἀγάλμα or ἀνδριάς or 'εἰκὼν', the former originally indicating a statue of a god (either cult or temple dedication) while

117 Plut. *Princ. Iner.* 2 = Mor. 779F

118 As Tatum observes: "The image if the true king resides not in bronze or marble, but in action, in the execution of justice. This view of monarchy conforms with Plutarch's general concern with ethos and its proper development. Excellence lies in good character, which is in Plutarch's view only observable in the making of proper choices, in the performance of right actions.": Tatum, "The Regal Image in Plutarch's Lives," 150.

119 See Appendix 3 - 7. Physiognomics and Hellenistic Royal Portraiture.

120 Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 3.

ανδριάς usually indicated a statue of a man.¹²¹ The Hellenistic kings blurred these distinctions because they were mortal men who could be worshipped as divine. Hence, the royal cult images (and even other dedicatory statues depending on the circumstances) can be described as 'αγάλματα' or 'εικόνες'. By the Roman period the usage was becoming less precise - and indeed it was not really fixed even in the Classical period; although the predominant usage would support the basic distinction as noted above.¹²² The distinction becomes clearer when we look at decrees ordering an 'αγάλμα' for a king in a temple, but an 'εικόν' in a public place like the *agora*.¹²³

The history of the Hellenistic honorary portrait statue is mirrored in the development of the city-states themselves.¹²⁴ They are virtually unknown in the fifth century B.C., except say for the statues of Harmodius and Aristogeiton which are cited as being the first by Pliny (E) - however, these were set up after these men were dead and hence could be seen as votive or cult statues.¹²⁵ They are still fairly rare in the fourth century B.C., the first real public portraits set up at Athens being those of King Evagoras of Cyprus and Konon in 390 B.C. following the battle of Knidos in 394 B.C.¹²⁶ Throughout this period honorific statues at Athens tended to be for successful generals or dead heroes from the city's past. Honorary statues only become common in the Hellenistic Age. As Smith notes even in the period of the Hellenistic kings honorary statues were not set up prodigally.¹²⁷ Interestingly, Pliny (E) suggests a similar chronology for honorary statues at Rome - although with a different intention.

121 The distinction between the two types is sometimes subtle and there is a great deal of confusion as to which type a statue was actually meant to be. It appears that in the earlier classical period the word 'αγάλμα' meant "that wherein one delights, a glory, delight, or ornament"; hence, a pleasing gift, especially for the gods. Later it came to mean a statue or image of a god as an object of worship, and later still it came to be used of any statue or image: H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *An intermediate Greek-English lexicon: founded upon the seventh edition of Liddell and Scott's Greek-English lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983). The word is used from an early date: J. Boardman, *Greek sculpture: the Archaic period: a handbook* (London: Thames And Hudson, 1978), fig. 97, 95, 103, 41. On the other hand 'ανδριάς' comes from the root word 'ανδρ-' (ανήρ/άνδρo) - meaning 'a man', and hence the word specifically denoted 'a statue or image of a man'. It is also used from an early period: Boardman, *Greek sculpture: the Archaic period: a handbook*, fig. 60. The third word 'εικόν' meant 'likeness' or 'image' and refers to a quality of representation. An 'εικόν' could therefore be a painting, sculpture or bronze. 'αγάλμα' came to mean 'statue' in the Classical period onwards. Of course the difference between the words is one of the type of representation and its intended purpose, and not necessarily a distinction of material.

122 As with the portraits of kings, throughout the Classical and Hellenistic periods the words 'αγάλματα' and 'εικόνες' were used interchangeably, with images of the gods also being referred to as 'εικόνες': OGIS 382.47, OGIS 383.26.

123 OGIS 332.5-13.

124 Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 17.

125 Pliny NH 34.17.

126 Demosthenes 20.70.

127 "For example, during its independence, the island of Delos, in its multitudinous honorific decrees awarded less than two statues per 100 decrees." Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 17.

With the appearance of the Hellenistic kings, the political and social environment altered. The kings brought with them a new centralised form of power on which the city states (though nominally independent) were becoming increasingly reliant: and this is reflected in the increase in honorary statues dedicated to the kings themselves, their relatives, and friends, as well as statues of those wealthy individuals in these cities for whom the Hellenistic kingdoms had presented increased opportunities for wealth and power. Later as the kings influence began to decline, it is honorary statues of Romans and wealthy local individuals that step in to fill the vacuum - since they now held the power (and money) on which these cities were becoming dependent. The statues and dedications at Delos are an instance.

The inscriptions of statues dedicated to the Hellenistic monarchs convey much information concerning the reasons for such dedications of honorary statues of the kings and their dependents. For example, they are often dedicated in terms of the king's 'εὐνοία' ('kindness' or 'goodwill') to that particular town, or indicate their anticipation of future favours "so that the people might be seen to be well-disposed towards the King".¹²⁸ Decrees for statues of the kings often stipulate that the statue is to be set up in the theatre or agora or 'ὅν τ' ἐπιφανέσσι τοῖσι' ('in the most distinguished place'), and a small committee of two or three was established to oversee the manufacture or erection of the work. Usually little more is said except maybe what form the statue is take, for example 'εἰκὼν ὑποπληγής';¹²⁹ one prescribes a standing full armoured statue of the king¹³⁰ and more rarely the word 'τέλειος' ('full-grown', 'life-size') is added.¹³¹

The decrees and dedications thus reveal a clear link between the benefaction (or hoped for benefaction) and the dedication of the statue, and this is usually mentioned in the decree which is set up on a stele nearby or forms the introduction to the decree. Once established in such a prominent place the Royal portrait statue proclaimed the relationship between the king and the city concerned. In this context, changed political circumstances produced not only

128 OGIS 216.16: Antiochos I Ilion.

129 H. B. Siedentopf, *Das hellenistische Reiterdenkmal* (Enlarged edition of the author's thesis: Tübingen 1964, Stiffland-Verlag, 1968), 83.

130 IvP 244 = OGIS εἰκὼν 332.

131 OGIS 270.7.

new statues but necessitated the removal of old ones.¹³²

A similar motivation seems to have underlined the practice at Rome, at least by the late Republican period; but unlike the dependence of the relationship between king and subject in the Hellenistic kingdoms, the dedication of honorary statues at Rome reflected the notions of *clientela* and *amicitia* (political allegiance) within the *nobiles* class.¹³³ In relation to honorary statues dedicated by the Roman state, the individual portrayed was placed firmly within the expectations of the *nobiles* power structure, and the image would have communicated the mutual nature of the relationship based on the values of *fides*, *severitas* and *gravitas*.

The other common form of Hellenistic Royal statues were cult statues - and these were either established on the initiative of the city concerned or were part of the official cult set up by the kings themselves. These cult statues can be viewed in purely political terms but they can also be seen as bridging the gap between the gods who protect the city and its fortunes in the person of the king (whose military power was a far more cogent form of power that could harm or benefit the city). Hence, establishing a Royal cult or dedicating a Royal portrait in the shrine of another god was an outward manifestation of true allegiance. The cult statue of the kings were very public; they could be placed in their own sacred *temenos*, or in a public

132 Such as Demetrios of Phaleron *OGIS* 1437-41; Philip V and the Antigonids at Athens in 199 B.C.: Livy *AUC* 31.44.4; Ptolemy VIII or IX at Alexandria, Justin 38.8.12. Just how potent a symbol of political relationship these statues were can be seen in the incident about the establishment, removal, then resetting up of the statues of Eumenes II - first established in the Peloponnesos in 192 B.C. by the Achaean League in return for military aid provided in their war against Nabis of Sparta. In the 170's B.C. due to a more pro-Macedonian sentiment among the Achaeans an anti-Roman stance was taking shape; so that in 172 B.C. the Achaeans voted to remove the king's 'illegal' statues - but after 170 B.C., despite mediation by Rhodes, they actually removed all the king's statues. In 169 B.C. after the Achaeans reaffirmed their loyalty to Rome, the statues of Eumenes II were restored (Polyb. 28.7 and 28.12.7). This fact discloses a highly political context imparted to the Royal images. As Smith notes this debate in the Achaean league as recounted by Polybios, was not about statues, it was about politics. See Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 128: "In autumn 170 B.C. the statues debate was not really about statues but about foreign policy. The debate on support for Rome went cautiously; the ensuing statues debate was seemingly much longer and more heated, but it was merely a continuation or re-enactment of the policy debate. Warm opposition to Rome could be safely expressed in relation to Eumenes statues. The final decision to restore all his honours symbolised and completed the announcement that the Achaeans were on the right side."

133 For an in-depth study of economic aspects of *clientela* and *amicitia* in the late Republic see K. Verboven, *The Economy of Friends. Economic Aspects of Amicitia and Patronage in the Late Republic* (Brussels: Latomus, 2002), 16 and 226. For in depth studies concerning the benefits of obtained from *clientela* and *amicitia*, see A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Patronage in Ancient Society, Leicester-Nottingham studies in ancient society* (London; New York: Routledge, 1989).

building or even in the temple of another god.¹³⁴ On the contrary, portrait statues of Romans dedicated in temples or shrines were *never* (in the Republican period) the subject of divine attributes or cult worship.

Apart from actual stylistic and physiognomic differences in the style of Hellenistic Royal portraits and the *severitas/gravitas* style of Roman Republican portraiture there are considerable generic differences which have been already outlined: particularly with reference to their external form, context and use. This also extends to the differences in physiognomic messages that Greeks and Romans read into their portrait works and makes them fundamentally different.

As stated the king stood in a position between men and gods and as Smith notes:

"portrait statues with their easy implicit or explicit evocation of the divine offered a flexible range of possibilities for nuanced expression of the kings status"¹³⁵

The statues of Hellenistic kings were conceived of as a whole, and not like Roman *imagines* where the head was almost an element disjoined from the body. There are a few examples of portrayals of Hellenistic kings which reveal the full paraphernalia and detail which accompanied a portrait, such as inscriptions, dedications, setting and other details which are hinted at from the portraits of the kings from coins and gems but which are no longer present in the surviving statues.

It would appear that the standing figure was by far the most common type - and as said above

134 Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 17. "...the promotion and worship of uniquely powerful rulers to fulfil a particular function (the temporal protection of the city) is more comprehensible. After Homer the mental construction of the anthropomorphic divine world had been carried on chiefly by images, and especially statues. And since...statues of kings could be made to evoke convincingly familiar godlike qualities, they were no doubt important elements in bridging the plausibility gap between the gods and mortal kings - in making the ruler cult 'credible' as we would say." An example of this relationship can be seen from a decree from Teos establishing two 'αγαλματα' next to the 'αγαλματα' of Dionysios which were to be 'as beautiful and as reverend as possible', as well as an 'αγαλματα' in the council house. This decree has a very detailed description of the cult that was to be established to serve it. This was in gratitude for the King's grant of privileges to the city in 204/3 B.C. The decree reveals the central role of the king in the form of his images at the core of the religious and civic life of the city. The distinctive role of the statue as an 'αγαλμα' is more clearly seen in the decree from Pergamon of the Pergamene Demos and Boule for Attalos II in response for some unknown victory: included in the honours was an 'αγαλμα' wearing armour to be consecrated in the Temple of Asklepios Soter and an equestrian 'εικόν' to be set up on a marble column by the altar of Zeus. The 'αγαλμα' is to be inscribed with the words 'for the king's virtue, courage in war, and defeat of the enemy'; whilst the 'εικόν' was to be for his 'virtue, care in prospering the state, and munificence towards the demos'. The 'αγαλμα' is therefore for the king as 'σωτήρ' of the state, the 'εικόν' is for his civic benefactions.

135 Ibid., 132.

the dedicatory inscriptions or decrees rarely state what form the statue was to take - except sometimes stating whether it was to be an equestrian work. Most frequently these works would be completely nude or wearing a *chlamys* and standing in a classical pose. They frequently held a spear, sword, or sceptre. A common posture was leaning on a spear held in the raised right hand. Sometimes the king was depicted leaning forward with one foot raised in support (Ill. 114).¹³⁶ For images of kings wearing armour there is epigraphic evidence as well as some fragments of figures and small statuettes. The same holds true for equestrian statues.

As for the naked portraits, both athletes and gods had long been depicted as naked so that straightforwardly there can have been no immediate pretension to divine imagery (as opposed to heroizing imagery) in such a depiction. However, it could have been associated with kingship in the Hellenistic period, more so since there is evidence that there existed a type of naked ruler statue leaning on a spear which had its prototype in a portrait statue of Alexander (Ill. 114).

What is noticeable is the lack of 'civilian' statues of Hellenistic kings. This contrast with the civilian *togatus* statues of Romans in the Republican period – which continued as a favoured mode of representation in the Imperial period even for Emperors.¹³⁷

In contrast to the Roman Republican portraits, the political and social messages that such statues of the king imparted to their viewers would have been immediately obvious. And herein lay the reason for the style of the Hellenistic kings' portraits - i.e, it was necessary that the image of the king should convey political and social messages determined to a large degree by general physiognomic principles as outlined above and in Appendix 2, especially the philosophical principles as to what constituted a good ruler reflected in the good looks and physiognomy of the ruler himself.

10.5.2 Coin portraits

Images of Hellenistic kings on coins also had a very different purpose to the portraits on Roman coins. Coins are perhaps the most useful means of conveying messages about the ruler to as wide an audience as possible. Because of this, the Hellenistic ruler coins served a

¹³⁶ Such as the bronze 'Terme Ruler', Museo Nazionale Romano - Terme di Diocleziano, Rome (Ill. 114).

¹³⁷ Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 33.

widespread legitimizing and publicity function, which was tangential to the function of Royal statues described above. Therefore, that there is no great correlation between the two forms of portraits should not be surprising.¹³⁸

In the Classical period, coinage of Greek city states usually depicted the patron deity image on the obverse with a reverse city legend.¹³⁹ After Alexander's death the Successors did not immediately put their heads on coins - except for Ptolemy I who was keen from the start to assert his legitimacy as King of Egypt.¹⁴⁰ The Diadochs only commenced using their own heads after the attempts at a unified empire were finally abandoned in 306/5 B.C. By this time, some of the Diadochs had already started to receive divine honours in certain Greek cities - which may have made it more acceptable for them to do so. The placing of the king's portrait on a coin naturally draws an analogy with the images of deities which had traditionally appeared on Greek coinage. This in itself is a strong statement of the king's status as βασιλεύς and his divine pretensions.

This is very different to the purpose of the Roman Republican coin portraits which appear only from the middle of the first century B.C. and are always for the purpose of advertising and aggrandising a deceased ancestor in political and social terms within the *nobiles* culture at Rome. Roman Republican coins *never* depict the head of a living person, and most definitely did not make any statements of divine pretensions for the person presented. By placing the likeness of a deceased *nobilis* on the coinage, there is a direct attempt to align the portrayed's living heirs with the *maiores*, ancestral custom (*mos*) and the *res publica* itself - and this was done through the profiled depiction of the values of *severitas* and *gravitas*.

As noted, Ptolemy I was the first to issue coins bearing his own portrait - and by so doing he affirmed the independence of Egypt.¹⁴¹ Other Diadochs, such as Seleukos I, continued to put Alexander on the coinage.¹⁴² In Macedonia the traditional Greek model remained used by Kassander, but Lysimachos later minted heads bearing Alexander's portrait.¹⁴³ The Dynast Philetairos of Pergamon used the same head of Alexander as that used in Macedonia, but after

138 As Smith points out: "Statues were used to concretise a whole range of social, political and religious interests, where we have quite another usually more pragmatic mechanism." *Ibid.*, 15.

139 *Ibid.*, 12.

140 Particularly his issue of coins dating to before 318 B.C. see C. M. Kraay and M. Hirmer, *Greek coins* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1966), pl. 74.1 No.796.

141 Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, pls. 74.8 75.1-2.

142 *Ibid.*, pl. 74.4.

143 *Ibid.*, pl. 74.5-6.

the battle of Kourupedion in 281 B.C. he used the head of Seleukos instead. Interestingly, the Antigonid Kings of Macedonia did not generally use their portraits on their coins, but followed traditional Greek practice (except for Poliorketes) until the reign of Philip V.¹⁴⁴

Later two patterns emerged in coin portraits which the successor Kings followed. The first was that of the Ptolemies who used the head of Ptolemy I on silver coinage until the end of the dynasty (with the exceptions of some minor coin issues which had portraits of later kings). The second was the pattern of the Seleukids who used the successive portraits of their kings on their coins.¹⁴⁵ An interesting parallel to note is that when Pergamon became independent its kings, too, used the head of their founder Philetairos on their coins down to the end of the dynasty (262 - 133 B.C.). In the rest of Anatolia and eastern Asia all the successor kingdoms (except the Attalids) followed the Seleukid example: Bithynia, Cappadocia, Pontus, and Bactria and later also the non-Greek kingdoms such as Parthia and some minor Iranian Dynasties. The reasons for this may have its causes in issues surrounding the political stability of these regimes, as pointed out by Smith.¹⁴⁶ As a result of the legitimising and propaganda value of the kings' image on the coinage, one of the first things a pretender or usurper would do was to issue their own Royal portrait coins. It is notable that the images on the coins of the Hellenistic kings generally represent the youthful and vigorous aspect of the king consonant with the ideas of kingship already noted, such as the examples depicting Seleukos II, Antiochos I and III, and Ptolemy I (Ills. 115.1-4).

10.6 Portraits of other Hellenistic monarchs

Of particular importance in discussing the relationship between Hellenistic Royal portraits and the Roman Republican portraiture are those of certain Hellenistic rulers which are claimed to indicate the development of the genre. Of particular note are the images of

144 The retention of standard Greek practise was most probably for reasons diametrically opposite those of the other successor kingdoms. In Macedonia, kingship had a long tradition and hence there was no deep seated 'crisis of legitimacy' with which the other Diadochs and Successors had to contend, nor was there a compelling need for these kings to assert their individual identities and their independence.

145 However, the Ptolemaic insistence on a standard weight coin (different from the Attic standard weight) bearing the standard portrait of Ptolemy made it an easily recognisable currency throughout the Eastern Mediterranean - which must have had important ramifications for the Egyptian economy. Because of its popularity and because of its stable value, it also served as a powerful tool of propaganda for legitimizing the dynasty through the reign of successive kings throughout the whole region.

146 Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 13-14: "Firstly these kingdoms were plagued by a lack of dynastic stability - both imagined and real - and to put it simply, if the issuing of coins showed that the royal government was functioning the royal portrait head showed which king was running it... and secondly, since one of the main functions of these coinages must have been to pay soldiers, it would be desirable for the money to bear the image of the army's specific paymaster or supreme commander"

Antiochos III of the Seleukid Kingdom (223-187 B.C.), Ariarthes III of Cappadocia (235-220 B.C.), Mithridates III of Pontus (220-185 B.C.), Pharnakos I of Pontus (185-169 B.C.), as well as those of Euthydemos of Bactria (235-200 B.C.), Antimachos of Bactria (210 B.C.), Eukratides of Bactria (180-150 B.C.), and Heliokles of Bactria (after 150 B.C.).

The date of these coins is adduced as further evidence that the 'veristic' images of Hellenistic Kings predate the use of the style by the Romans by almost one hundred years.¹⁴⁷ Evidently, Richter's description of the Hellenistic Royal portraits is based wholly on physiognomic perceptions.¹⁴⁸

Particularly emphasise has been placed on the portrait of 'Euthydemos I of Bactria': especially the so-called Torlonia 'Euthydemos' head in the Villa Albani, Rome, (Ill. 112) for proof that the Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* style originated with the Hellenistic kings.¹⁴⁹ This piece has long been held to be a precisely identified and dated head of Euthydemos I of Bactria. The head portrays an older man with a fat, wrinkled face, small eyes and wearing a broad rimmed hat. As Smith observes, it is quite unlike any royal Hellenistic portrait.¹⁵⁰

In relation to this issue, the first important observation is that the piece has no exact provenance, other than that it was found in Italy. It differs markedly from other Hellenistic Royal portraits which tend to emphasise the youthfulness and power of the king in a more idealised way. There is the added problem that the head is not wearing a royal diadem – the usual identifier of Hellenistic kings. When one compares the portrait with the image of Euthydemos I on coins, a certain resemblance, especially in the down turned mouth, the chin shape, and the age-line on the cheek, is apparent (Ill. 116.1-5). However, the coin portraits do

147 Richter, "Late Hellenistic Portraiture," 25: "...for a comprehensive study of Greek portraits of the second and first centuries B.C. - both preceding and contemporary with Roman Republican portraiture - one encounters realistic likenesses that clearly presage the Roman 'veristic' masterpieces. I refer particularly to the heads of the Hellenistic rulers that occur on the coinage minted by them during these two centuries."

148 Ibid.: "Some of the men represented in these illustrations...are well known historically; of others we have hardly any information except what can be gleaned from these portraits. All are arresting likeness of men of affairs - of the able, resolute sometimes unscrupulous and self indulgent princes who for three centuries ruled the separate kingdoms of Alexander's far flung Eastern empire. Most of these men, at least the earlier ones, were of pure Macedonian-Greek stock, though as time went on, their blood was doubtless tinged with Eastern intrusions"

149 no.133: marble, H.34cm. Villa Albani. P.C. Bol, ed. *Forschungen zur Villa Albani. Katalog der antiken Bildwerke I-III* (Berlin 1988-1992)

150 Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, Appendix IV. The suggestion that it was Euthydemos I of Bactria was first made by J.P. Six in 1894 on the basis of comparison with several variable coin portraits of that king. All commentators have accepted this identification apart from Helga Von Heintze, who suggested that the head is made from Luna marble and is in fact better dated to the first century B.C., and represents a Roman Republican commander. G. Lahusen is the only other scholar to have accepted this view, although it was firmly rejected by P. Zanker.

not show the king to be nearly so old, whilst the nose is of a completely different shape - the coin portraits have a convex nose profile, whilst the stone head has a concave nose profile which turns up at the tip.¹⁵¹ Thus the correlation between the head and the coin portraits is not certain. At the very least, if they represent the same person, then they were not taken from the same original. It should also be noted that even among the Bactrian coin portraits, the image of Euthydemos I is quite unusual.¹⁵²

As noted by von Heintze, the Torlonia head is of Luna marble, thus (if the provenance she gives to the marble is correct) this indicates that it must be a copy made in Italy. Just how the Romans would have come by a portrait of Euthydemos I is uncertain. There is no sanctuary in the Roman geographic sphere of influence or area where a Roman would visit frequently enough that is known to have contained portraits of the Bactrian kings. It would be extremely unlikely that a portrait of Euthydemos would have been able to make its way to Rome from Bactria, and it would have been even more remarkable had a Roman patron wanted to commission a copy of such a portrait.

It is more likely that the 'striking' similarities identified between the face and the coin portraits are illusional. In fact, the statue looks more like the second type of Pompey portraits (like the Pompey-Janus types) or perhaps it represents the Roman general, Lucullus. Another suggestion is that it could be a Roman client king of the first century B.C.

Furthermore, in relation to Roman portraiture, when the image of Euthydemos is examined, although it has generic similarities to Roman Republican portraiture, it has only faintly what I have described as the *severitas/gravitas* expression. The face is heavily lined, and there are two short vertical lines rising at the beginning of the eyebrows on either side of the nose bridge, which may indicate a contraction of the eyebrows. Interestingly while the mouth turns down, the face as a whole appears almost expressionless - and this may indicate that it is an image of an older man, and nothing potentially more in physiognomic terms. Given these observations, it could represent a Hellenistic ruler within Rome's sphere of influence who was referring to the Roman style of portraiture - but from where and of whom, precisely, I would not venture to guess. Perhaps Heintze's suggestion is correct, that it in fact represents a Hellenised version of a Roman general - or even a Hellenised portrait of Pompey.

151 Ibid.

152 Ibid.

Accordingly, the head can tell us nothing concerning the origins of the style of Roman Republican portraiture.

Regarding Royal coins from Bactria, these date from 250 - 130 B.C. and in India to the mid-first century B.C. They represent a series of nearly 40 kings about whom there are very little surviving written documents (Ill. 117). They stand out particularly from the mainstream and more usual depiction of Hellenistic kings - though not as much as the Pontic coins (Mithridates III to IV) (Ill. 118).¹⁵³ Most of the Bactrian kings are depicted as being quite mature. They also unusually have quite close cut short hairstyles.

It is true that these portraits from the Greek East do not follow the typical portrayal of Hellenistic kings. Yet, when examined as a whole, these portraits still appear to convey elements of Hellenistic monarchy, but a different aspect of it,¹⁵⁴ most obviously the military side. This is reflected on the coins (unlike other Hellenistic king portraits) by the appearance of cuirasses, spears, elephant's head helmets and cavalry helmets. The Bactrian Kingdom, more isolated from the Greek heartlands, had to fight more aggressively for its survival - and this may also account for the need for the king to be more recognisable and to emphasise the military aspect of the king's position. The image may first have been established by Antiochos I who governed Bactria as co-regent from 293-281 B.C. It may then have been taken over by Diodotus I who was quite old when he became king, and then kept by Euthydemus I (Ills. 116-117). Whatever the origins of the style, the Bactrian Royal portraits are unique and are most unlikely to have influenced portraits styles further to the west.¹⁵⁵

The portrait identified as Antiochos III (227-183 B.C.) has also been claimed as evidence that the *severitas/gravitas* style of Roman Republican portraits originated with the portraits of the Hellenistic Kings (Ill. 113). What is striking about the identification, is that the coin portraits of the king are all in the Hellenistic pathos formula usually for depicting the Hellenistic monarchs - and these bear little or no semblance to the portrait head in question (Ill. 115.3). The head is depicted as wearing a tubular diadem - denoting that it represents a Hellenistic ruler - and interestingly, while the features of the face are softly modelled, the composition of

153 Ibid., 113: "[M]ost are strongly realistic, though not in the rather bucolic and 'foreign' Pontic manner...the generally combine a sharp individuality with a strong expression of martial determination (*deinotes*)"

154 Ibid., pl. 14.

155 Ibid., 114: "[T]he distinctive, short-haired, hard faced image continued unaffected by, and without affecting, portrait styles to the west. From this point of view, these portraits well express the political and historical isolation of the Greco-Bactrian kings."

the face does suggest the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression.¹⁵⁶ There is a slight downturn of the mouth line, the mouth is drawn closed, and there are softly modelled forehead creases which dip slightly in over the nose bridge, which is demarcated by a softly polished diagonally drawn fold lines. There is also the hint of crows feet at the corners of the eyes. The face also appears slightly older than that which is usual for the portraits of Hellenistic kings.

Given these indicators, I would suggest that the portrait does not represent Antiochos III – but some other Hellenistic monarch whose identity must remain unknown. I would suggest that it is a monarch who is influenced by Roman portrait imagery – and appears to have been consciously hinting at the Roman *severitas/gravitas* style for political reasons that can only be conjectured.

10.7 Portraits of Hellenistic kings in the ‘Republican Style’

There are a series of other coin and sculpted portraits which bear a strong resemblance to the Roman Republican portraits mentioned but obviously portray Hellenistic kings or potentates. These portraits, while possessing Hellenistic elements, do not on the whole follow prevailing Hellenistic Royal iconography or style.¹⁵⁷ However, I would propose that they use the Roman Republican portrait style through conscious choice for political reasons.

There is an earlier coin portrait of a King of Illyria, Ballaeus (167-135 B.C.) also in the Roman portrait style, in stark contrast to those of his predecessor Genthios (180-169 B.C.).¹⁵⁸ Genthios’ portrait is in the typical Hellenistic portrait style. He sided with Perseos of Macedon against Rome and was defeated by the Praetor, L. Anicius Gallus and was deported to Rome. His son, Ballaeus, was then installed as king under Roman protection. This may easily suggest why Ballaeus adopted the Roman *severitas/gravitas* style for his portrait, as he was clearly a Roman *cliens* dependent on Roman power.

The most obvious example are the coin portraits from Cappadocia belonging to the period

¹⁵⁶ It has also been suggested that the head resembles the portraits of the priests of Isis, such as that found at Athens: Ill.91. However, the format of the ‘Antiochos’ head scarcely resembles that of the Isis priests; see discussion in Appendix 5.

¹⁵⁷ Richter, “Late Hellenistic Portraiture,” 44–45. “The portraits on these coins and gems bring before us personages who had not the familiar Greek physiognomies. They show us the beginnings of a veristic style, introduced by Greek artists when faced with the novel task of portraying new types – those of Roman officials living in Greek lands and those of the princes in the Asian principalities.”

¹⁵⁸ See Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits*, 105, ill. 77–78.

following 95 B.C., particularly that of Ariobarzanes I.¹⁵⁹ The portrait on this drachma is difficult to equate with the Roman Republican portrait style because it is in profile (Ill. 119.1-3).¹⁶⁰ It can be stated that the king's mouth is down turned at the corner, he also has hollowed cheeks and high cheekbones - and his eyebrow gives the merest hint that it is in fact contracted by the way it turns down at the nose. There is also evident a series of frown lines on his forehead which seem to start low over the temples and rise up over his eye to turn down towards the top of his nose. These factors suggest that had this been a frontal image of Ariobarzanes, it would have borne the typical *severitas/gravitas* expression.

Importantly, Ariobarzanes' portraits do not bear the divinised features of those of other Hellenistic rulers. He has short-cropped hair and a harshly drawn older face. Interestingly, from an early time in his portrait sequence he is depicted as getting older (Ill. 119.1-3) - quite unlike the portrait series of Mithridates VI of Pontus (Ill. 120.1-2). Toynbee describes him as "... almost the veristic likeness of a Roman of his day"¹⁶¹

While I have eschewed the use of the term 'veristic',¹⁶² when Ariobarzanes' image is compared with his rival Mithridates and his pretender son Ariarthes, Ariobarzanes' image clearly resembles the Roman Republican portraits already discussed. The only logical explanation is not that he was portraying himself in the style of the Hellenistic kings, but that he was making a conscious choice drawing on the portrait style of the Romans on whom he depended for his throne,¹⁶³ to make it clear to others in the region that he was protected by Rome. In essence the king's image demonstrated that he possessed *fides*, *severitas* and *gravitas* and could therefore be trusted by his Roman backers, yet clearly warned any potential rival. This supposition is further confirmed by the political reality of this ruler;

159 Around this time Mithridates VI of Pontus attempted to install his son, Ariarthes IX as king, but the Roman senate put a native noble, Ariobarzanes I, on the throne. More importantly, it is recorded that he took the title of *Philorhomaioi*: Strab. *Geog.* 12.2.11; Just. *Epit.* 38.2.8. Between his accession in 95 B.C. to his abdication in 63 B.C. he was expelled (and restored by the Romans) to his kingdom no less than six times: Plut. *Sull.* 5, 22.24; Livy *Epit.* 70, 74, 76; App. *Mith.* 10, 15, 56, 57, 64, 66, 67, 105.

160 See Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 130-31, and pls. 78.9-10, 79.1.; Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits*, fig. 246.

161 N. Petrolichos, *Roman Attitudes to the Greeks* (1974) 164.

162 See Chapters 1, 14-15 *supra*, and p. 270 *supra*.

163 Smith, "Philorhomaioi: Portraits of Roman client rulers in the Greek East in the 1st Century B.C.," 497: "The portraits of the client kings we have looked at show that the late Republican portrait style was not primarily a matter of how Romans looked, nor of a different aesthetic taste, but a matter of political expression - of desire to project a particular image. This portrait style was programmatically 'Roman'. These client kings and local Greek dynasts in the cities, like Theophanes, use a deliberately Roman-looking portrait style by which they announced their loyalty to and dependence on Rome and that the Senate was the ultimate guarantor of their power and position. For these client rulers this was a pro-Roman style. It expressed the political quality of the title *Philorhomaioi*, Friend of the Romans."

unlike other kings who owed the security of their positions to Rome, but had gained their thrones through inheritance, Ariobarzanes did not, and hence he suffered from a crisis of legitimacy which he had to avert by publicly proclaiming who his protectors were.¹⁶⁴

The end result of Ariobarzanes' image is not due to the smallness of the coins or the difficulty of the die engraving; nor is it a result of the personal artistic taste of Ariobarzanes himself given the political implications of using a Roman Republican portrait style for his image when he was a Hellenistic monarch. Nor can the portrait be sensibly attributed to mere Roman artistic influence - since the style of other kings who were just as likely to be 'influenced' by Roman methods of portrayal continued to employ the traditional Hellenistic Royal portrait style. This suggests that the use of the Roman *severitas/gravitas* expression was not an artistic, but a political choice. When considering this, one should be mindful of the praise that Cicero bestowed on King Deiotarus, in that he specifically equated the King's virtues with those held dear to the ruling élite at Rome (see Appendix 2 - Chapter Two: [129] Cic. *Deiot.* 16; [130] Cic. *Deiot.* 26; [131] Cic. *Deiot.* 37). These are particularly Roman virtues ascribed to Hellenistic royalty which contrast to those values such a king was expected to exhibit in the Hellenistic context.¹⁶⁵ Cicero in his speech is consciously making the image of Deiotarus a decidedly Roman one possibly to counter the low traditional Roman perception of Hellenistic Kings generally.¹⁶⁶

Another example of the client king adopting the Roman portrait style is that of Tarkondimotos who was ruler of a small part of Cilicia in the Amanus Mountains (Ill. 121.1-2).¹⁶⁷ Similarly Lysanias, Tetrarch of Chalcis in Northern Syria was confirmed on his throne by Antony and is depicted on his coins with extremely short hair and a harsh style of facial feature (Ill. 122.1-

164 Ibid., 494: "The most obvious explanation for this lies in his political situation. It seems most likely that he has chosen a recognisably Roman style of image to express the idea that the Romans stand behind him politically. Other kings of course had been allied with Rome who did not adopt 'Roman' portrait style - like the Attalids of Pergamon, for example. But they maintained their position by their own inherited force; they were independent kings, whereas Ariobarzanes is one of a new type of ruler in the Greek East - a Roman client king, politically and often militarily dependent on Rome."

165 See pp. 301-305 supra.

166 Polyb. 36.15 - the description of Prousius II of Bithynia; Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 131.

167 Ibid., 131, pls 78.13, 79.3. Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits*, fig. 234. He was installed as Dynast by Pompey in 63 B.C. and made a king by Antony in 40 B.C. On his coins he is depicted with short hair and hard furrowed features. He took the surname *philantonios* and eventually died fighting with Antony's forces at Actium. Again he owed his position solely to Roman favour and support - without it he would not have been able to maintain his kingdom.

2).¹⁶⁸

There are also portraits of two non-royal Greek local rulers in the same style. Nikias of Kos (44-30 B.C.) is depicted in a style similar to that of Caesar (Ill. 123).¹⁶⁹ The other to utilise the Roman Republican portrait style was Theophanes of Mytilene on Lesbos (Ill. 124).¹⁷⁰ Smith suggests that a marble portrait from Mytilene in the same style could actually depict him (Ill. 125).¹⁷¹

The basic reason why the dynasts chose the Roman Republican portrait style for their images did not stem from a different aesthetic taste but from purely political consideration. By utilising a portrait of oneself in the Roman Republican portrait style the ruler concerned was making definite political and social comment - thereby exemplifying the inherent meaning of the title *Philorhomaioi* with which many of them are associated. In fact Ariobarzanes' portraits on his coins vary considerably - in some he is even shown as being distinctly younger - and hence it becomes apparent that with the images of these rulers there is no definite relation to actual physiognomy or the physical appearance of these men in reality - the portrait is a concoction of stylistic elements being composed of a facial expression adapted to a physical type. That the style was a political choice, is evidenced by the fact that after Augustus established his portrait type *his* style became predominant among many of the client kings - thus again proclaiming their allegiance to the power of Rome (Ill. 126).

There are also a group of portraits from the Greek East and Asia Minor which closely resemble the Roman Republican portrait style, in that they have short cropped hair with 'realistic' or middle aged features. Some of them undoubtedly represent actual Romans - such as the heads from Delos. For others, the context is not clear and hence the identity of the subjects is not known. It cannot be stated for certain whether a Greek or a Roman is portrayed, and some may well have represented Greeks. An example is a marble head

168 Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 131, pls 78.11-12, and 79.2; Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits*, fig. 297. Smith describes him thus: "He has an aged face, from which protrudes a huge, sagging, rather comical nose, shaped like a sausage." Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 131.

169 Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 131, pls. 78.15-16; Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits*, fig. 186. Little is known of him, although he does appear in an inscription from the island as 'son of the people', although Strabo mentions that Antony installed him as 'ruler (tyrant) of Kos': Strabo *Geog.* 14.658.

170 Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 131, pls. 78.14. He was a close friend and advisor of Pompey and even received Roman citizenship. He even managed to gain 'freedom' from Pompey for his home city where he was greatly honoured. Bronze coins in the Roman Republican style were issued around the time of his death or shortly after.

171 No. 1109, Mytilene Museum; *Ibid.*, 105.

excavated at Pergamon in the Lower City in a structure which has been tentatively identified as the 'Diodoreion' - a building dedicated to the cult of Diodorus Paspasos, a local powerful citizen at the time of the Mithridatic Wars (Ill. 127).¹⁷²

If it portrays Paspasos, it is a good exemplification of what has been said above, serving as an example of the newer type of wealthy individual who emerged as powerful local identities after the collapse of the Hellenistic monarchies. They gained a great deal of influence, wealth and prestige by mediating between Rome and their home cities - often heading embassies to Rome itself. The fact of their Roman connections leads them to adopt the Roman style of portraiture, or a style influenced by it, to represent this causal relationship.¹⁷³

In relation to the theories of Richter¹⁷⁴ and R. R. R. Smith¹⁷⁵ - that the Romans took over a portrait style that was being used by certain later Hellenistic Kings and members of the Greek ruling classes - the evidence presented suggests the opposite conclusion.¹⁷⁶ As noted, citizenship or ethnicity was not the defining factor in selecting a particular portrait style: it was the conscious use of a visual language by the Romans which stated or communicated their specific values, which were taken up by those wishing to convey pro-Roman sentiments in their images. Their significance is summed up by Smith:

"It also seems likely that these had broad significance, just as hairstyles, dress-codes, and styles of self-presentation often have. They can make highly generalised but powerful statements about where the subject stands on a range of loosely defined questions."¹⁷⁷

172 No. 3438, Bergama Museum; K. Fittschen, *Griechische Porträts* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1988), 26 n.158, Taf. 54.1 and 2; Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 105, 31-32, pl. 72.2; G. Hübner, in: *Ritratto ufficiale e ritratto privato*, Atti II. Conferenza Internazionale sul ritratto romano, Rom 1984 (1988), 335, Abb. 1-3. The portrait depicts a middle aged man with short receding hair and "[a]n objective realistic face, and an unidealised shape of the head. The head turns and tilts slightly, giving it a benign expression but neither this nor the very fine plastic modelling of the surface which does not dwell on the wrinkles or warts, dispels the overall impression of a down-to-earth 'Roman-ness': Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 105-06.

173 Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 105-06: "Their pre-eminence in their cities was derived from their access to Roman power; they were 'in' at Rome". Cf. P. Zanker, "Zur Rezeption des hellenistischen Individuellporträts in Rom und in den italischen Städten," in *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien - Colloquium 5-9 Juni 1974* (Göttingen: 1976), 581-609.

174 Richter, "Late Hellenistic Portraiture," 45.

175 Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 132.

176 Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 132: "[T]here is no good evidence for this assumption, that is, there are no portraits certainly of Greeks and certainly to be dated before this portrait mode was first used by Romans. The first dated portraits of non-Romans in this style are the client-rulers, which require (or at least allow) quite another interpretation."

177 Ibid.

In other words a Roman portrait style would represent a Roman choice (*Rhomaïke Hairesis*)¹⁷⁸ by the ruling and élite classes of the Greek East.¹⁷⁹ The use of the Roman Republican portrait style is thus similar to that of the client rulers - it is an effective show of loyalty (*fides*/πίστις) to the Roman cause, by proclaiming *severitas* and *gravitas* and other Roman virtues in a visual language that Romans would understand as well as those non-Romans within their own communities.¹⁸⁰

10.8 Roman attitudes to Greeks

At the root of the difference between portraits of Hellenistic kings is the content of the messages conveyed. Predominantly, Hellenistic Kings chose a youthful, handsome, vigorous appearance in contrast to the surviving works which depict Romans in the Republican period. This can be related back to the very different cultural emphasis in physiognomic beliefs, and in the political and social systems that the produced the two types.¹⁸¹

It should be carefully noted that 'καλός', which could mean moral and physical beauty, did not equate with the Latin '*pulcher*' which can be rarely used in this way; in fact in contrast to 'καλός', the other Latin terms which are used for good looks even have negative implications: '*venustus*', '*formosus*', '*speciosus*'. Thus the Romans, unlike the Greeks, positively rejected the key physiognomic point of 'good looks = good character'. What the Romans found was that other facial expressions and certain modes of portrayal in stance and demeanour and context were the proper means by which to convey proper behaviour.

The history of interaction between the two peoples in the second century B.C. suggests that the physical conflict brought their moral and cultural differences into sharp contrast like never before. To the Romans the Hellenistic kings were corrupt, pleasure loving, potentates; while

178 Polyb. 31.23.11.

179 With the effective defeat of the Hellenistic kings and the demise of the Achaean League the ruling classes saw that their continued existence and wealth lay in allying themselves with Rome. The Achaean uprising in 146 B.C. and the threats posed to the peace from leaders such as Aristonikos and Mithridates were not in the Greek ruling classes' interests at all - and this suggests that they were becoming consciously more politically pro-Roman.

180 Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, 132: "The style of these portraits represents, on the political level, an embracing of Rome. They are an early and striking visual testimony of the unholy alliance of the Roman and Greek élites that came to run the empire." Also D. E. E. Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992), 36, ill.12.

181 Ward-Perkins et al., *Pompeii AD 79: treasures from the National Archaeological Museum, Naples and the Pompeii Antiquarium, Italy*, 13.

to the kings the Romans were vulgar and rapacious barbarians.¹⁸² A good example is Polybios' description of Prousius of Bithynia; i.e., "half a man as regards his appearance...like a woman in military matters...not only cowardly but also incapable of putting up with hardship, and effeminate in body and mind."¹⁸³

Effeminate appearance and its moral corollary, softness and cowardice, were favourite Roman charges against Greeks and the kings particularly. In fact, the use by Romans of the term 'Asiatics' for Greeks allowed them to take over a whole range of terms which the Greeks themselves had invented for the peoples of the East who were stereotyped from the time of the Persian wars.¹⁸⁴ One need only refer to a poem by Lucilius quoted by Cicero to be reminded of how Romans viewed Greeks and Greek practices in the Republican period:

*Graecum te, Albuci, quam Romanum atque Sabinum
Municipemque Ponti, Tritani, centurionem,
praeclarum hominum ac primorum signiferumque,
maluisti dici. Graece ergo praetor Athenis,
id quod maluisti te, cum ad me accedis, saluto:
'Chaere' inquam 'Tite'. Lictores, turba omnis chorusque:
'Chaere Tite'. Hinc hostis mi Albucis, hinc inimicus!*¹⁸⁵
(Cic. Fin. I.3.8 quoting Lucil. 2.87-93)

In this extract it is important to note that not only is Albucius described as an *inimicus* (personal enemy), he is also described as a *hostis* – a strong word which could be used to describe non-citizen enemies of the *res publica* itself. It seems that Albucius' crime was to speak Greek to a Roman official.

Thus, when a Roman thus looked at a portrait of a Greek King – with its deliberate god-like appearance – it would only contrast with the way they saw themselves. The basic physiognomic messages conveyed by the Hellenistic portraits were not in the *severitas/gravitas* mode and did not convey to the Romans the same messages. This is the crucial element as to why the Romans would *not* have taken up Hellenistic Royal portrait style to depict themselves. The Romans were not Greeks; in fact, Roman generals came to tell

182 Speech of Mithridates in Pompeius Trogus: "the Romans 'suckled on the teats of a she-wolf' are thus rapacious in the natures and hungry for riches and Empire": Justin *Apol.* 38.6.8.

183 Polyb. 36.15; 31.23.11.

184 Hippoc. *Aer.* 16.

185 'You have preferred to be called a Greek, Albucius, rather than a Roman and a Sabine, a fellow townsman of Pontius and Tritanus, of centurions of famous and foremost men, yes, standard bearers. Therefore I as praetor at Athens greeted you in Greek, when you approached me, just as you preferred. 'Chaere Titus', I say in Greek. 'Chaere Titus' likewise say the attendants, all my troop and band. That's why Albucius is a foe to me, that's why he is an enemy!'

Greek kings what to do and were not to be emulated. The '*summi viri*' and '*boni*' of the Roman State (who were largely *nobiles*) considered themselves superior to any Hellenistic king – and this is explicit in the attitude of the Roman senate which sources tell us insisted on addressing Greek embassies only in Latin.¹⁸⁶ Attendant on this was the fact that the Romans liked themselves to be perceived as people of pure rustic virtues; the stories of Cato the Elder and the turnip eating Roman Generals of the Early Republic evidence this – and it is a view clearly revealed in their other moral and ethical terms.¹⁸⁷ More cogent to the Roman mind, the Greeks had a reputation for soft living and a like for light and frivolous things which were considered as 'un'-Roman.¹⁸⁸

The Romans also disliked the Greek's high opinion of themselves. To the Romans, this was Greek '*adrogantia*' and '*superbia*' – things not expected in a good Roman but manifest in the last of the Roman kings and in the Hellenistic potentates of the East.¹⁸⁹

One of the earliest impressions created by the Greeks on the Italian mainland and in Sicily – a people who had long been notorious even in Greece itself for such a style of living – was of base self-indulgence in private life: feasting, drinking, whoring; and the Romans had a word for this kind of living, '*pergraecari*' – 'to act the Greek'. The word appears in the plays of Plautus;¹⁹⁰ but it soon went out of use, probably because of the rise of Greek commodities on

186 Val. Max. *Mem.* 2.2.2. That upper class Romans during the (late) second and first century B.C. could speak Greek, and fluently at that, is attested by the sources – although there appears to have been a few individuals who could not: Cic. *Verr.* 4.127. Sources say that Publicus Crassus Mucianus, Proconsul in Asia in 133 B.C. was competent in five Greek dialects: Val Max *Mem.* 8.7.6; Quint. *Inst.* 11.2.50. Cicero tells us that he even spoke Greek to local senate in Syracuse, something for which he was criticised by an opponent on the basis it was not proper for a Roman senator to speak Greek to Greek audiences: Cic. *Verr.* 4.147. Apollonius Mollo, the Rhodian ambassador, was permitted to address the senate in Rome without an interpreter: Val. Max. *Mem.* 2.2.3. Atticus spoke Greek like he was a native of Athens: Nepos *Att.* 4.1; and we are told a similar thing concerning L. Crassus: Cic. *De orat.* 2.2. Just how fluent though is debatable. Augustus we are told was competent in writing Greek, but was unwilling to speak Greek *ex tempore* or to compose his own speeches in Greek: Suet. *Aug.* 89. However, we are told that after the Battle of Actium he addressed the Alexandrians in Greek: Cass. Dio 51.16.4. Emperor Claudius by contrast used to address Greek ambassadors with lengthy speeches in Greek: Suet. *Claud.* 42. See Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, 10–11.

187 Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 22–23.3: "...he wholly despised philosophy, and out of patriotic zeal mocked all Greek culture and learning...and to prejudice his son against anything that was Greek, in a rasher voice than became one of his age, he declared, as it were with the voice of a prophet or seer, that the Romans would lose their empire when they began to be infected with Greek literature". Also Liv. *Epit.* 18; Val. Max. *Mem.* 4.4.6.

188 J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *Romans and aliens* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979), 33: "...the Greeks attached importance to a number of things (works of art, for instance) which in his heart of hearts the Roman regarded as being trifling importance."

189 Ibid.: "There was also Greek cultural conceit, *insolens Graecia*. Greeks were aware that the achievement of no other people could match theirs, whether in literature or in art; and culturally the Romans gave them plenty to laugh or to sneer at."

190 Plaut. *Truc.* 1.1.69: "*ut cum solo pergraecetur milite*"; Plaut. *Most.* 1.1.24. The word had a negative connotation.

the Roman market, the prominence of Greeks in the education of their Roman masters, and a natural human desire for an improvement in the standard of living. However, this did not stop the Romans from believing that corruption, immorality and soft living had come from contact with the Greeks.¹⁹¹

These basic cultural differences in attitude largely speak against the view that the Romans would have adopted a Greek portrait style, but can explain why some later Hellenistic kings came to generally adopt Roman Republican portrait style. It was simply a matter of power and wealth. The facial expression, messages, and context of the Hellenistic Royal portrait served political and religious ends – which manifested themselves in the style chosen for the Royal portrait. On the whole the images of the kings were of younger men in the prime of their strength and power and employed traditional Greek iconographic elements with some limited individualisation to produce a suitable image that would convey everything that the Hellenistic king wished to communicate about himself and his position. It is not the same as the Roman Republican portrait, either in form, content or context, and leaves the viewer with a very different impression and conveys very different culturally specific messages.

The preceding discussion shows that the Romans possessed clearly defined moral and ethical values which they connected with precise physiognomic features, gestures and expressions and which they would have expected to be conveyed by their portrait images – and it would be striking coincidence if the facial expression the Latin literature describes as communicating *severitas* and *gravitas*, which is precisely that found on portrait after portrait from the Middle and Late Republican periods, happened to be identical to a genre of portraiture developed in the Hellenistic eastern Mediterranean by Greek artists for the Hellenistic Kings. This suggests that the form of Roman Republican portraiture was in fact a response of capable artists (no matter whether they were Greek or not) to the demands of Roman patrons (or Roman inspired patrons) than a creation of these artists themselves or as a genre derived from the programme of the Hellenistic Kings or any other form of purely Greek art.

191 Livy *AUC* 39.6. 3-9; Vell. Pat. 2.1.1.1-2; Plin. (E), *HN* 33.11.147-150.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

OBSERVATIONS ON THE ORIGINS OF ROMAN REPUBLICAN PORTRAIT STYLE

11.1 Introduction

The evidence discussed in the previous chapters indicates several points: that the Romans regarded portraiture as necessarily communicating the *motus animi* of an individual, that portraits were displayed and utilised for purposes originally derived from the practices of the élite classes, and that their portraits were seen as communicating the distinct Roman values of *severitas* and *gravitas* – values which, as we have seen, were descriptive and prescriptive of a Roman citizen functioning in his public capacity as a senator, judge and magistrate, and in his private capacity as a *paterfamilias*. Given these associations it is perhaps by tracing the development of the *nobiles* as a class, which came to dominate Roman political and social life for a period of three hundred years, that we may get the best evidence for understanding how the *severitas/gravitas* portrait style originated and developed.

Rome, situated on a major communication route on the Tiber river and largely controlling the north-south land communication route between the Greek south and Etruscan north, was subject to influences from its neighbours from the earliest periods.¹ This state of fluid cultural interaction remained a fact throughout Roman history. However, as Rome grew to become the dominant power, at first within Italy and then within the Mediterranean, its culture in turn influenced those of its neighbours and subject peoples.

¹ The archaeological and literary evidence thus far discussed provides a glimpse of the complex economic and social network of which Rome was a part from a very early period and within which Roman society and its traditions developed. That Rome was strategically placed to grow rich quickly is a fact of its geography. That there were contacts from far afield, even with the Phoenicians, is confirmed by a gold inscription from the Etruscan port of Pyrgi excavated from the ruins of an ancient temple: O. J. Brendel, *Etruscan Art, Pelican History of Art* (New York: Penguin Books, 1978; reprint, 1996), 231, n.2; N. Spivey, *Etruscan Art* (London; New York: Thames and Hudson, 1997), 98-99. This document, in Etruscan and Punic on three panels, records a dedication by the ruler of Caere, Thefarie Velianas, to the Goddess Astarte-Uno (Juno?) and probably dates from the late sixth/early fifth century B.C. Phoenician wine amphora also make an appearance in local graves at Decima, Acqua Acetossa, Laurentina, Gabii and Ficana from the seventh century B.C. onwards – and it would seem that for several of these locations, the amphorae must have come through Rome: F. Zevi, "La situazione nel Lazio," in *Il commercio etrusco arcaico* (Rome: Quaderni del Centro di Studio per l'Archeologia Etrusco-Italica, 1985). The rich decoration from the "Princely Tombs" at Praeneste, known also as the "Barberini" and "Bernardini" Tombs, are also suggestive of outside trading contacts. Among the goods found therein were ornaments that suggest Phoenician, Syrian, Greek and North African origin – although it has been suggested that most items could have been made by eastern tradespersons who had settled in the area: R. R. Holloway, *The archaeology of early Rome and Latium* (London; New York: Routledge, 1994), 156-60.

This state of cultural interaction is evident in the Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* portraits which, I have suggested, date from possibly the third century B.C. until the Augustan period. Many examples readily utilised Hellenistic stylistic elements for their composition. At the same time there are other portraits which appear to pay no heed to Hellenistic stylistic dictates, being constructed in a highly abstract and inorganic form.² However, as I have suggested in previous chapters, their unifying element is the presence of the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression, irrespective of what precise stylistic elements were used to convey it.

This stylistic eclecticism presents us with something of a conundrum in explaining the origin and course of development of portraiture at Rome, not least of which is that it calls into question any chronology for the extant Roman portraits based on the traditional stylistic tools, including the notion that art between the third and first centuries B.C. developed in an orderly fashion, *pari passu*.

Greek influence on the development of Roman portraiture has already been discussed. The suggestion that native Roman, Italic or Etruscan influence was seminal to the development of Roman Republican portraiture is not new. In reference to the tomb sculptures dating to the late Republican period at Rome, Zadoks-Jitta believed the style reflected an indigenous element derived from the late Etruscan style. Gazda, similarly to Zadoks-Jitta, identified in the Roman tomb reliefs the techniques of the late Etruscan tradition.³ Kaschnitz von Weinberg saw the Republican portraits as a form of native Italic *kulturwollen*.⁴ Bianchi Bandinelli and Felletti-Maj viewed the funerary reliefs as examples of a Plebeian or Italic indigenous art form which remained an undercurrent over which Hellenistic style was laid.⁵ Other scholars, such as Schweitzer, viewed the Roman Republican portrait style as being a combination of Roman Italic and Greek elements manifested as a 'Roman city' portrait style that emphasised harsh 'realism' – perhaps being a product of less talented workshops.⁶ Vessberg referred to what he saw as the local character of the reliefs – referring to them as the

2 E. Gazda, "Etruscan Influence in the Funerary Reliefs of Late Republican Rome: A Study of Vernacular Portraiture," *ANRW* 1.4 (1973), 862-63.

3 *Ibid.*, 858.

4 G. Kaschnitz von Weinberg, *Römische Bildnisse*, vol. 2, *Ausgewählte Schriften* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1965).

5 R. Bianchi Bandinelli, *Roma: L'arte romana nel centro del potere* (Milan: Feltrinelli, 1969); M. Felletti-Maj, *La tradizione italica nell'arte romana* (Rome: G. Bretschneider, 1977).

6 U. Heisinger, "Portraiture in the Roman Republic," *ANRW* 1.4 (1973), 813. See his characterisation of the funerary relief of Gessius: "The portrait of Gessius is a particularly well executed example from among frequently cruder works in which physical realism with a harsh, brutal accent exists to the near exclusion of any sense of personality. In these stiffly posed figures with their vacant, staring faces the portrait becomes in effect the physical container for a psychological vacuum."

Sachliche Stil - believing that they were an artistic innovation of the Caesarian period (100 - 45 B.C.). He characterised the Roman portraits as containing a strong 'surface realism' aimed at an objective portrayal of the subject.⁷ The only Hellenistic influence which he detected in the portraits was the soft modelling present in many of the heads.⁸ Dohrn believed there was a close association of possible stylistic influence stemming from Etruscan red figure vases.⁹ To Dohrn the Greek influence was evidently strong but there existed a level of characterisation not present in Greek works.¹⁰

This diversity in academic opinion on the origins of Roman Republican portraiture and its relation to Etruscan and Greek cultures speaks for itself. Many such studies have proceeded on the basis that, since the elements of Greek sculptural style were clearly defined (stemming from long study of Classical and Hellenistic art), it was considered simply a matter of identifying those elements in Roman portraits that were 'non-Greek' and labelling these as native Roman, Italic or Etruscan. However, an approach dissecting a portrait into stylistic minutiae ultimately denies the object the validity it had to the people who commissioned it, produced it and viewed it in holistic terms according to its function, context and what it communicated about the individual portrayed. That a Roman portrait, regardless of its stylistic content and from where those elements of style were drawn, conveyed specific Roman messages to Roman and non-Roman viewers has been amply evidenced in the previous chapters.

In tackling this issue illumination may be provided by redefining what precisely constitutes the adjective 'Roman' in relation to 'Roman' portraiture, interpreting it instead as a meaningful social and cultural phenomenon, rather than just as a sterile assemblage of defined stylistic elements. In other words, it is the application to portraiture of a precise, formulaically rendered facial expression communicating the moral values of *severitas* and *gravitas* which was used to shape and reinforce political and social relationships among Romans and between Romans and non-Romans, that makes Roman Republican portraiture a truly unique *Roman* art

7 O. Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik*, 2 vols. (Lund, Leipzig: C. W. K. Gleerup, O. Harrassowitz, 1941), 175-207. See also Gazda, "Etruscan Influence in the Funerary Reliefs of Late Republican Rome: A Study of Vernacular Portraiture," 857.

8 Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik*, 208.

9 T. Dohrn, *Zur Geschichte des italisch-etruskischen Porträts*, vol. Offprint, *MDAI-R* (s.l.: s.n., 1937), 119-39.

10 Ibid., 119: "Eine späte Gattung etruskischer Vasen mit roten Figuren zeigt uns an Stelle der in Unteritalien und Etrurien üblichen, griechische beeinflussten, grossen Idealköpfe individuell anmutende Köpfe von völlig abweichendem Charakter"

form.

This brings us to the essential issue: how did a precise facial expression come to communicate *severitas* and *gravitas* and how did it come to be applied to Roman portraits? The answer to this is perhaps unknowable – founded as it is in psychological aspects of understanding and moral values linked to physiognomic expression stemming from the Romans' self-identification as a people. Such precise ethical and physiognomic beliefs developed in prehistory, adapted slowly through time with the appearance and development of the moral and ethical beliefs of Roman society in tandem with changing economic, political, religious, social and cultural factors.

The major problem in charting the development of this genre is the lack of absolutely datable portraits utilising the *severitas/gravitas* style. The surviving portraits largely comprise those of marble, travertine and tufa (which are mostly dated to the first century B.C.) and a few examples in bronze and a handful in marble, some of which, as I have suggested, may date as early as the beginning of the third through second centuries B.C. Despite this, the textual evidence makes it clear that portraits were made of diverse materials (including terracotta, wax, bronze, travertine, tufa and gypsum) from at least the Middle Republican period and that marble only really became widely available for the manufacture of portraits in the mid-first century B.C. The only logical conclusion is that these portraits in less durable materials have not survived, thereby distorting the archaeological database. What we do possess, in fact, is the 'end' product of a very long process.

In the absence of the definitive evidence of the portraits themselves, it is necessary to rely on negative or inferential evidence that may cast some light on the issue. Given the close association between the *nobiles* as a class and the values of *severitas* and *gravitas*, the fact that it was the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression which characterised Roman portraiture in the second and first centuries B.C., and the close association between the *nobiles* class and particular uses, context of display and creation of portraits in this period, it is perhaps to the origins and evolution of this class during the mid-fourth century B.C. onwards, with its control of the political and economic life of the state, that perhaps we can best discern the origins of the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression and its emergence as the defining element of Roman portraiture during the Republican period.

There are two aspects for consideration. The first is how the contextual display and uses of

portraiture which have been identified in earlier chapters developed within Roman society. The second is how and when the values of *severitas* and *gravitas* came to be applied as the facial expression characteristic of the portraits. It is the synthesis of these two factors that ultimately produced the Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* portraits in the contexts in which they were utilised – and to me, both are explained by examining the emergence of the *nobiles* as the dominant political and social class in Roman society.

Essential in all of this was the existence of competent artisans who could manufacture the portraits – and there is much literary and archaeological evidence which shows there were highly skilled artists working in a local art industry manufacturing artworks from terracotta, bronze and other materials from the Regal period onwards. This shows that the Romans possessed the technical skills for producing portrait images which utilised a range of stylistic elements reformulated and adapted to achieve the result desired by the patron and befitting the context and purpose of the portrait – and given this, the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression as it appears on Roman portraits could easily have originated and developed at Rome without an external stimulus. This background is discussed in Appendix 6.

For these reasons I shall examine how the contexts of display of portraiture at Rome originated and developed, especially in relation to the funerary, political and social practices of Rome's neighbours, such as those of the Etruscans, which were highly influential in these respects. Finally, I shall consider the evidence concerning the emergence of the *nobiles* as a class, with its defining values of *severitas* and *gravitas* and its manipulation and utilisation of portrait images as tools for reinforcing their privileged position in the political, social and economic structures of the Roman state, which in turn influenced the culture of Rome's neighbours and subject peoples.

11.2 The origins of the development of the contexts of display and utilisation of portraiture at Rome

In relation to honorary and votive statues, literary sources state that these were dedicated at Rome from an early period – and the archaeological evidence mentioned above would tend to support this account.¹¹ Regarding the honorary statues, Pliny (E) mentions these were at least

¹¹ Such as the terracotta statues from the Sant' Omobono sanctuary of 'Heracles and Minerva' (Ill. 151) and other statuettes found in the contexts of religious sites. See Appendix 6.

30 years earlier than the earliest known truly honorary statues from Greece,¹² and so it has been suggested that these could not have dated to the fifth century B.C.¹³ In respect of the 'Minucius column' it has been claimed that coins minted at a later date which depict it, indicate that it was not a type constructed during this century (Ill. 128).¹⁴ It is noteworthy that all honorary statues of men set up in Rome in the early Republican period which Pliny (E) mentions appear to have been dedicated to dead men and also seem to have been in places which strongly suggest a votive intention (in *loci religiosi*, such as the *rostra*, *comitium* and *capitolium*).¹⁵ This merely confirms the suggestion that the practice of honorary statuary grew from votive dedications, and while the practice may have originated in Greece, the pottery and terracotta statuary fragments that have been found associated with religious sites (Sant' Omobono sanctuary) dating to the sixth century B.C. at Rome, combined with the literary tradition, suggest that the practice of erecting votive (and later honorary) statues was coeval to that of Greece. The terracotta sculptures from the Sant' Omobono sanctuary (Ill. 151), the Capestrano Warrior (Ill. 130), and the colossal head in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Marche, Ancona (Ill. 131), may be cited as possible examples dating to the sixth century B.C., a practice already entrenched at Rome by the time of the Republic.

What is certain is that by the Middle and Late Republican periods, honorary statues decreed by the senate (or more rarely by the Assembly) were being made with increasing frequency,¹⁶ and while the Roman practice in this period may have been influenced by that of the Hellenistic kingdoms, it appears that the practice was an ancient one. Even granting a Greek causation, it was very much adapted to meet Roman social and political purposes, there being some forms of honorary statues that were preferred at Rome – such as equestrian statues with

12 Plin. (E) *HN* 34.20-23. The earliest Greek examples are the statues of Harmodius and Aristogeiton, the Tyrannicides, set up at Athens.

13 E. H. Richardson, *The Etruscan origins of early Roman sculpture*, vol. [Offprint] 21, *MAAR* (Roma: G. Bardi, 1953), 75-124, esp. 02. It is interesting to note that the Greek works Pliny (E) cited as examples of honorary statues, Harmodius and Aristogeiton, were actually set up in the Athenian *Agora* after they were killed by Hippias: Thuc. 6.57.4; thus, more likely to have been votive offerings dedicated to dead 'Heroes': M. Sehlmeier, *Stadrömische Ehrenstatuen der republikanischen Zeit: Historizität und Kontext von Symbolen nobilitären Standesbewußtseins* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999), 24. That these statues had a votive intention is supported by the fact that most were said to have been placed in sanctuaries of the gods; for instance, the statues of Cleobis and Biton at Delphi (Ill. 129): Hdt 1.31.

14 Richardson, *The Etruscan origins of early Roman sculpture*, 102. However, works such as the bronze *Chimaera* from Arezzo (Ill. 185), and the *Mars of Todi* (Ill. 188) suggest that excellence of bronze-work from the region at this time and the fact that statues in bronze could be quite large. See Appendix 6.

15 Sehlmeier, *Stadrömische Ehrenstatuen der republikanischen Zeit: Historizität und Kontext von Symbolen nobilitären Standesbewußtseins*, 24.

16 Cf. H. I. Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 55.

a rider dressed in a toga, cuirassed or togate free standing statues, and *clipeati* attached to temple walls or columns consisting of a portrait attached to a shield.¹⁷

Turning to the *imagines* displayed in the home and during the funeral, how and why such usages developed is a point of dispute among scholars.¹⁸ It has frequently been argued that the origins of the *imagines* (and the style employed for all other forms of *imagines*) lay with Etruscan burial culture - specifically the use of a mask to cover the face of the deceased during the funeral¹⁹ - and that these and other associated customs were taken up directly by the Romans.²⁰

That there were Etruscan influences in the cultural, political and social organisation of early Rome seems beyond doubt - paralleled in the influence of Etruscan art. The Roman literary tradition itself recognises this Etruscan influence. This credits much of the transformation of the city during the Archaic period to Tarquinius Priscus I, who reigned from 616-579 B.C.²¹ and who allegedly came from an Etruscan city.²² Etruscan influence is also evident on the civil and religious institutions of the city during the Late Republic: including the *fasces* as the symbol of *imperium* (an iron model of which has been discovered at the Etruscan site of Vetulonia (Ill. 132.1)),²³ the *sella curulis* and the *lituus* for presiding magistrates, and other religious cults and practices, most notably augury and divination (such as those divination

17 Sources indicate that the first to dedicate *clipeati* was Claudius Appius Caecus in 312 B.C.

18 Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 32-59, and 339.

19 O. Benndorf, "Antike Gesichtshelme und Sepulcramasken," *D(K)Wien* 28 (1878); Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik*.

20 E. Courboud, "Imago," in *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*, ed. C. Daremberg and E. Saglio (Paris: 1900), 403.; E. H. Swift, "Imagines in Imperial Portraiture," *AJA* 27 (1923), 192.

21 Reinforcement of the literary tradition concerning the Kings is tantalisingly suggested by several pieces of highly disputed evidence. 1) a pottery fragment dating to the third building phase of the *regia* on which was inscribed the Latin word *rex* (king). 2) The inscription from a *cippus* found under the *lapis niger* and related to the antique Forum. The text is in very archaic Latin but it seems to prescribe some ancient ritual or procedure for the maintenance of a shrine. This also confirms the picture of Rome drawn by later Roman writers themselves, who refer to the religious reforms instituted by King Numa and later by King Ancus Marcius - and who freely ascribed institutions to Etruscan influence, but not to Etruscan domination. 3) The paintings from the François Tomb which depict persons named as 'Cneve Tarchunies Rumach' (Gnaeus Tarquinius Romanus ?) who is being attacked by 'Marce Camitlnas' (Marcus Camillus ?), and another person named 'Macstarna' who is freeing a person named 'Caile Vipinas' (Caelius Vibenna ?). This is all the more interesting since Tacitus states that the Caelian Hill in Rome was named after Caelius Vibenna, an Etruscan, who settled there some time around the reign of King Tarquinius Priscus (Tac. *Ann.* 4.65). In a fragment from a speech delivered by the Emperor Claudius, it is stated that King Servius Tullius was an ally of Caelius Vibenna (*CIL* XIII, 1668) and Varro says that Servius Tullius used to be known as 'Mastarna' (Varro *LL* 5.46).

22 Similar to the tradition of Attus Clausus migrating to the city with all his retainers in the early years of the Republic. If this is based on some historical reality, it suggests that there was a high degree of social mobility between the upper and ruling classes of various towns and cities which is in evidence throughout the middle and eastern Mediterranean at this time, rather than any positive evidence of an Etruscan conquest of the city.

23 Brendel, *Etruscan Art*. This is paralleled in a bronze statuette from a votive deposit found under the *lapis niger* dating to the mid-sixth century B.C.: ill. 32.2.

scenes depicted in paintings from the *Tomb of the Augurs*, Tarquinia (Ill. 133)).²⁴ The close association between Rome and Etruscan cities is also attested by the literary tradition which records that Caere was the town to which the Vestal virgins and the *sacra* of the Roman state were entrusted during the Gallic invasion of 390/387 B.C.;²⁵ and where Romans went to learn religious lore and rituals.²⁶ It also appears that certain elements of Etruscan social organisation were to become greatly influential on the development of the later magisterial culture of the *nobiles* at Rome.²⁷

The *Tomba delle Statue* near Ceri, dated to the early seventh century B.C. may provide some evidence of the state of Roman social structure during the regal period.²⁸ The tomb contained statues of two 'colossal' seated males carved directly from the rock in the entrance room which leads into the tomb chamber (Ill. 134). Since the occupants of the *Tomba delle statue* in fact are husband and wife, the two male statues are therefore believed to represent the husband's father and grandfather or the husband and wife's fathers – if the identification is correct, these are ancestral images of authority figures; perhaps previous '*patresfamilias*' or members of the family who held some form of political or social position.²⁹ The same analogy has been drawn between the images from the *Tomba delle cinque sedie* (Ill. 135) and a small terracotta figure from Massa Maritima which are also concluded to be portraits of ancestors.³⁰

It has been suggested that these equated with images from the entrance halls of Etruscan houses – which the tombs allegedly reflect.³¹ If so, then the fact that there were *solia* associated with images of ancestors in the tombs is strongly suggestive of antecedents for the

24 Also the fresco from Cerveteri, dating to the third quarter of the sixth century B.C., polychrome terra cotta; S 4034, Musée du Louvre. However, there were some notable difference between the Etruscan practices and those found at Rome: Cic. *Div.* 1.41, 2.35, 38; *De Re. Deor.* 2.4.

25 Livy *AUC* 5.40 and 49.

26 Livy *AUC* 9.36.3.

27 T. Cornell, *The beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c. 1000-264 BC)*, Routledge history of the ancient world. (London; New York: Routledge, 1995), 151-72.

28 G. Colonna and F. W. von Hase, "Alle origini della statuaria etrusca: la tomba delle statue presso Ceri," *StEtr* 52 (1986). See also S. Steingraber, "Ahnenkult und bildliche Darstellungen von Ahnen in etruskischen und unteritalischen Grabgemälden aus vorromischer Zeit," in *Images of Ancestors*, ed. J. M. Hojte, *Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Antiquity* 5 (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2002), 130-31.

29 Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 344. In Etruscan tombs, women were also depicted by seated statues (such as from the *Tomba delle cinque sedie*) but usually in another room in the context of a banquet. Importantly, images of women are not associated with power insignia. F. Prayon, "Zum ursprünglichen Aussehen und zur Deutung des Kultraumes in der tomba delle Cinque Sedie bei Cerveteri," *MWP* (1974).

30 Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 345; S. Steingraber, *Etruskische Möbel* (Roma: G. Bretschneider, 1979), 130 no. 513; F. W. von Hase, "Eine unbekannter etruskische Sitzstatuette in Massa Marittima," *MWP* (1973).

31 Steingraber, *Etruskische Möbel*, 176-77.

later Roman *solium* of the *paterfamilias* placed at the door of the house and the presence of *imagines maiorum* in the *atrium*.³²

The emphasis on ancestors throughout the region may be evident from the finds from Murlo, Tuscany. Diverse interpretations have been proposed for the site, including that it was a sanctuary (due to the acroterial roof figurines), or that it was an 'archaic banquet or meeting hall' of a local clan or group of clans or of a local military, social or economic alliance, due to the fact that the ground plan of the site has little in common with typical Etruscan temples from this period.³³ The hall itself as decorated internally with a terracotta frieze which shows what looks like a wedding procession, of a couple being carried along in a wagon past tripods, while the procession culminates in an assembly of figures seated on folding stools and includes couples on banqueting couches being waited on by servants, strumming lyres while hunting dogs crouch beneath (Ill. 136). Importantly, the folding chairs are similar to the *sella curulis* – later associated with the *imperium* of Roman magistrates. Interpretation is difficult. The stools and pose of the figures may be divinities,³⁴ or they may be a collection of 'predecessors' who held magisterial or royal power; or they could be a collection of aristocrats, or they could be the ancestors of such persons.³⁵ They could thus have analogies with the seated terracotta figures from the *Tomba delle cinque sedie* and the *Tomba delle statue, et al.*, already mentioned. Whoever these figures represented, they were obviously

32 Cic. *De or.* 2.225-226. T. Schäfer, "Imperii Insignia: Sella Curulis und Fasces, zur Repräsentation romischer Magistrate," *MDAI-R* 29 (1989). For the Etruscan origin of the *atrium*: Varro *L.L.* 5.161; Plin. (Y) *Ep.* 5.6.15.

33 R. D. De Puma and J. P. Small, *Murlo and the Etruscans: art and society in ancient Etruria, Wisconsin studies in classics*. (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1994). The main site is a courtyard building with four sides (three of them with porticoes) approximately 60 metres long (Spivey, *Etruscan Art*, 139.), dating to the early sixth century B.C. This structure was built over an earlier, simpler predecessor dating to the Orientalising Period. The building was then, for reasons unexplained, systematically dismantled and buried in approximately 530 B.C. It could be that the hall actually served as the public *consilium*, or *curia*, the place where a magistrate, 'king' or a paramount clan leader of the area sat in council with his advisers - those who were heads of other families in their own right, or who were distinguished enough to be called upon to perform this role. Or it could be that it represented a religious centre or banqueting hall of a local grouping of associated clan leaders (*paterfamilias*) perhaps linked by blood or other familial association. It has been suggested more recently that the building served an important economic function as a site for primary production and manufacturing of raw materials, well protected and lavishly decorated, which served as part of a system of trade in large commodities – similar to a European colonial fort. J. MacIntosh Turfa and A. G. Steinmayer Jr, *Interpreting Early Etruscan Structures: The Question of Murlo*, vol. 70, *Papers of the British School at Rome* (Rome: British School at Rome, 2002).

34 Spivey, *Etruscan Art*, 139.

35 A similar scene is the terracotta frieze from the structure at Acquarossa (Ill. 137), contemporary with the hall at Murlo. Possibly related is the frieze from the Archaic Temple of the Sant' Omobono Sanctuary at Rome, which depicts chariots drawn by winged horses carrying a female figure and charioteer which is similar to that found at other sites at Rome, such as the Forum, Palatine, Esquiline and Capitolium, and at Veii and Velletri: Holloway, *The archaeology of early Rome and Latium*, 75, Fig. 5.14.

important people who held (or had held) some status within the society that constructed the hall, and the fact that similar imagery is also associated with tombs, indicates that social status, power and ancestry were considered worthy of celebration and representation.³⁶

Similarly intriguing are the figures from the roof, among which are sphinxes and seated figures wearing strange 'cowboy hats' which suggests that these might represent divinities or figures who presided over the hall³⁷ or perhaps they are 'guardian ancestors' - such as the later *imagines maiorum* in the Roman *atrium*³⁸ (Ill. 138.1-2).

Another artefact perhaps confirming the aristocratic nature of society across central Italy at this time is the 'Capestrano warrior' (Ill. 130) now in the Museo Nazionale Archeologico di Antichità, Chieti, which dates to the second half of the sixth century B.C.³⁹ and was found in a necropolis near L'Aquila.⁴⁰ The monumental size of this statue, being a male warrior

36 De Puma and Small, *Murlo and the Etruscans: art and society in ancient Etruria*, 100-13.

37 There are problems with the suggestion that it was a 'meeting place' or 'league hall' - primarily because this would indicate that Murlo was the centre of some kind of regional association - religious, political social, or all three. It has also been suggested that the site was the 'palace' of a clan leader. Confirming the aristocratic nature of the hall, it has been suggested that a niche in the courtyard may have once been the position of a 'throne' or *solium* - but this is not conclusive as there is no other evidence, such as caches or storage rooms found associated with the site which suggest it was a clan leader or king's residence - at least not a palace of the 'megaron' type found in the Aegean. However, it cannot be discounted that it was a palace or building for central administration. That is was a building of significance cannot be disputed.

38 Verg. *Aen.* 7.173-176.

39 The native origin and chronology of the figure are relatively sound. The panoply of the Warrior is central Italic: the disk armour being a type the Greeks called *kardiophylakes*, actual examples of which are to be found in the large necropolis of Aufidena in Abruzzo: L. Mariani, "Aufidena," *MonAnt* 10 (1901). The leather apron was known to the Greeks as the *mitra*, which also formed part of the defensive armour - another example an example of which is in the Villa Giulia Museum, Rome: V. Cianfarani, *Antiche civiltà d'Abruzzo* (Roma: De Luca, 1969), 18-19. The short sword carried by the Warrior is part of the strong metalworking tradition of the Abruzzi: P. F. Stary, *Zur eisenzeitlichen Bewaffnung und Kampfweise in Mittelitalien (ca. 9. bis 6. Jh. v. Chr.)*, *Marburger Studien zur vor- und frühgeschichte. Bd. 3* (Mainz am Rhein: P. von Zabern, 1981), 283-84, with parallels once again from Aufidena and Campovalano: V. Cianfarani, *Introduzione all' Antichità adriatiche* (Chieti: Soprintendenza alle Antichità degli Abruzzi, 1975), 43. The dagger and small axe also have various analogous types found throughout the Abruzzo region: Stary, *Zur eisenzeitlichen Bewaffnung und Kampfweise in Mittelitalien (ca. 9. bis 6. Jh. v. Chr.)*, 284-85; Cianfarani, *Antiche civiltà d'Abruzzo*, 53-61. However, the chronology of the panoply of the figure, the letter-forms of the inscription and material from the small necropolis surrounding the find-spot of the Warrior, all suggest a date in the second half of the sixth century B.C.: See G. Moretti, "Il guerriero italico e la necropoli di Capestrano," *BPI* (1936-7); L. Franchi Dell'Orto et al., "Schede: Capestrano," in *Culture adriatiche antiche d'Abruzzo e di Molise* (Roma: De Luca, 1978); R. Salvia del Rosario, "Necropoli archaiche d'Abruzzo: La Necropoli di Capestrano," in *Papers in Italian Archaeology IV. The Cambridge Conference. Part iii: Patterns in Protohistory*, ed. C. Malone and S. Stoddart, *BAR International Series* (Cambridge: BAR, 1985).

40 M. Sehlmeier, *Stadtrömische Ehrenstatuen der republikanischen Zeit: Historizität und Kontext von Symbolen nobilitären Standesbewußtseins*, *Historia* (Wiesbaden, Germany). Einzelschriften; Heft 130 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1999), 20; see J. J. Basile, "Livy VIII, 10, 12 and the Warrior from Capestrano: A Re-Evaluation," *BCIJ* 10 (1996).

standing over two and one half metres tall,⁴¹ its public location, and its inscription provide a possible analogy for the development of votive or honorary statuary tradition at Rome.⁴² This statue, which is described in the museum notice as an image of a local 'king', 'Nevius Pompuledius', was allegedly set on top of a tomb accompanied by an inscription in South Picene, a paleo-Sabellian language.⁴³

The interpretation and function of the figure is disputed. The most popular theory arose from its "stele-like" configuration and proximity to a contemporary necropolis: indicating it possibly was grave marker or effigy representing a specific deceased individual, and that it perhaps served as a focal point for certain rituals involving the dead. This hypothesis was stated by A. Boëthius, who interpreted the schematized facial features as a funerary mask of Italic type and the javelins on each of the figure's struts as representing the propping up of the deceased for public display before burial.⁴⁴ That the statue had some religious context and was not purely secular would therefore seem to be beyond doubt. Given the hat the figure wears (similar that of the acroterial figure from Murlo) it is possible that it was in fact a votive offering of a local paramount clan leader or king to a god, such as Apollo and that it was

41 G. Moretti, *Il Guerriero Italico di Castrano* (Roma: La Libreria dello Stato, 1936), 6; Cianfarani, *Antiche civiltà d'Abruzzo*, 78. The figure's arms are folded across its chest, and it wears a panoply depicting a disk-type armour protecting the chest and back. The figure also has a short sword, knife, and axe, a wide belt encircling the waist, a necklace and armlets, a stiff apron over the groin with a shorter version covering the small of the back; and a pair of sandals on the feet. On its head the figure wears a wide-brimmed discoidal helmet made from a separate piece of terracotta. The statue stands on a plinth with two struts running from base to elbows; on each of these struts is sculpted a short javelin in low relief and on the one to the right of the figure there is a short inscription. The Warrior is sculpted with unnaturally wide hips and buttocks and a thin, wasp-like waist, and the facial features are highly schematized.

42 Sehlmeier, *Stadrömische Ehrenstatuen der republikanischen Zeit: Historizität und Kontext von Symbolen nobilitären Standesbewußtseins*, 20.

43 The actual decipherment of the short inscription is disputed: Moretti, *Il Guerriero Italico di Castrano*, 17-18; V. Pisani, *Le Lingue dell'Italia antica oltre il latino*, 2 ed. (Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier, 1964), 225; G. Devoto, *The languages of Italy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 29.

44 A. Boëthius, "Livy 8, 10, 12 and the Warrior Image from Castrano," *Eranos* 54 (1956), 203-04. Both of these practices are well-attested to by Polybios' (Polyb. 6.53) and by Pliny (Plin. (E) *HN* 35.6). Problematic for this interpretation is that the statue was not found in association with any one grave specifically, and more importantly, with no warrior tomb - which is what one might expect if it had served as a grave marker. Also, the state of preservation of the monument suggests that it was carefully *buried* very soon after it was made - perhaps a practice similar to the one mentioned at Rome of burying old statuary and terracotta reliefs from temples and religious sites (possibly including material from tombs) in *favissae* if damaged or if the site was reconstructed.

placed in a spot of religious significance.⁴⁵

The above evidence confirms the importance of individual, ancestral and power iconography in Etruria, Latium and central Italy from the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. The written sources indicate that at this time Etruscan and Roman society was still organised according to large clan groups bound under a senior leader who would be recognised as its head,⁴⁶ such as the story concerning Attus Clausus and the *lapis satricum* which names Publius Valerius and his *sodales* (Ill. 139). Even in the middle Republic such men were still regarded as the 'senior' members of their *gens*.⁴⁷ The fact that the Etruscan tombs were laid out to resemble houses, with the cinerary urns placed in association with *solia* and statues representing male figures, could be the source for later Roman practice associating the *imagines* with the *atrium* and the fact that this was the place where traditionally the Roman *paterfamilias* kept his *solium*.⁴⁸

Confirmation that later practice had its seeds in earlier aristocratic culture would seem to be provided by the literary tradition recorded by Livy who related the story of the murder by the Gauls of the Roman senators while seated upon their *solia* in 390/387 B.C.⁴⁹ This implies there was a long tradition common to the Roman and Etruscan élite classes of keeping images of the ancestors (or at least totem representations via their *solia*) which acted as tutelary safeguards at the entrance or within the *atrium* of the house.

45 That it could be such a piece is suggested by the fact that in early Roman religion, a *templum* or some other sacred area could in fact be an open area or *temenos* that was cleansed and used for ritual purposes – some of the later sacred areas of the Forum at Rome, such as the *regia* and the *lapis niger*, it would seem were once such open areas that had been marked off specifically for such purposes. There are also earlier graves associated with both these places at Rome and with the Temple at Satricum – and in the context of the find-spot of the Warrior, this could explain the presence of graves which may, therefore, be earlier than the Warrior itself. An innovative attempt at answering these questions, also based upon literary sources, was advanced in 1949, and again in 1956 by Ferri who suggested that the Caepetrano Warrior represented a victim of *devotio*, an Italic and Roman practice of religious significance which secured the defeat of an opposing army by the surrender of the life of the army commander, or later by swearing a devotional statue or temple to the god whose assistance was invoked: S. Ferri, "Osservazioni intorno al guerriero di Caepetrano," *BdA* (1949).

46 As the inscription from Satricum containing a dedication to Publius Valerius and his *sodales* would indicate: see H. J. Versnel, "Satricum Publius Valerius," *Hermeneus* 52 (1980); R. Bloch, "À propos de l'inscription latine archaïque trouvée à Satricum," *Latomus: Revue d'Etudes Latines* 42 (1983); V. Pisani, "l'iscrizione paleolatina di Satricum," *Glotta* 50 (1981).

47 Cic. *Fam.* 9.21.2-3.

48 These suggestions are, of course, merely speculative on my part; all that these cinerary urns factually tell us is that other Italic peoples placed great emphasis on deceased family members and ancestors – something which was noted in relation to the Etruscans by the Romans themselves and which later became characteristic of Roman Republican culture. Although the emphasis on power imagery and the focus on the human head (not in an individualised form) are striking.

49 Livy *AUC* 5.41.7-10; Colonna and von Hase, "Alle origini della statuaria etrusca: la tomba delle statue presso Ceri," 34-41 esp. 40.

Kaschnitz von Weinberg thought that the early Roman *imagines* were directly related to the so-called 'canopic' urns from Chiusi in form and context, which roughly span the time period from 700 and 550 B.C.⁵⁰ These urns may well have had their antecedents in Villanovan urns which have been found in Rome, Cerveteri, Tarquinia and other sites and which sported warriors' helmets⁵¹ – the helmets possibly denoting some rank or position of the deceased (Ill. 140).⁵² The Chiusi urns were for housing the ashes of the dead, and have lids shaped as human heads.⁵³ They were commonly made of clay, but some were also made of beaten bronze. Frequently they are found associated with, or sitting on, what is described as a 'throne' (*solium*) in the tomb; thereby further suggesting possible allusions to the deceased's position or rank (Ills. 141-147).

Early in the sequence the heads of these urns were merely linear, abstract representations.⁵⁴ Among the earlier examples dating typically from the early to mid-seventh century B.C.⁵⁵ are urns with bronze or clay masks attached to the neck with bronze wire (Ills. 141 and 142).⁵⁶ The faces are shaped like pears and the eyebrows, mouth, eyes and nose are modelled in high relief or plastically moulded and then applied, which would indicate that they were hammered (in the case of bronze) or moulded over a core.

By the end of the seventh century B.C. the heads fashioned from clay formed the actual lids to the jars. These heads on the whole appear schematic and linear – with large, balding head surfaces of the skull, sometimes somewhat squat. An example from Chiusi⁵⁷ (Ill. 143) dating to around 600 B.C. has what looks like puncture or peg holes interspersed on the surface of the face, which may have indicated that a mask of bronze or some other material was attached

50 There has been a typological sequence laid out for them by Riis: P. J. Riis, *Tyrrhenika: an archaeological study of the Etruscan sculpture in the archaic and classical periods* (Copenhagen: E. Munksgaard, 1941), 108-9. Brendel believed that only Riis' groups 1-5 are older than 600 B.C., while Riis' group 6 dates for the most part to around 600 B.C., and that his group 7 dates to the mid-sixth century B.C.: Brendel, *Etruscan Art*, 106.

51 Villanovan Helmet Urn from the Impiccato cemetery, Tarquinia eighth century B.C. – Museo Archeologico, Florence; illustrated in Spivey, *Etruscan Art*, 30, ill 18.

52 Brendel, *Etruscan Art*, 106.

53 G. Kaschnitz von Weinberg, "Clusium," *MonAnt* 30 (1925); D. Levi, *I canopi di Chiusi*, vol. 1, *Critica d'arte* (Milan: Feltrinelli, 1935/36), 18-26, 82-89, pls 8-15, 56-59.

54 G. Kaschnitz von Weinberg, "Studien zur etruskischen und frühromischen Porträtkunst," *MDAI-R* 41 (1926), 192.

55 Brendel, *Etruscan Art*, 107. See cinerary urn head. Museo Etrusco, Chiusi (Ill. 140).

56 Ibid., 108. See M. Cristofani et al., *I bronzi degli Etruschi* (Novara: Istituto geografico De Agostini, 1985), 288-89, figs. 107-09.

57 Terracotta, GR 1853.6-4.1 (Vases H 245) Room 71, Italy before the Roman Empire, case 18, British Museum: O. Brendel, *Etruscan art, Pelican History of Art* (Yale University Press, 1995), 106-9; E. Macnamara, *The Etruscans* (London, The British Museum Press, 1990), 29, pl. 31; J. Swaddling (ed.), *Italian Iron Age artefacts in the British Museum*, Papers of the Sixth British Museum Classical Colloquium (London, The British Museum Press, 1986), 153-57. For a further example from Dolciano, see Brendel, *Etruscan Art*, 108.

to it (Ills. 143 and 96). During the sixth century B.C. the jar bodies often bear elementary hands or arms moulded to them (Ills. 144 and 145).⁵⁸ The faces still appear flat and mask-like although with a basic attempt at individuation of the features - although it must be said there appears to be absolutely no attempt at individualisation or personalisation to approximate a living person's actual physiognomy.⁵⁹

The latest group, dated to the mid-sixth century B.C. have more individuated features and are more competently executed - appearing as true heads - not just stereotypical masks attached to necks or modelled as the earlier examples. These have defined 'bobbed' hair styles and each has a different arrangement of the facial features (Ills. 146 and 147).⁶⁰

The claim that the Republican portraits were derived from this Etruscan tradition is supported by the observation that both at Rome and Etruria these images were associated with funerary contexts and with emblems of power or status, such as the *solia*. Furthermore, Brendel saw in the typology of the Chiusi urns a striving to include physiognomic references to the actual deceased, and hence that they provide evidence of an early portraiture type which had a strong interest in 'realism'.⁶¹ However, I do not consider that these constitute portraits in any modern sense - they are in fact types denoting or symbolically representing the deceased person in the context of their social (and possibly 'political') status.⁶² What they do indicate is an emphasis on the head which was to manifest itself in later Etruscan and Roman art.

Etruscan burial practices, evidenced by the early Chiusan cinerary urns and tomb sculptures already mentioned, may have reflected developing political structures which may have provided a precursor to patrician and later magisterial *nobiles* culture, such as the senatorial use of *solia* and the close association of *imagines* with both the *atrium* and funerary practice in the middle and late Republican periods. However, the link (if any) between the Etruscan forms and Roman *imagines maiorum* is not entirely clear. The fact that some of the Chiusan

58 Another example is a canopic urn dating to the second half of seventh century B.C. made from terracotta, Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Sarteano (Ill. 144). Another is in the Louvre: cinerary urn with hands dating to the second half of the sixth century B.C. (Ill. 96).

59 Brendel, *Etruscan Art*, 108.

60 Ibid., 130-31, ill. 83 and 84.

61 Ibid., 106.

62 Cf J. Prag, "Seianti and Etruscan Portraiture," in *Seianti Hanunia Tlesnasa: The Story of an Etruscan Noblewoman*, ed. J. Prag and J. Swaddling, *The British Museum Occasional Papers* (London: The British Museum, 2002), 60: "Even if these early attempts can make no claim to be portraits in the true sense, they mark a very important psychological and artistic step from the general to the specific in the recognition and representation of individual human personalities rather than mere types." See also O. J. Brendel, *Etruscan Art* (New York: Penguin Books, 1978; reprint, 1996), 106-09, 29-31.

urns appear to have had bronze masks placed over a clay face, may be an early manifestation of what would become the later Roman practice of placing masks on the deceased for the purposes of the funeral ceremony (which we are told by literary references were made of wax and were then placed in the *armaria* of the house) - and may have originated from the same underlying belief, that it was considered bad fortune to look upon the eyes of a deceased person.⁶³ Similarly the association of these urns with *solia* and other power iconography would indicate a connection with the role of the Roman *patres* and *patresfamilias* of the middle and late Republican period.

From the late sixth to early fifth century B.C. the focus in Etruscan burial practice shifts to Cerveteri (Caere) and Tarquinia, where many of the tombs are still laid out to resemble houses and are lavishly decorated with painted frescoes and sometimes stucco reliefs. At Cerveteri, there is a change in burial custom within the tombs, which are more elaborate and characterised by inhumation burials in large sarcophagi. Early in the sequence at Cerveteri these took the form of terracotta gabled boxes,⁶⁴ but by the last quarter of the sixth century B.C. the lids of some of these sarcophagi consist of terracotta statues depicting the deceased reclining on a bier or bed, as if present at a feast, and sometimes in the company of a female figure. Among the most characteristic of these is the *Sarcophagus of the Newly Weds* in the Villa Giulia Museum, Rome (Ill. 148),⁶⁵ and another known as the *Sarcophagus of the Spouses* now in the Louvre (Ill. 149).⁶⁶ These figures are in the Archaic Greek/Etruscan style⁶⁷ characteristic of the statues from Veii, including the "Apollo" (Ill. 150.1-9) and the early fragments from Temple I of the Sant' Omobono sanctuary at Rome (Ill. 151); accordingly they are dated to the last half of the sixth century B.C. These statues reveal the Etruscan interest in the head and other typological elements which are emphasised by the manner in depicting the other parts of the body; in the case of these sarcophagi the legs and torsos are almost formless, swathed by drapery. The fact that these are not individualised portraits in any sense is revealed by a comparison of the heads of each of the figures and their

63 Plin. (E) *HN* 11.58.

64 Prag, "Seianti and Etruscan Portraiture," 60.

65 Sarcophagus from Cerveteri (Banditaccia necropolis). Museo Nazionale di Villa Giulia, Rome; dating to around 520-510 B.C.

66 Sarcophagus from Cerveteri (Banditaccia necropolis), called the "Sarcophagus of the Spouses", polychrome terra cotta, (114 x 190 x 69.5 cm), Louvre; dating to around 520-510 B.C.

67 The Greek influence is said to be East Greek or Ionian – possibly through Ionian colonies established in Sicily and southern Italy. See Prag, "Seianti and Etruscan Portraiture."

overwhelming similarities.⁶⁸

This tradition of depicting the deceased as a reclining banqueter continues through the late fifth to the early second century B.C. at centres such as Cerveteri and Tarquinia, with the full sized sarcophagi in limestone and alabaster, and some even in bronze.⁶⁹ An example is the sarcophagus in the Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, dating to the mid-fourth century B.C., which is made from 'marble of Circei' and comes originally from the Banditaccia necropolis at Tarquinia (Ill. 153) from the *Tomb of the Sarcophagi*, so-called because of the presence of three other sarcophagi made of the same stone.⁷⁰ On the lid of the sarcophagus, decorated on the corners with acroteria reminiscent of the roof of a building, the deceased lies adorned with jewels; near the head is the representation of a *liber linteus*, i.e., a book written on a linen cloth. There is a polychrome bas-relief on the casket's front and on one side, which appears to represent some form of *pompa funebris* including musicians and a reference to political office, in that a priest or individual is shown carrying a *lituus*.

Dating to the early third century B.C. is the so-called *Sarcophagus of the Magistrate* (Ill. 154) from Tarquinia.⁷¹ This is decorated with a bas-relief only on the front, contained the remains of an Etruscan magistrate who died at age 36. The relief shows the deceased himself on a chariot, preceded and followed by personages in keeping with his status who wear his sashes (emblems of power) – and perhaps this, too, echoes the *pompa funebris* of Roman funerals. On the upper strip of the frame of the casket there is a long inscription naming the deceased, listing the offices he held, some cultural prescriptions regarding the tomb, and the age at which he died. This inscription is reminiscent of the *eulogia* or *tituli* found associated with Roman burials from the third century B.C., such as those from the *Tomb of the Scipiones*.⁷²

A mid-third century B.C. example is the sarcophagus of Velthur Partunus, 'The Magnate', made of painted marble and limestone, which is now housed in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Tarquinia (Ill. 155).⁷³ The male figure on the lid of the sarcophagus is shown

68 Ibid., 60. Interestingly, the Etruscan focus on the head, evidenced in the cinerary urns already discussed is in marked contrast to the Greek tradition which is more concerned with depicting the human form in its idealized totality.

69 Ibid., 61.

70 Cat. 14949. Cerveteri, Necropolis of Banditaccia. Mid-fourth century B.C. Marble "of Circei"; H. 100 cm; L. 190/195 cm; W. 66/70 cm.

71 Cat. 14950, third century B.C.; nenfro H 85cm; L 206cm: Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, Musei Vaticani.

72 ILLRP 312 and 316.

73 No. 9873, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Tarquinia.

almost fully reclining, draped only from the waist down - his upper torso being bare. He holds in his right hand a *patera*. In contrast to the youthful appearance of the figure, the inscription on the sarcophagus (CIE 5423) tells us he was aged 82 when he died.⁷⁴

A final example is the sarcophagus of Laris Pulena from Tarquinia, dating to the early second century B.C. (Ill. 167). The figure of Laris has a large body, bare chest, garlanded head and he holds an unfurled scroll on which is inscribed details of his life.⁷⁵

These representations are rather formulaic, although the fact they are made of stone suggest that there were not mass produced, as the terracotta urns later in the sequence were.⁷⁶ That there was some attempt at individuation in the facial features of the portrayed seems credible, that these were 'individualised' seems more remote.⁷⁷ Overall, the emphasis still seems to be on the type of individual that the deceased was, rather than on his individual personality as revealed by the physiognomy.

In contrast, but parallel in development to the large sarcophagi from Tarquinia, is the series of cinerary urns, mostly made from alabaster and terracotta, which depict the deceased as under life sized, dating from the fourth to the first centuries B.C. In the earliest phase at Volterra, the urns were often made of tufa and were without sculpted decoration; although in many instances these appear to have been painted with floral or geometric decoration (Ill. 157). These urns are composed of two parts, the cover and the case. The cinerary urns are found throughout central and southern Etruria where cremation was dominant such as at Chiusi, Perugia and Volterra.

From the beginning of the third century B.C., the lids of these urns start to be decorated with sculpted representations of the deceased while the case is decorated with relief scenes depicting Greek myths or Etruscan scenes. The deceased is usually depicted lying on their side on a couch with cushions under the arm, as if at a banquet – similar to the earlier

74 M. Nielsen, "'stemmate quod Tusco ramum millesime ducis.'" Family Tombs and Geneological Memory among the Etruscans," in *Images of Ancestors*, ed. J. M. Højte, *Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Antiquity* 5 (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2002), 96 and 98, fig.6.

75 Prag, "Seianti and Etruscan Portraiture," 63.

76 Cf. *Ibid.*, 62.

77 Brendel, *Etruscan Art*, 396: "There appears to be a serious possibility, not to be disregarded, that a turn from 'typical' to 'real' portraits indeed happened in Etruria about or shortly after 350. If the workshops of the sculptured sarcophagi led this change, they merely brought the old Etruscan insistence on facial differentiation as a mark of human reality to its ultimate conclusion. Henceforward portraits in the modern sense, i.e., genuine likenesses of specific and nameable persons, may be expected in Etruria, though we will have to regard them as special and perhaps as exceptional."

sarcophagi from Tarquinia and Cerveteri mentioned above. Sometimes the figures are shown holding something: for women it is an object such as a mirror or a pomegranate, for men it is often a writing tablet or a writing scroll, etc. (Ill. 158.1-4). The female figures are often veiled, while the men are often depicted with their shoulder and side uncovered. Many of the figures are shown with a particular hand gesture involving the middle finger of the right hand, although what this means can only be conjectured. Some of these cinerary urns have inscriptions in Etruscan, and later sometimes in Latin, which often state the name of the deceased, their age and sometimes other salient facts. Early fourth century examples are the terracotta urn from Chinciano Terme depicting the deceased with a 'vanth' (Ill. 152)⁷⁸ and the bronze urn depicting a reclining youth now in the Hermitage (Ill. 156).⁷⁹

Interestingly, during the third century B.C. the male figures are increasingly depicted with bare chest, large belly and fleshy limbs – and this would appear to have become a typological method of portrayal for Etruscan men, as evidenced by the parallel development of the full sized sarcophagi already mentioned.⁸⁰ Such a body shape must have communicated something specific about the individual to the viewer, and stands in stark contrast to the Greek portrayal of the body beautiful in the contemporary period.

In the earlier phase, the facial images of the deceased were typological representations, such as 'old man', 'young man', 'woman' etc., consisting largely of what appears to have been anonymous faces with little attempt at individualization. Examples are an urn lid in Florence⁸¹ and two from Volterra.⁸² It is likely that these type of images were meant to serve as symbolic images of the deceased rather than as individual portraits *per se*.⁸³ This is confirmed from the fact that many of the lids appear to have been mass produced as set types with some amendment to the overall portrayal, thereby showing that some individuation in the images was attempted, although probably not any precise individualization.⁸⁴ Further justification for the view that these are typological representations is shown by the fact that in some, male faces were converted to represent women.

78 Museo Nazionale Etrusco, Firenze.

79 Reclining Youth, cinerary urn, bronze, early fourth century B.C.: L. 69 cm, H. (of figure) 42 cm. State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg, Russia.

80 Prag, "Seianti and Etruscan Portraiture," 63. One is reminded of the Roman authors description of the 'obesus etruscus': Catull. 39.10-12; and their characterization as 'pinguis': Verg. G. 2.193.

81 No. 78487, alabaster, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Firenze.

82 No. 375, alabaster; and no. 414, tufa: Museo Etrusco Guarnacci, Volterra.

83 M. Nielsen, "Portrait of a Marriage," *ActHyp 4: Ancient Portraiture: Image and Likeness* (1992), 111.

84 Ibid., 108.

In style many of the Volterranean urns exemplify 'middle Italic Hellenism', consonant with the portrait of 'Ennius' from the *Tomb of the Scipiones* in Rome⁸⁵ and the urn from Chinciano Terme mentioned above (Ill. 152), the stimulus for the genre emanating from the Hellenistic world through frequent contacts with the Greek cities of southern Italy, then from other Etruscan centres and the middle-Italic region.⁸⁶ The figures on the urns are therefore representative types to which a modicum of individuation appears to have been introduced, but they fall far short of being portraits of recognisable persons. The quality of the urns also varies considerably, on some the figures are reduced to nothing more than a mass produced type. However, the Etruscan emphasis on the head of the individual as the important element is clear, and in many urns, particularly those from Volterra, the body becomes foreshortened and somewhat deformed, usually swathed in drapery and holding some conventional attribute, such as a *patera* or fan.⁸⁷

Images which depict elderly persons in a "realistic manner and denote their social position and advanced age"⁸⁸ also begin to appear at about the same time on several cinerary urns, and those found at Volterra are particularly good examples.⁸⁹ Of particular interest is the *urna degli sposi* now in the Museo Etrusco Guarnacci, Volterra⁹⁰ (Ill. 159) which dates to the mid-second century B.C. This depicts a man and a woman reclining on a bed – the faces of the couple are shown as being distinctly old, with manifold wrinkles etc.⁹¹ Whether the heads were meant to be individualistic is uncertain.⁹² It would appear that many of this terracotta cinerary urns were made from moulds with some individuated features being added later.⁹³

In a similar vein to the *urna degli sposi* during the second half of the second century B.C.

85 Cic. *Arch.* 9.22; A. Maggiani, "Lineamenti di un sviluppo: Il problema del ritratto," in *Artigianato artistico: l'Etruria settentrionale interna in età ellenistica* (Firenze Milano: Regione Toscana; Electa, 1985), 92-93, nos 78-91; Nielsen, "Portrait of a Marriage," 106-07.

86 R. Herbig, *Die jungeretruskischen Steinsarkophage*, vol. 7, *Die Antiken Sarkophagreliefs* (Berlin: 1952), pls 91-103.

87 Prag, "Seianti and Etruscan Portraiture," 62.

88 Nielsen, "Portrait of a Marriage," 111.

89 No. 7, Museo Etrusco Guarnacci, Volterra. See A. Maggiani, "Ritrattistica tardo-ellenistica fra Etruria e Roma," *Prospettiva* 60 (1985), 41-42, no.10.

90 No. 613, Museo Etrusco Guarnacci, Volterra.

91 Portraits such as these have been referred to "...[a]s examples of brilliant naturalism, ruthless realism or of brutal verism – in whatever sense different authors use these overlapping terms. ...In more popular books the descriptions are mostly affected by the physiognomic tradition, according to which the character of a person can be read out of his or her physical features.": Nielsen, "Portrait of a Marriage," 95-96.

92 On the non-individualisation of the cinerary urn heads, see G. R. Barker, T., *The Etruscans* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001; reprint, 2001), 291. However, for the view that there was an attempt at individualisation of the images, see Prag, "Seianti and Etruscan Portraiture," 58-66.

93 Nielsen, "'stemmae quod Tusco ramum millesime ducis.' Family Tombs and Geneological Memory among the Etruscans," 109, fig. 15 and 14.

comes a series of urns given the name of the *Gruppo Luvisi I* – named after the fact that many were found in a tomb belonging to this family.⁹⁴ Examples are urns 174 and 346 in Volterra (Ills. 160-161). The faces of the “Gruppo Luvisi I” are described as “...furrowed, worried looking with strong jaws... this ...reflects ambitious portraiture which can be linked with a face type which was widely disseminated throughout the Greek world now under Roman domination (e.g. Athens, Delos and Pergamon) as well as in Hellenized Italy, in Rome itself and in various Italic towns”.⁹⁵ These are followed by the *Gruppo Luvisi II* which date from the beginning of the first century B.C. to about 80 B.C.: examples are urns 335 and 339 from Volterra (Ills. 162-163). Further examples are urn 262 and the *urna del aruspice* (urn 136) (Ills. 164-165).⁹⁶

While it has been claimed that these later terracotta cinerary urns – such as the *urna degli sposi* – have a direct relation to Roman funeral practice and portrait representation in the Republican period, particularly the *imagines maiorum* and the later marble versions found on the tombs of the non-élite classes from the late second century B.C. onwards,⁹⁷ just precisely

94 A. Maggiani, *Contributo alla conologia delle urne volterrane: i coperchi*, vol. 18, *AALinc* (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 1976), 36-38; Maggiani, “Lineamenti di un sviluppo: Il problema del ritratto,” 93-95, nos 82-83, which corresponds to Nielson’s “Earlier Realistic Group”: M. Nielsen, “I coperchi delle urne volterrane. Caratteristiche e datazione delle ultime botteghe,” *Caratteri dell’ellenismo* (1976), 138, 40 n.16.

95 Nielsen, “Portrait of a Marriage,” 113.

96 Three cinerary urns made from tufa from Volterra can be cited: nos. 572, 568 and 546: R. Bianchi Bandinelli, *Storicità dell’arte classica*, 3. ed. (Bari: De Donato, 1973), 271 n.106. Also, Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik*, pl 89:2.; Maggiani, “Lineamenti di un sviluppo: Il problema del ritratto,” 93, no.81. These three share similarities in the depiction of the drapery (billowing as opposed to folds), the style of the cushions, shape of the fingernails, and the protruding veins on the figures’ left hands etc. Similar features appear on about one hundred Volterranean lid figures of alabaster and tufa: Nielsen, “Portrait of a Marriage,” 103, all of which have been classified as the ‘Earlier Idealising Group’: Nielsen, “I coperchi delle urne volterrane. Caratteristiche e datazione delle ultime botteghe,” 138; M. Nielsen, “Late Etruscan Cinerary Urns from Volterra at the Paul J. Getty Museum: A lid Figure altered from Male to Female and an ancestor to Satirist Persius,” *GMusJ* 14 (1986), 45-48; Nielsen, “Portrait of a Marriage,” 103. This group is dated to around 110-80 B.C. and is largely synonymous with the Gruppo Luvisi I and II: Nielsen, “I coperchi delle urne volterrane. Caratteristiche e datazione delle ultime botteghe,” 138; Nielsen, “Late Etruscan Cinerary Urns from Volterra at the Paul J. Getty Museum: A lid Figure altered from Male to Female and an ancestor to Satirist Persius,” 45-48.; Nielsen, “Portrait of a Marriage,” 103. These dates have been arrived at after taking into consideration a series of unrelated dating methods: the burial complex in which the urns were found, typological series of various features of the lids, epigraphical data, grave goods (including coins) and hairdos: Nielsen, “I coperchi delle urne volterrane. Caratteristiche e datazione delle ultime botteghe,” 138; Nielsen, “Late Etruscan Cinerary Urns from Volterra at the Paul J. Getty Museum: A lid Figure altered from Male to Female and an ancestor to Satirist Persius,” 45-48; Nielsen, “Portrait of a Marriage,” 103.

97 G. Karo, *Etruskisch-romische Bildkunst*, vol. (Festschrift Amelung), *AntPl* (Berlin & Leipzig: 1928), 100-05, esp. 103-04; Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik*, 242-43, 83, pls 88:2, 89:1; B. Schweitzer, *Die Bildniskunst der Römischen Republik* (Leipzig-Weimar: Koehler & Amelang, 1948), 55-56, 78. (stressing the middle-Italic background); P. J. Riis, *Den etruskiske kunst*, 2nd 1962 ed. (Copenhagen: Forlaget Fremad, 1948), 195-97; E. H. Richardson, *The Etruscans, their art and civilization* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), 166; R. Bianchi Bandinelli, *Il Ritratto nella antichità* (Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia italiana, 1965), 695-738, esp. 16; Gazda, “Etruscan Influence in the Funerary Reliefs of Late Republican Rome: A Study of Vernacular Portraiture,” 861-62.

the direction of the relationship is debatable. Much depends on the dating of the urns which varies between the early third to the early first century B.C. when the portraits at Rome are believed to have commenced. In the alternative, other scholars have stressed that Hellenistic 'realism' in portraiture had pervaded the whole of Italy by the time of the creation of the Etruscan and Roman forms, and so they attribute both the urn series and the portraits at Rome to Hellenistic traditions.⁹⁸

In support of this view the monument of Blaesus and Blaesia from the Via del Mortaro made from travertine is cited, which is regarded as among the earliest example of the rectangular framed Republican tomb type.⁹⁹ The monument was originally given a date of the late second century B.C., but Vessberg believed it dated to the first quarter of the first century B.C.¹⁰⁰ Gazda believed that the style of the heads directly resembled the late Etruscan cinerary urns (Ills. 159-165) and central italic terracotta votive heads¹⁰¹ (Ills. 169 and 170). She believed these depicted men in a stereotypical formula. i.e., a boneless ovoid solid, full cheeks, round chins, protruding lips and large ears; the open lips and bulging forehead supposedly having parallels with the terracotta urns from Chiusi, such as the urn of Aule Vetana;¹⁰² the head of Larth Sentinates Caesa from the *Tomba della Pellegrina* (Ill. 166); and the portrait of Laris Pulena which dates to the late third, early second century B.C. (Ill. 167),¹⁰³ particularly in the schematic design of the surfaces.¹⁰⁴ Another Roman parallel, she claimed, is the Republican monument bearing a double portrait from the Via Statilia (Ill. 72).¹⁰⁵

Further parallels with contemporary late Etruscan works (such as the Etruscan sarcophagus in the Villa Giulia (Ill. 168))¹⁰⁶ is that the head of Blaesus shows a disinterest in anatomical correctness. The head rests on disproportionate shoulders, the neck is stiffly placed, and the

98 Kaschnitz von Weinberg, *Römische Bildnisse*, 8 and 41; R. West, *Römische Porträtplastik*, 2 vols., vol. 2 (Munich: 1933-1941), 17; G. M. A. Richter, "Origins of Verism in Roman Portraits," *JRS* 45 (1955), 40; M. Cristofani, *La tomba del "Tifone"; cultura e società di Tarquinia in età etrusca* (Roma: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 1969), 219, n.27.

99 No.2279, Nuovo Sala VI, Palazzo dei Conservatori.

100 Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik*, 183-84.

101 Gazda, "Etruscan Influence in the Funerary Reliefs of Late Republican Rome: A Study of Vernacular Portraiture," 860. See also Kaschnitz von Weinberg, *Römische Bildnisse*, 13 - for 4 terracotta heads which are similar

102 HIN 59, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek.

103 MN 9804, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Tarquinia; Nielsen, "'stemmate quod Tusco ramum millesime ducis" Family Tombs and Geneological Memory among the Etruscans," 95, fig. 4.

104 Gazda, "Etruscan Influence in the Funerary Reliefs of Late Republican Rome: A Study of Vernacular Portraiture," 866.

105 Once No.2142, Braccio Nuovo, Sala III, Palazzo dei Conservatori. Now in the Museo Centrale Montemartini, Musei Capitolini, Rome.

106 No. 15709, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, Rome.

right shoulder is dislocated and loosely attached to the arm.¹⁰⁷ Similarly, the folds of the drapery on the Blaesus monument have been reduced to a series of flattened, angular planes with only a faint suggestion of rounded modelling. This preference for flat, linear design is also claimed to be evident in most Etruscan stone depiction of drapery. Interestingly it is suggested that the Etruscan figures and the Roman reliefs are both carved with the edge of a flat chisel, driven along the surface of the stone in continuous strokes. There are no deep hollows gouged with a drill in either example which was the preference of Hellenistic sculpture, while both have rough or textured surfaces unlike Hellenistic sculpture of the period.¹⁰⁸

From Volterra also come red-figure *kelebai* which date from around 300 B.C. to the mid-third century B.C.¹ These depict figures which are shown with wrinkles, double-chins, un-classical noses and bald heads. Sometimes these are almost sketch-like in their rendering. This was following a tradition that was already in evidence in the red-figure vases from Apulia and Campania, but the fact that these faces show physical peculiarities and are not in the classical mode make them stand out.¹⁰⁹ A similar emphasis on depicting the human head can be seen in the terracotta votive heads which are provenanced from Etruscan areas including Latium and Campania, dated to the second and first centuries B.C. (Ills. 169-170).¹¹⁰ These were ostensibly votive or thank offerings left in temples and shrines. While these reflect the Etruscan emphasis on head as evident on the cinerary urns and sarcophagi, and appear to advert to the physiognomy of actual individuals, these are at best only referential indicators of individualism – the main emphasis is still on the ‘type’ of person that is represented – and this is indicated by the fact that separate examples, one depicting a young man and another an older man sporting a noticeably careworn facial expression, are made from the same mould.¹¹¹

Whatever the precise dating of these Etruscan and Roman examples, there are a few

107 Gazda, "Etruscan Influence in the Funerary Reliefs of Late Republican Rome: A Study of Vernacular Portraiture," 860.

108 Ibid., 861. The depiction of Blaesus' hands are also referred to as having Etruscan parallels, in that they are highly simplified, angularly cut forms which constitute one element along with the drapery folds within an overall linear surface scheme. Similarly, the fingernails are not described at all or are indicated by summary depressions at the tips of the fingers.

109 See J. D. Beazley, *Etruscan vase-painting, Oxford monographs on classical archaeology* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947), 10, 128-29, Pl. XXIX 7-10; Brendel, *Etruscan Art*, 93, fig. 303.

110 G. Hafner, "Manner-und Junglingsbilder aus terrakotta im Museo Gregoriano Etrusco," *MDAI-R* 73/74 (1966/7), 29-52; Brendel, *Etruscan Art*, 393-94; Prag, "Seianti and Etruscan Portraiture," 60.

111 Prag, "Seianti and Etruscan Portraiture," 60-61.

observations which indicate that the later Etruscan urns are in fact inspired by Roman burial custom and *imagines* and not the other way around. The first is that the power of Rome appears to have been well entrenched in the area by the time these later Etruscan urns appear. While the earlier Etruscans appear to have given much to Rome in terms of its nascent magisterial and religious culture during the sixth and fifth centuries B.C., including certain aristocratic elements relating to status and burial practice (such as *solia*, *fasces*, *collocatio*, and the use and display of a form of *imagines* within the tomb and in the home), it appears that by the fourth and third centuries B.C. Roman culture had evolved its own distinct practices which were now influencing its neighbours and subject peoples.¹¹² This is evidenced by the increasing appearance of processions in Etruscan tomb contexts, depicting lictors bearing *fasces* and magistrates wearing the *toga praetexta* with other symbols of magisterial power. That the portrait style of the Etruscan burial urns and votive heads should also reflect the style favoured at Rome should not be surprising.

It should be considered no coincidence that these portrait heads bear similarities to the *severitas/gravitas* expression, and that they date to the period when Rome's power and cultural influence was setting the agenda throughout the Italian peninsula. I would suggest that the later Etruscan cinerary urns from Volterra, Chiusi and other sites, and the votive terracotta heads of the second and early first centuries B.C. indicate that the *severitas/gravitas* portrait style developed at, and emanated from Rome, and did not in fact owe its origins to the adoption of early Hellenistic pathos portraits used to depict philosophers and literary figures as has been suggested.¹¹³ This will become more clearly evident when the literary and archaeological evidence concerning the social organisation of Rome from the sixth to third centuries B.C. and the emergence of the *nobiles* class and its practices are discussed below.

11.3 The social organisation of Rome in the Regal and early Republican periods and the emergence of the *nobiles* class

Evidence concerning the social organisation of Rome during the late Regal and early Republican periods appear to have reflected similar patterns in neighbouring Etruscan cities. It appears that in the late regal period, Rome was ruled over by a king who held power in

112 Brendel, *Etruscan Art*, 387-401; T. Hölscher, "Römischer Nobiles und hellenistische Herrscher," in *Akten des XIII. Internationalen Kongresses für klassische Archäologie in Berlin 1988* (Mains: 1990), 74; Nielsen, "Portrait of a Marriage," 94.

113 Papini, *Antichi volti della Repubblica* 2004, 72 and 94.

conjunction with a group of clan or tribal leaders. Towards the end of the Regal period it appears that there were moves to restrict or curtail the power or influence of the king and that perhaps after a failed attempt by the last king to reassert a more centralised authority, this system gave way to an aristocratic republican form of government.

The emergence of this aristocratic culture is suggested by several pieces of evidence. The first is the construction of large *atrium* style homes on the *Via Sacra* in the Forum at the end of the sixth century B.C.¹¹⁴ This was the form of home that was to remain dominant during the Republican period – and was to serve as the focus for much of the later *nobiles* culture, particularly the display of *imagines*.¹¹⁵ Interestingly, the ancient tradition relates that Tarquinius Priscus, and Publius Valerius Poplicola, one of the first Consuls of the Republic, both had houses in this area.¹¹⁶ The second is the inscription, the *lapis satricum* (Ill. 139), from Satricum which names a ‘Publius Valerius’ and possibly his companions (*sodales*). This inscription in archaic Latin is related by its find context to the construction of Temple I on the site – which dates to the middle of the sixth century B.C.¹¹⁷ There is some dispute as to the correct interpretation of this fragmentary inscription, but the reference suggests that Publius Valerius was the headman of a group (possibly a clan of related persons) who seem to have formed some kind of armed or religious association suggested by the words *sodales* and *mariei*. The third is the literary account of the transference to Rome of what appears to be clan-chiefs and their retainers, such as the migration to Rome during the reign of Tarquinius Priscus (or shortly thereafter) of Caelius Vibenna,¹¹⁸ and later in the first year of the Republic by the Sabine, Attus Clausus, who thereafter became ‘Claudius’ and so founded one of the most aristocratic and Patrician *gens* in Rome.¹¹⁹

Roman social and political structure did not remain static. At some point between the regal or early Republican periods and the middle Republican period, political, economic and social power became vested in a new élite class, known as the *nobiles*. The emergence of this class with its adoption and adaptation of patrician aristocratic culture (with its concomitant moral

114 Holloway, *The archaeology of early Rome and Latium*, 63, Fig 4.14.

115 This *atrium* house appears to be a development from an adaptation of the *porticus* style house (widely documented from other sites, such as Latium, Ficana, Torrino and Satricum) to a more urban setting: M. Maaskant-Kleibrink, “Early Latin Settlement-Plans at Borgo Le Ferriere (Satricum),” 66, no. *Bulletin Antieke Beschaving* (1991); Holloway, *The archaeology of early Rome and Latium*, 63.

116 Plin. (E) *HN* 34.29.

117 The inscription reads: “...IEI STETERAI POPLIOSIO VALESIOSO SUODALES MAMARTEL...”.

118 Tac. *Ann.* 4.65.

119 Livy *AUC* 2.16.

and social values and funeral customs rooted in religious practice) is suggested by various pieces of literary and archaeological evidence.

During the regal period it appears that the 'senate' may well have been a council (*concilium*) composed of clan chiefs who held some form of religious and social power in relation to their clans acting in some capacity to the King. These clan leaders were referred to as *patres*. It would seem that during this period the conduct of religious affairs, and most importantly control of the auguries and application and interpretation of the law, were largely in the hands of these same clan leaders.¹²⁰

The one-time privileged position of the *patres* (Patrician) in terms of social, religious and political power is confirmed by certain facts still evidenced in historical times in the late Republican period. For instance, the *auspicia publica*, essential for the conduct of any important state business, could only be taken by the highest magistrates, who were seen to act on behalf of all of Rome whenever the gods were consulted.¹²¹ The power to take auspices was transferred from one magistrate to the next; that is, after an official was elected he had to perform a special augury to see if the gods approved his election. Without the auguries a magistrate could not function as any of his acts was believed to be without divine sanction. In the event of a crisis whereby the magistrate ceased to function, the auguries were said to return to the senate where they resided. Crucially, the capacity to take the auguries seems to have become identified with patrician prerogative – and through the auguries it seems that, at least in the early days of the Republic the *patres* were able to exert a considerable influence, if not control, on the high offices of state.

The association between the *patres* and augural and religious rites is further evidenced by the fact that traditionally all religious offices were the preserve of the patricians until the passage of the *lex ogulnia* in 300 B.C.¹²² Even in the late Republic certain public religious offices remained the preserve of the old aristocracy; for example the office of *Pontifex Maximus*. Also suggesting the importance of the *patres* in religious terms was the fact that later Roman domestic sacral ritual was conducted by the *paterfamilias*, centred on the hearth in the *atrium*

120 Holloway, *The archaeology of early Rome and Latium*, 33.

121 A magistrate also took the auspices whenever the various *comitia* and senate were to meet, whenever the erection of a temple or other public building was proposed, or whenever the Romans were about to go to war. Magistrates also commanded the Roman armies, and auspices were taken prior to engaging in any battle.

122 Livy *AUC* 10.6-9; J. A. Crook, *Law and life of Rome*, Cornell paperbacks ed. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984), 134.

which was considered the proper *locus religiosus* of the house, and that the *patresfamilia* had power of life and death over those in their *potestas*. Another clue suggesting that the senate was originally formed from selected heads of the various clan groups is the fact that in the late Republic *patres* was still typical term of address for senators.

However, important for the later evolution of the senate, it appears that even in the regal period, the king may have had the power to include as members of his *concilium* those persons not strictly speaking *patres*. Certainly in later historical times a magistrate would form a *concilium* from among his *amici* (sometimes including former magistrates) to advise him in the conduct of his office, as would a *paterfamilias* in the conduct of his family affairs. This suggests that even in the regal period there may have been non-patrician members of the senate.

Given this fact, it suggests that the *patres* may not have held an absolute monopoly on positions of power or influence in the state during this time – particularly in the early years of the Republic, when tradition relates that the first consul, Lucius Junius Brutus, was in fact a plebeian. The fact that the *patres* never had a complete grip on the state apparatus is also suggested by the evidence that the class of Patricians was not entirely a closed one, such as the literary references to Caelius Vibenna and Attus Clausus and their acceptance as ‘Patricians’ upon moving to Rome.

However, by the middle of the fifth century B.C. it appears that there were attempts by the *patres*, to close admission to the class and to gain a stranglehold on the political structures through their religious prerogatives. This is strongly suggested by the laws of the Twelve Tables, among which was a ban on intermarriage between Plebeians and Patricians. Based on the fact that the Patrician form of marriage was by *confarreatio* which required the taking of the auguries, and the fact that Plebeians were excluded from the practice of ritual and augural rites, they were *ipso facto* excluded from this type of marriage ceremony. Given the *patres* assertion of their sole prerogative with regards to the auguries,¹²³ the laws of the Twelve Tables may have signalled their attempt to exclude plebeians from the magistracies and offices of state, for which possession of the auguries were a necessity. This bespeaks a strong emphasis in Roman political and social terms during this period, on descent and lineage.

123 Livy *AUC* 4.2, 6.41; 10.8.

However, the attempt by the *patres* at domination was immediately challenged. It is interesting to note that the appearance of military tribunes holding consular power and the appearance of the *concilium plebis* (which elected its own representatives, the *tribunum plebis*) seems almost to coincide with the publication of the Twelve Tables. Because the office was military, was appointed by the *comitia centuriata* and was outside the line of Patrician curule magistracies, the possession of the auguries was not a prerequisite, and hence any person could be elected to it. Another important point is that the consuls and military tribunes with consular power (until the passage of the *lex ovinia* in around 318 B.C.¹²⁴ may have had the power to choose and replace, or at the very least add, those men to the senate whom they considered most fit from among the *curiae* and these may not necessarily have been from the patrician class.¹²⁵ This may explain why in later times the senators were addressed as *patres ac conscripti*. Perhaps elite members of the plebeian class aligned with some of the patricians acting in the *comitia centuriata* and the senate were able to enact the *leges valeriae et horatiae* – which tradition relates were proposed by the Consuls L. Valerius and M. Horatius in 449 B.C.¹²⁶ One of these *leges* was that the *plebiscita* of the *concilium plebis* should be binding on the people (difficult to differentiate this from the later *lex Publilia*).¹²⁷ Another supposedly re-enacted the *lex valeria de provocatione* granting the right to appeal against decisions of magistrates.¹²⁸ The third held that the *tribuni plebis*, *aediles*, *iudices*, and *decemviri* were sacrosanct. In a further rebuff to the *patres*, and perhaps most tellingly, was the passage of the *lex canuleia* in 445 B.C. which permitted *conubium* between the *patres* and *plebs*.¹²⁹

However, the *patres* did not give up their attempts to monopolise effective power within the political system by instituting the office of the *censura* (Censorship) which was originally to be held by Patricians only. The creation of this office was likely an attempt by the *patres* to prevent the military tribunes with consular power (who could be Plebeians) or the occasional plebeian consul from conducting the *lustrum* and from revising the citizen roll, since this power was exclusively given to the *censores*.

124 A *Plebiscitum* which gave the Censors certain powers in regulating the lists of the senators. The main object seems to have been to exclude all improper persons from the senate, and to prevent their admission, if in other respects qualified: Festus p.290L; and Cic. *Leg.* 3.12.

125 Festus p.290L. Cornell, *The beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars* (c. 1000-264 BC), 369-98.

126 Livy AUC 3.55.

127 Livy AUC 8.12.

128 Livy AUC 3.55 and 4.13; Cic. *Rep.* 2.31.

129 Livy AUC 4.1.4; Cic. *Rep.* 2.37.

Just how the plebeians were able to assert themselves against the patricians has long intrigued scholars. What the evidence suggests is that the Patrician grip on the political machinery during the early Republic may not have been absolute, neither in the senate nor in the *comitia centuriata* and the roots of this may well be traced back to the Regal period. Perhaps the creation or reorganisation of the *comitia centuriata* (which tradition asserts was undertaken by King Servus Tullius) was a royal attempt to weaken the clan leaders and their direct influence in military and political affairs,¹³⁰ thereby relegating the old *comitia curiata* (which was formed from the old Roman tribes and which may have given more significance to the *patres* as heads of *gens* and *familiae* within the tribes) to religious matters such as confirming bestowal of *imperium* and approval of adoptions of patricians – matters of acute interest to the patrician aristocracy.¹³¹

The organisation of the *comitia centuriata* meant that the patrician *gentes* had nowhere near a majority of votes, and so reliance had to be placed on a wider base including the more élite members of the plebeian class, as these were probably also essential in Rome's military organisation. This may have ultimately worked against the interests of the monarch, since by the end of the Regal period, it seems that many of the offices or powers of the king had been devolved onto members of the *patres* and leading plebeians (although it appears that religious offices were still monopolised by the *patres* and remained the business of the *comitia curiata* and *comitia calata*). It may well have been that the expulsion of the last king, Tarquinius Superbus, was a reaction by a coalition between the *patres* and certain leading plebeians

130 In Republican times, the *comitia centuriata* had responsibility for election of the consuls (when the assembly was called *comitia consularia*, Livy *AUC* 1.60; 10.11), the praetors (hence, *comitia praetoria*, Livy *AUC* 7.1.10 and 7.1.22), the military tribunes with consular power (Livy *AUC* 5.52), the censors (Livy *AUC* 7.22; Livy *AUC* 11.45), and the decemvirs (Livy *AUC* 3.33-35). The centuriate assembly also had legislative power in that it could pass or reject a measure brought before it by the presiding magistrate in the form of a *senatus consultum*, hence the assembly had no right of originating any legislative measure. When a proposal was passed by the centuries it became *lex* (law). The *comitia centuriata* could also confirm declarations of war on the advice of a *senatus consultum*. However, it appears that until the Sabine War, peace was concluded by a mere *senatus consultum*, without the approval of the Assemblies. The *comitia centuriata* was also the highest court of appeal: Dion Cass. 37.27; and it also tried all cases of *perduellio* and *maiestas*, and was the ultimate court in all cases involving the life of a Roman citizen: Cic. *Sext.* 30.34, *Rep.* 2.36, *Leg.* 3.4; Polyb. 6.4.14.

131 Following the introduction of the *comitia centuriata* – which was a military based arrangement dividing the citizenry according to wealth, the powers to elect magistrates, pass laws and to declare war were transferred to this assembly. However, the *comitia curiata* (and in another form possibly the more ancient *comitia calata*) it continued to function by formally conferring *imperium* and the right of taking the auspices upon magistrates after their election. This was done by the passing of a *lex curiata de imperio*. This became simply formulaic as time passed, since in the time of Cicero (Cic. *Att.* 4.18; Cic. *Fam.* 13.1), it was enough that three augurs had declared that they had been present in the *comitia curiata* at which the *imperium* had been conferred, although in reality no such *comitia* had taken place. The *comitia curiata* (or *calata*) continued also to affirm the inauguration of certain priests, such as the *Flamines* and the *Rex Sacrorum*. In its form as the *comitia calata* it still continued to function in Republican times to affirm or approve *arrogationes* or patrician adoptions.

against his attempt to reassert more power over the political processes.

Following the establishment of the Republic and the heavy reliance Rome placed on its military forces for its survival, it appears that non-patrician forces within the *comitia centuriata* were able to ensure that Patrician control of the state never became absolute. Due to the organisation of the *comitia centuriata*, the patricians were not able to effectively control the outcome of its voting. Thus it appears that the *comitia centuriata* continued to elect plebeians to the high magistracies of the Roman state throughout the late fifth and early fourth centuries B.C. It is probable that these plebeian consuls (and military tribunes), having retained their power to add members to the senate, took advantage of it to include in the senate all plebeian ex-magistrates. Thus by the mid-fourth century B.C., it may have become accepted practice that any person who had held an elected magistracy (from quaestor upwards) became eligible for a place in the senate upon election.

It is hence from this time that we can see the emergence of a new élite class, the *nobiles*. These changes in the social composition of the ruling élite at Rome is reflected in the *Censura*. In 351 B.C. C. Marcius Rutilus was selected as the first Plebeian Censor;¹³² this in itself hints at the fact that the power balance in the senate had shifted away from the Patricians as a class to already encompass leading Plebeians. Later in 339 B.C. one of the *leges publiciae* provided that one of the Censors must necessarily always be a Plebeian.¹³³ Most importantly, the *lex ovinia* of 318 (or 313 B.C. ?) B.C. gave to the Censors the power to revise the list of senators – taking this power from the Consuls.

While the *lex ovinia* of 318 B.C. can be superficially interpreted as a diminution of the power of the Patricians within the senate (in that it robbed the leading magistrate of his power to add those to the senatorial class or delete those from the citizens roll as he wished), it is more likely that the law was in fact an attempt by the newly emerging *nobiles* class to entrench their position in relation to determining who would constitute membership of the senatorial order by passing the power to revise the senatorial roll to the Censors – which as a collegiate patrician/plebeian office would ensure their combined interests as the new *nobiles* class would be protected.

The full emergence of the *nobiles* class itself was confirmed by the passage of the *lex ogulnia*

¹³² Livy *AUC* 7.22.

¹³³ Livy *AUC* 8.12.

in 300 B.C. – which opened the priestly colleges to the Plebeians (so breaking the Patrician control of the auguries) – and thereby removing any restriction on the formal entry to the higher magistracies to those from outside the Patrician class. The opening of all curule magistracies to members of the Plebeian class was completed with the passage of the *lex maenia* in 287 B.C. which required the *patres* to allow the auguries to pass to any person elected *magistratus* that the *comitia centuriata* should elect.¹³⁴

The literary tradition concerning these political changes throughout the fourth century down to 280 B.C. suggests a radical transformation of the ruling élite at Rome, ostensibly the rise of the *nobiles* as a class, which formed from a coalition of the Patrician and the élite sector of the Plebeians – and was possibly triggered by the class divisions of the *comitia centuriata* and an increasing reliance on the military within Roman foreign policy. These élite Plebeians were probably already connected in some degree by marriage to the Patrician class (as suggested by the *lex canuleia* of 445 B.C.) and the opening up of political and religious offices of state to them, coupled with the formalisation of the requirements of membership of the senate merely upon election to a curule magistracy, would all appear to coincide with the emergence of the senate as the most influential body in charge of state policy and the development of the magisterial culture based on election, with its emphasis on the social and political ethics of that class.¹³⁵

It is important to note that the appearance of the form of the *nobiles* funeral emphasising the *imagines maiorum* as attested in the sources coincides with the period when the literary sources attest that honorary statues were becomingly increasingly familiar in Rome,¹³⁶ and when temples began to be dedicated to abstract virtues, such as *Salus*, *Honos*, *Virtus* etc.¹³⁷ Such developments also appear to run parallel to the refurbishment of the *forum romanum* into a grander public space as the centre of civic and political life in the new centre of power;¹³⁸ and the development and adaptation of the *atrium* house which became an important feature within *nobiles* culture. It was here, the focal point of the domestic power of

¹³⁴ Livy *AUC* 1.17.

¹³⁵ Given the fact that the new *nobiles* class together dominated the senate, and most probably the majority of votes in the *comitia centuriata*, meant that their members would continually be elected to public office. It also meant that the *comitia centuriata* was most unlikely ever to ignore the *consulta* of the senate, as its members would be sure to use their influence to ensure that the *comitia* voted they way required.

¹³⁶ Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 341.

¹³⁷ L. Richardson, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1992), 446–48.

¹³⁸ Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 341; F. Coarelli, *Il foro romano, Lectiones planetariae*. (Roma: Quasar, 1983), 140–49.

the *dominus* and the point of public access to *him*, that advertisements concerning his family's power and social standing could be displayed. It was here that the *imagines maiorum* (both in their developed wax forms, but also in terracotta and/or bronze versions) were set up, thereby showing the continuity of power and social position held by the family and its members.¹³⁹

Livy mentions *imagines* as existing at Rome in the regal period¹⁴⁰ - although these probably bore little resemblance in appearance or usage to those of the middle and late Republican period. However, the tomb and funerary practices of the Etruscans identified above, and the power/ political imagery in use in the domestic sphere in Etruria appears to have been mirrored at Rome in contemporary Patrician practice throughout the sixth and early fifth century B.C. which developed and was adopted by the *nobiles* as they emerged as the dominant class within the Roman social and political structures. The use of *imagines* thus became central to *nobiles* culture probably from the late fourth early third century B.C., concomitant with all the contexts of their display and usage: truly honorific portraiture, the inclusion of *imagines* in the *pompa funebris* and the placement of ancestral *imagines* in the *atrium*. With the growing influence of Rome and the conquest of the Italian peninsular these practices were then reintroduced into Etruria in their Romanised form.

This scenario is given credence by the fact that the oldest direct evidence of *imagines* used in the *pompa funebris* and display in the home comes from Plautus and Polybios - and it can be assumed that these practices were well established at Rome by the time they were writing. This suggests that the form of the *nobiles* funeral may have reached its mature form at the end of the fourth or beginning of the third century B.C. and that it derived from earlier aristocratic/Patrician practices. The laws of the Twelve Tables prohibited lavish funerals and punished those who took part in them, and this may indicate that public processions formed a part of aristocratic funerals back in the days of Patrician dominance of religious rites at

139 M. Torelli, "Le popolazione dell'Italia antica: società e forme del potere," in *Storia di Roma I: Roma in Italia*, ed. A. Momigliano, et al. (Torino: Giulio Einaudi, 1988), 103.

140 Livy *AUC* 1.34.6; 1.47.4.

Rome.¹⁴¹

The fact that Patrician social practices were maintained and evolved to new social circumstances should not be surprising given that the emergent *nobiles* were an amalgam of the Patricians with the élite of the Plebeian *familiae*. The fact that they ultimately formed a coalition with Patrician society, not overthrew or destroyed it, strongly suggests that the *nobiles* merely inherited many Patrician aristocratic customs and adapted them to new social and political requirements.

The fact that this new élite class also became a closed one is suggested by the facts that election to any curule magistracy entailed admission to the senate; and that formal election depended on martialling the resources (political, social and economic) to ensure the required number of votes in the *comitia centuriata* – which through its very organisational structure was dominated by the élite classes. The need to show political and military success as a justification for election and to assert one's standing (*dignitas*) within the élite, combined with the closed nature of the class, indicates that the success of one's ancestors became an essential factor for maintaining one's social and political influence within the class. This appears to have created a self-conscious class identity associated closely with the continued holding of political office and with being 'known' (*notus*, hence *nobilis*) through the fact that oneself or one's ancestors had held political office. If one failed to gain election to office risked the family falling from its status.

Concomitant with these social and political changes at Rome is the growing power of Rome within central and southern Italy. The rise of the *nobiles* as the dominant class thus appears to have been influenced by military successes in central Italy, and then led to a more aggressive foreign policy that commenced with the beginning of the third century B.C. As the territories were extended, so too Roman citizenship was gradually extended beyond Rome, and this would have led to further elitism of the *nobiles* class, in that as the numbers of Plebeians

141 The legal injunction against lavish funerals seems to be a common concern among emerging aristocratic based societies. This is to ensure that a deceased member will not impoverish or bankrupt his heirs through an overly lavish funeral or that customary pressure will not develop such that surviving members feel the need to 'outbid' previous heirs or contemporaries in funeral display, and thereby threaten the viable patrimonium of the heir. A similar phenomenon occurred in England in the 13th and 14th centuries A.D. in the development of testamentary law. There, the competing desires of feudal landholders to maintain wealth strictly within an order of inheritance and within the family, with that of freedom of testamentary capacity insisted upon by the Church (Roman) Canon Law, resulted in a compromise that there was an assumed order of inheritance in the absence of a strict testamentary document, and that any statement as to the desired conduct of the funeral of the deceased merely remained a moral request, and was not considered legally binding on the Executor or heirs.

increased with the addition of those newly enrolled, the mass of these had no connection with the élite *nobiles* class which dominated the political and social structures at Rome itself. These new citizens and the mass of other Plebeian citizens were probably tied to the political system through the social institution of *clientela*, or were excluded from the power structures by the arrangement of the political institutions – most Plebeians were enrolled in those centuries of the *comitia centuriata* which were irrelevant to the electoral processes.¹⁴² Most elections to high office were thus fought between members of the élite itself who sought election by obtaining the maximum number of votes within the élite centuries of the *comitia centuriata* which consisted of their peers: that is, the élite property and social classes (i.e., the *boni*). Elections at Rome were thus a highly competitive and very élite affair and were far from democratic or representative of the actual will of the majority of the Roman *populus*.

This indicates that it was Roman social practice which developed its emphasis on facial expression as embodying the virtues of the true Roman magistrate and *nobilis*. This would account for the Roman influence on the images appearing in Etruscan tombs commencing during the late fourth and third centuries B.C. as the political and social practice of these cities came to mirror that of their new master. An example is the high frequency in which magistrates began to be depicted in Etruscan tombs as toga clad and preceded by lictors bearing *fascēs* during the third century B.C. – the magistrate himself often carrying the *lituus* or curved staff symbolic of magisterial power. An example comes from the *Bruschi Tomb* (Ill. 171) at Tarquinia which is dated to the early third century B.C.¹⁴³ Among the toga clad dignitaries in this mural are members of the Apuna family to whom the tomb belonged.¹⁴⁴ In the Etruscan tomb murals, such processions often depict the deceased as a magistrate being met by the ancestors in the underworld – which is similar to the actual *pompa funebris* of aristocratic funerals witnessed by Polybios, in which actors wearing *imagines* representing the deceased office holding ancestors would take part.¹⁴⁵

Cristofani believed that these processions were parallel to the development of *cursus*

142 The magistrates that were elected by the *comitia centuriata* were the consuls (Livy *AUC* 1.60, and 10.11), the praetors (Livy *AUC* 7.1, and 10.22), the military tribunes with consular power (Livy *AUC* 5.52), the Censors (Livy *AUC* 7.22, and 11.45), and the Decemvirs (Livy *AUC* 3.33 and 35). The voting was dominated by the élite sectors since they made up a majority of the voting centuries: Livy *AUC* 1.43. See nn. 129 and 130 supra.

143 Spivey, *Etruscan Art*, 168, ill. 56.

144 Others of this type are discussed by Cristofani, *La tomba del "Tifone"*; cultura e società di Tarquinia in età etrusca, 228-32.

145 S. Steingraber et al., *Etruscan painting: catalogue raisonné of Etruscan wall paintings*, English-language ed. (New York: Johnson Reprint Corp.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1986); Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 349, n. 44.

inscriptions for magistrates, family tombs which were reused over several generations, and the rebuilding and construction of such tombs in Rome.

The *Tomb of the Scipiones* may provide an example at Rome itself. The earliest phase of this tomb appears to date from the first decade of the third century B.C., perhaps being constructed by L. Cornelius Scipio Barbatus (Cos. 298 B.C.) or by his sons L. Cornelius Scipio (Cos. 259 B.C.) or Cn. Cornelius Scipio Asina (Cos. 260 and 254 B.C.).¹⁴⁶ In the middle of the second century B.C. it appears that the tomb was enlarged and modernised to create a series of galleries forming a fairly regular square (14.5 x 13.5 m), the roof supported by four large pillars of tufa. A new façade was created by cutting a podium into the tufa at the front, which was decorated with Corinthian columns, arches cut into the rock, and statues (Ill. 172).¹⁴⁷ It appears that the façade was originally plastered in sections and painted with commemorative scenes and that this was repainted several times.¹⁴⁸ The latest was merely a covering of stylised red waves. The frieze appears to have been in two registers: the lower one painted a deep red, while the upper was originally decorated with figures of men – fragments of which are still evident on the extreme right of the podium (Ill. 158.1-2). These men were in some kind of procession, wearing red tunics with white strips, yellow waist bands and black boots and carrying appear to be *fasces*: all indicators that the men depicted were in fact *lictors* and suggesting a magisterial procession (Ill. 173).¹⁴⁹

An even earlier example from Rome may be the frescoes from *Tomb of the Magistrates* (*Tomba Arieti*) excavated on the Esquiline in 1875 (Ill. 174.1-3).¹⁵⁰ Interestingly, the tomb contained internal decoration consisting of a lower socle in peperino and topped with orthostates (similar to the 1st style of Pompeian wall-painting) and an upper register consisting of a painted frieze. Only a few fragments of the fresco were removed before the tomb was demolished – however, it consisted of battle scenes and a procession of magistrates and lictors.¹⁵¹ Two fragments depict these lictors: one facing to the left wearing a red tunic and bearing a bundle of *fasces*; a second fragment depicts another three lictors moving from left to

146 P. J. Holiday, *The Origins of Roman Historical Commemoration in the Visual Arts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 33.

147 F. Coarelli, *Il sepolcro degli Scipioni a Roma, Itinerari d'arte e di cultura. Via Appia* (Roma: F.lli Palombi, 1988), 13-14.

148 Holiday, *The Origins of Roman Historical Commemoration in the Visual Arts*, 34.

149 App. *Bel Pun.* 66; Sil. *Pun.* 9.41; Ibid., 34-35, and ill. 6.

150 Museo dei Conservatori, Braccio Nuovo, Rome. Ibid., 36-41, esp. ill. 7-13. Holiday, *The Origins of Roman Historical Commemoration in the Visual Arts*, 34.

151 Holiday, *The Origins of Roman Historical Commemoration in the Visual Arts*, 37.

right.¹⁵² A *terminus post quem* is provided by materials found associated with the tomb datable to the late fourth, early third centuries B.C., although the frescoes themselves have been dated to the middle of the second century B.C.¹⁵³ Given the correspondence with paintings from Etruscan tombs, I would see no problem in dating them however, to the early third century B.C., consonant with the other material from the tomb.¹⁵⁴

Several interpretations for the frescoes of the *Tomb of the Magistrates* has been proposed, ranging from the claim that it represents a *pompa funebris* with *munera* in the form of gladiatorial combats, to a depiction of a triumphal procession.¹⁵⁵ What is definitely identifiable in this fresco and that from the *Tomb of the Scipiones* is the portrayal of a magistrate who wields *imperium* in procession, such as occurred at the funerals of notable individuals (the *pompa funebris*) or in triumphal processions – and it might be no coincidence that the rise in magisterial representations in tombs in Rome (and thence in Etruria with examples such as the *François Tomb* (Ill. 175) and *Tomb 58* at Andriuolo) coincide with the end of the ‘Struggle of the Orders’ and a significant change in the conduct of Triumphs that appeared to have commenced with Rome’s conquest of the Greek cities of southern Italy and reached their most lavish form with the triumphs of Curius Dentatus in 275 B.C.,¹⁵⁶ Scipio Africanus in 201 B.C.,¹⁵⁷ of L. Scipio in 189 B.C.,¹⁵⁸ and later of Aemilius Paullus in 167 B.C.¹⁵⁹ Just as permission to hold a *pompa funebris* had to be granted by the *aedilis*, the grant of a triumph was the preserve of the senate (hence the *nobiles* elite) – and sources indicate that the honour was not granted lightly.¹⁶⁰

The above evidence indicates that there was a certain circularity in the influences between Roman and Etruscan funeral practice and magisterial culture, and although the construction of *imagines* for use in the funeral and the placement of *imagines maiorum* in the entrance way and *atrium* of the house may have been inspired by Etruscan practice, it is just as obvious that

152 Ibid., 38–39, ill. 10–11. Museo dei Conservatori, Braccio Nuovo, Rome.

153 Ibid., 40.

154 Festus records among the earliest public dedications of triumphal painting was that dedicated by M. Fulvius Flaccus in the Temple of Vertumnus in 264 B.C. and of T. Papirius Curor in the Temple of Consus in 272 B.C.: Fest. *Gloss. Lat.*, *Epit.* 228.

155 Holiday, *The Origins of Roman Historical Commemoration in the Visual Arts*, 40.

156 Flor. *Epit.* 1.13.26–27.

157 Sil. *Pun.* 8.66.

158 Livy *AUC* 37.59.

159 Plut. *Aem.* 34; for a comprehensive discussion of the requirements for a grant of a triumph, its purpose and the form of the procession, see Holiday, *The Origins of Roman Historical Commemoration in the Visual Arts*, 22–27.

160 Polyb. 6.15; Livy *AUC* 33.23.

the changing form of the *imagines* and Roman funeral practice within terms of the development of magisterial culture at Rome had a significant re-influence on Etruria where these new practices were readily accepted owing to the pervasiveness of Roman power and its hegemonic position (Ills. 176 and 177).¹⁶¹

While one can explain the development of *imagines* and portrait statuary and the context of their use and display at Rome in this way, the application of the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression to *imagines* and the context and meaning which they held within Roman society must be examined as a Roman social and cultural phenomenon. Important in this regard are the studies on the development of the Roman *nobiles* class from the mid-fourth century B.C. onwards,¹⁶² which view the *imagines* as a product of this social change.¹⁶³ It is therefore no coincidence that the rise of magisterial culture occurs at the same time as the sources indicate the proliferation at Rome of honorary and votive statues emphasising individual achievement (*dignitas*) within terms of those who held magistracies and military offices, and at the same time as the city was being transformed to reflect its growing power and wealth under the control and guidance of the *nobiles* class.¹⁶⁴ From this date status (*dignitas*) was equated with holding office, and this *dignitas* was inheritable by one's descendants and represented in those members of the family who had held elected office..

There is some dispute as to what level of office an individual was required to hold before he could warrant having an *imago* constructed. Literary sources indicate that where a family was already *nobilis*, the attainment of the aedileship was worth celebrating by an *imago* among those of the *maiores* housed in the *atrium*. This is confirmed by the epigraphic references in tomb inscriptions indicating that the holding of the curule aedileship was enough to maintain the nobility of the family [*Tomb of the Scipiones*].¹⁶⁵ As noted, literary evidence suggests that once a person attained the curule aedileship, that person became a member of the senate and a

161 For examples of office holders and processions appearing in wall paintings from Etruscan tombs, see the Tomba della Scuda in Tarquinia, Tomba Golini II in Orvieto, Tomba Bruschi, Tomba del Convegno and Tomba dei Tifoni also in Tarquinia; see Steingraber, "Ahnenkult und bildliche Darstellungen von Ahnen in etruskischen und unteritalischen Grabgemälden aus vorrömischer Zeit," 141-42.

162 Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 340.

163 See esp. T. Hölscher, "Die Anfänge römischer Repräsentationskunst," *MDAI-RM* 85 (1978); T. Hölscher, "Die Geschichtsauffassung in der römischen Repräsentationskunst," *JdAI* 95 (1980); Hölscher, "Römischer Nobilitas und hellenistische Herrscher.," K. J. Hölskeskamp, "Conquest, Competition and Consensus: Roman Expansion in Italy and the Rise of the Nobilitas," *Historia* 42 (1993), 27-30.

164 Torelli, "Le popolazione dell'Italia antica: società e forme del potere," 92-104; J. Stambaugh, *The ancient Roman city, Ancient society and history* (Baltimore; London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988), 23-35.

165 *ILLRP* 312 and 316.

member of the *nobilis* class. Evidence from Cicero's time suggests that at the very least the holding of the consulship definitely made the holder, and his heirs, members of the *nobilitas* if they had not been members of the *nobiles* class beforehand.¹⁶⁶ Before Cicero's time it seems that holding lesser magistracies also bestowed *nobilitas* on the holder, or at the very least it maintained the *dignitas* of one's family within the *nobiles* class if the family were previously members of that class.¹⁶⁷

This would make sense given the numbers of magistracies available. There were only two consuls each year, meaning that in any twenty five year period, only 50 individuals would be in a position to have held that office. This would be hardly enough over such a time period to maintain the *nobilis* standing of each of the great *familiae* or *gentes* if election to the consulship were the essential criterion, or the only criterion for continued *nobilis* status. This would have been particularly so towards the end of the second century B.C when the family of the *Metelli*, and the *novus homo* Marius so dominated election to that office – thereby 'shutting out' many of the oldest *nobiles gentes* still sitting in the senate. Election to a modicum of curule positions would ensure the continued nobility of the family and would guarantee a continued place in the senate for the person who attained that office, and hence continuing influence in the council of state for the individual concerned, and a central role in state affairs for his *familia* and *gens*.

It would seem that the idea of *nobilitas* was a social/political, not a legal phenomenon¹⁶⁸ therefore the concept of *nobilitas* accordingly changed over time.¹⁶⁹ It must not be forgotten that Cicero himself was the first *novus homo* in some considerable time to attain the consulship - and so his evidence regarding his achievement may be overstated.¹⁷⁰ What can be concluded is that, while *nobilitas* was not itself defined merely by the possession of *imagines*,

166 M. Gelzer *The Roman Nobility* (Oxford 1912/75); A. Afzelius, "Zur Definition der römischen Nobilität in der Zeit Ciceros," *CI Med* 2 (1938); A. Afzelius, "Zur Definition der römischen Nobilität vor der Zeit Ciceros," *CI Med* 7 (1945).

167 Such as the inscriptions from the Tomb of the Scipiones, including ILS 6=ILLRP 316: *Cn. Cornelius Cn. F. Scipio Hispanus/ pr(aetor) aid(ilis) cur(ulis) q(uaestor) tr(ibunus) mil(itum) (decem)vir sl(itibus) iudik(andis)/ (decem)vir sacr(is) fac(iundis) / Virtutes generis meis moribus accumulavi / Progeniem genui facta patris petiei / Maiorum optenui laudem ut sibi me esse creatum/ laetentur stirpem nobilitavit honor.*

168 J. Bleicken, "Die Nobilität der römischen Republik," *Gymnasium* 88 (1981).

169 Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 61-64.

170 A person who was *novus* (i.e., had never held office) became a *nobilis* once (according to Cicero) he attained the consulship, upon which he immediately became a member of the *nobilitas* – thus making it possible for a person to be *novus* and *nobilis* at the same time. The *nobiles* depended on election and office holding to maintain their *nobilitas*, and therefore it was incumbent upon one's descendants to attain at least the level of one of the curule magistracies in order to be considered to have maintained the family's rank among the *nobiles*.

they would have been an important factor in advertising the greater prestige of the individual concerned within the *nobilis* class itself, more or less proving one's position within the *nobilitas*. There could be no better advertisement concerning one's rank, position and prestige than the portraits of one's office holding ancestors, proclaiming by their *tituli* and their appearance (in that their features were representative of traditional Roman virtues: *gravitas* and *severitas*) the *gloria* and *dignitas* of the family wherever they were placed or in whatever context they were displayed.

Thus by Cicero's day, the concept of *nobilitas* had evolved such that the holding of office became the most important, if not the only criterion, for rank and the determiner for *nobilis* status itself.¹⁷¹ This would account for the increasing importance of *imagines maiorum* from the beginning of the third century B.C. for confirming the rank of the individual, *familia* and *gens*. The *imagines*, in effect, are symbols of the *nobiles*, their values and the offices they hold as well as providing justification for their monopoly on power.

This brings us to the question of when the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression typical of Roman Republican portraiture came to be applied to *imagines* at Rome. Several scholars have noted the importance of the human head to both Etruscan and Roman art from an early date¹⁷² The Etruscan votive heads in terracotta were likewise not individuated before the third century B.C. – while those appearing from the second century B.C. begin to reflect the Roman *severitas/gravitas* portrait style (Ill. 169 and 170), after Roman power had become entrenched in the region. Yet traditionally, Etruscan images of what are assumed to be 'ancestors' (or who were at the very least, the 'deceased') were largely not individualised – and remained fairly generic in their structure and appearance before this time. This again suggests that *severitas/gravitas* style emanated from Rome itself.

Just precisely when the *severitas gravitas* facial expression was first applied to *imagines* (no matter whether of wax, terracotta or bronze) remains unknowable. It is most probable that the

171 K.-J. Hölkeskamp, *Die Entstehung der Nobilität: Studien zur sozialen und politischen Geschichte der Römischen Republik im 4. Jhd. v. Chr.* (Stuttgart: F. Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden, 1987); and Hölkeskamp, "Conquest, Competition and Consensus: Roman Expansion in Italy and the Rise of the Nobilitas," 25.

172 D. E. E. Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992), 32; G. Hafner, "Bildnisse des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. aus Rom und Etrurien," *MDAI-R* 76 (1969), 14-16; G. Hafner, "Römische und Italische Porträts des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.," *MDAI-R* 77 (1970); Hafner, "Männer- und Junglingsbilder aus terrakotta im Museo Gregoriano Etrusco.," T. Dohrn, *Grundzüge etruskischer Kunst*, vol. 8, *Deutsche Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft* (Baden-Baden: B. Grim, 1958), 56, Abb. 34; Gazda, "Etruscan Influence in the Funerary Reliefs of Late Republican Rome: A Study of Vernacular Portraiture."

imagines (bearing the *severitas/gravitas* expression, as well as the diverse contexts of their usage) emerged with the appearance of the *nobiles* as a conscious (but not constitutionally or legally defined) class at the end of the 'struggle of the orders' towards the end of the fourth century B.C. when they began to utilise the *severitas/gravitas* expression as communicating the ethics of their class which justified their dominant position within Roman social and political structures. An example of the style is the Brutus Capitolinus already discussed which I believe dates to this time.

The development of the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression and its application to portraits at Rome was due to peculiarly unique Roman social and cultural circumstances. This does not mean that the facial expression was not utilised or that it had no importance previous to the rise of the *nobiles* – perhaps it developed from earlier Patrician ethical concepts, or that its roots lay even earlier still within the clan structure of early Latin society. But precisely when and how the link formed between a particular facial expression and the values of *severitas* and *gravitas* ultimately remains conjecture. Given the close association of the *nobiles* with *imagines* attested in the literary tradition from the middle Republican period onwards, it can be guessed that the style first became apparent before 300 B.C. with the full emergence of the *nobiles* class dominating Roman political and social life. From this point it characterised the portraiture of the *nobiles* class, and by extension it enforced the association that the values of *severitas* and *gravitas* were the descriptive and prescriptive values of the Roman people as a whole.

CHAPTER TWELVE

CONCLUSIONS

12.1 Introduction

In examining portraiture during the Republican period at Rome, it has been necessary to focus on the important distinction between the function and meaning of an artwork and the form or stylistic elements through which such meaning is communicated. A portrait, as discussed in *Appendix 1*, is a depiction of a person that communicates something of their individual identity in conjunction with messages concerning their character, status, beliefs etc. In this sense similitude to the physiognomy of the individual may be a factor, but it is not necessarily always the case. As an actual artefact, a portrait is put into concrete form in response to the desire of the patron by the skill of the craftsperson; both patron and craftsperson acting within the cultural and social environment to create an image that responds to the objectives to be achieved: this includes the context of its display and the intended messages to be conveyed to those people who view it. Once established, a portrait communicates those social and cultural perspectives which it simultaneously represents and thence reinforces them and conditions the response of the viewer to it – thus forming a cycle in which individuals (patron-craftsperson-portrait-viewer) are inter- and intra-actional. Thus, a portrait is a manifestation of a dynamic cultural cycle that is itself constantly evolving and changing, in tandem with changes in social/political attitudes, culture and technology.

Identifying the origins and course of development of a form of portrait which is defined by a formulaic representation of the facial expression, such as the *severitas/gravitas* expression of Roman Republican portraits of men, is no easy thing to do. A facial expression and its attendant meaning are relatively intangible – leaving little concrete evidence in the archaeological evidence, other than the portraits themselves and references from literary sources through which we obtain glimpses of the communicational and social significance of the facial expression in relation to individuals and representations of them.

It is my contention that the ethical, social and political meanings drawn from a particular arrangement of the facial expression communicating *severitas* and *gravitas* developed as a particular phenomenon within Roman society over centuries – and that Roman culture itself was formed by its larger inter-actional context within central Italy. In essence, portraiture at

Rome in the Republican period was a tangible manifestation of evolving cultural political and social factors stretching back into prehistory, which in turn were influenced and stimulated by interaction with other dynamic cultures: Etruscan, Italic, Greek, etc. which no doubt in turn were influenced by their interaction with the increasing political, military and economic power of Rome.

Roman Republican portraiture was thus a distinctly Roman phenomenon that evolved along with other Roman social customs and attitudes, including funeral practices, political culture, social structure, morals, values and traditions. Whatever the ultimate source for the technological and stylistic elements drawn upon to create the actual portraits, the facial expression applied to these portraits is very much a product of a distinct Roman psychology, both expressive and formative of the relationship between those portrayed and those who viewed it.

If nothing else, this study makes clear that there was a highly, culturally specific orientation regarding personal appearance and physical expression embedded in the Roman way of thinking during the Republican period. The Romans clearly believed in physiognomics as a means of visual communication. Indeed, the Latin literature reveals that these Roman beliefs were complex and specific - and although they increasingly borrowed the formal structure of their physiognomic theory from the Greeks (particularly from the first century B.C. onwards), the precise emphasis on personal psychology, morality and ethics as communicated by the physical features, bearing, gait and facial expression of an individual were more precise and personalised than that which is found in Greek literature.

By careful examination of the extant Latin literature of the Republican and early Imperial periods, it has been possible to recreate the descriptive formula or physiognomy which communicated definitive Roman values of *severitas* and *gravitas* – and it is this facial expression which provides an important tool for identifying Roman portraits and in understanding the context, usage and course of development of Roman portraiture in the Republican period.

The important conclusions from this study may be summarised as follows:

1. Physiognomics (in both its ancient and modern forms) can provide an important tool for examining, identifying and understanding Roman Republican portraiture. Physiognomics concerns the arrangement of physical features, gesture and gait, as well as the expression of

the face, as communicating specific cultural, moral, ethical, emotional or social messages about the individual to the viewer. Central to a physiognomic definition of portraiture is that a portrait is intended to convey (through its physical expression) such specific, culturally defined messages about the subject to the viewer. This definition provides the basis on which an hermeneutic study of Roman Republican portraiture can be conducted and which may provide answers regarding its definition, identification, meaning, origins and course of development.

2. Latin literature confirms that the Romans linked ethical, moral and emotional states to precise facial expressions and gestures. In other words, they believed in the communicative power of facial expression (i.e., physiognomic principles). They particularly believed that the facial expression conveyed the inner workings of the mind, described in Latin as the *motus animi*. It is also apparent that the precise content of Roman physiognomic principles differed from Greek physiognomic beliefs which remained largely generic, emphasising the body's true beauty or representative of dominating personality traits.

3. Latin literature of the Republican period confirms that the Romans made portraits of themselves, which are predominantly described by the Latin word *imago*. The literature also confirms that the meaning of *imago* includes not only that a portrait is a physical representation of a specific individual, but that it communicates through its physical form the *motus animi* of that individual. The context and usage of *imago* shows that *imagines* could be manufactured from diverse materials, most importantly bronze, terracotta, marble, other stones, gypsum and wax. It is apparent that once a person was deceased any portrait of them displayed in public or private contexts could be referred to as an *imago maioris*, collectively referred to as the *imagines maiorum*. The description of these utilising similar moral and ethical terms indicates that no matter the material from which *imagines* were made, or the context of display or utilisation, they were all capable of communicating similar social and political messages concerning the person represented.

4. The Latin literature shows that there were precise facial expressions for general emotional states (sadness, happiness, joy, grief, ferocity) but that there were also precise facial expressions which communicated more precise values and which were considered appropriate in given situations. For instance, a person standing trial would be expected to convey a sense of humility and shame, an arrogant person would comport themselves with one eyebrow raised, while *nobiles*, in connexion with their role as senators and judges (as

well as *patresfamiliae*) were not only expected to conduct their affairs with the appropriate *severitas* and *gravitas* but they were expected to be the embodiments of these values as expressed through their facial expression. Literary evidence also confirms that *severitas* and *gravitas* are frequently values referred to as embodied and communicated by portraits of living and dead Roman citizens and were values particularly associated with portraits of the deceased ancestors, the *imagines maiores*.

5. The Latin literature confirms that *severitas* and *gravitas* were communicated by a precise facial expression: a contracted forehead, contracted or drawn together eyebrows, and down-turned mouth. It is this facial expression I refer to as the '*severitas/gravitas* expression'.

6. When a group of portrait heads (such as those existing in various museums and from the island of Delos) are examined, it is evident that the *severitas/gravitas* expression can be identified on portrait after portrait. From this it can be concluded that the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression was the essential element for constituting *Roman* portraits during the middle and late Republican periods – and which reappears at various times throughout the Imperial period. It can be further concluded that where the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression appears on a portrait, it is a conscious attempt to communicate the specific Roman values of the person represented to the viewer. Given the importance of this facial expression in the context of Roman Republican society, it is the use of this facial expression by which I define Roman portraiture during the Republican period: 'Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* portraiture'.

7. With regards to dating of the Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* portraits, it is important to note that there are very few (if any) absolutely datable pieces – most having *termini ante* or *post quem*; but none providing enough precise data to create a sensible or meaningful chronology. Important in this regard is the fact that no examples from Delos bearing the Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* expression can be shown to predate the earliest examples of Roman Republican portraiture found elsewhere, particularly within Italy. Indeed, the fact that marble did not become an easily available product on the Roman market until the end of the second century B.C. suggests that the Delos heads are in marble is merely because of expediency and availability – it would equally seem that the earliest portraits at Rome were made from bronze, wax, gypsum or terracotta and therefore have not survived – thus distorting the data on which a chronology can be based.

Despite the fact that the Delos heads are dated from between 166 B.C. and 88 B.C. in no way

suggests that the style originated there. In fact, there are portraits from Italy and elsewhere which I have concluded may well date from as early as the beginning of the third century B.C. – the earliest being the so-called ‘Brutus Capitolinus’ in around 300 B.C., with other examples dating through the second century B.C. such as the portrait of ‘Albinus’ in the Louvre, bronze head of Scipio Africanus in Naples, etc.

8. The literature reveals that the display and utilisation of portraiture at Rome was closely associated with the practices of the ruling élite: the *nobiles*. While there was no precise legal regulation about who could display portraits at Rome, it seems that there were some rules concerning the display of portraits in certain public contexts. For instance, only those statues and *imagines* decreed by the assembly or senate were permitted to stand in public spaces proper – those that were not properly sanctioned would occasionally be systematically cleared away. Also, the right to have a public funeral procession (*pompa funebris*) in which *imagines maiorum* would feature had to be obtained from the *aedilis curulis*, hence it is unlikely that those unconnected with the *nobiles* would have had the capacity to hold a public funeral or to display *imagines*. In understanding the ancient literary testimony concerning statues and *imagines*, it must be remembered that it was the role of the *aedilis curulis* to maintain public statuary (at least). This means that throughout the Republican period the context of display of statues in public spaces could be constantly changing over time – even the inscriptions, setting, location and identity of various pieces could be completely altered from their original settings and context.

Apart from these restrictions, it appears that individuals were relatively free to have statues and images made and displayed, particularly in semi public spaces (such as temples etc.), within the home, and on tombs. The use and display of such *imagines* appears to have been a matter of *mos* ‘custom’. However, for a person without the requisite social standing to display *imagines* in the home (or to display *imagines* in the wrong context) may have been considered immodest and brought social reprobation.

9. The Latin Literature shows that portraiture at Rome in the Republican period (being made from diverse materials such as bronze, terracotta, wax and stone) was displayed and utilised in various contexts. In relation to this, the physiognomic appearance of the portraits was an essential factor. The Romans used their portraits not only as marks of honour bestowed by the state in public spaces, but also had private portraits erected in semi public spaces, such as votive offerings in temples and on other public monuments. They also had

imagines constructed for display in their *atria*, and for use in semi public contexts (such as the *pompa funebris*) where portraits served an important didactic role to the members of the *familia* not only concerning the moral values of the individual portrayed, but also as a reminder of the *dignitas* and rank of the family within the ruling élite and within Roman society as a whole. This continuity in the holding of power was physically communicated through the creation, maintenance and display of the *imagines maiorum*.

10. Because of the importance to the Romans of the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression, a Roman requiring a portrait of himself could therefore draw on a diversity of styles or amalgam of styles by which to convey the required facial expression. This has resulted in a great deal of confusion among modern scholars as to the true nature and definition of Roman Republican portraiture. It also means that Roman portraiture need not have developed according to easily definable stylistic criteria - as it was possible to utilise a mixture of Hellenistic or more traditional linear styles to convey the necessary facial expression. It is hence possible that a variety of styles could co-exist simultaneously in the same portrait or that an amalgam or diversity of styles could appear in the same area at the same time. The stylistic content of how a portrait may finally appear seems to have been determined by a variety of factors: *mos*, the taste and demands of the patron and the intended context of display of the portrait in terms of the ultimate viewers, the technical ability of the artist, the money available, combined with religious, social and political factors. The eclecticism of stylistic choices available to the Roman patron confounds any sensible attempt at creating a sensible chronological framework for Roman Republic portraits.

11. The demands of the Roman patron meant that the artist was required to present a fixed form of facial expression no matter what the 'stylistic content' of the portrait concerned. The ethnicity of the artists cannot be ascertained with any great clarity and such ethnicity seems to have been irrelevant in the development of the Roman Republican *severitas/gravitas* portrait style; any competent artist could have been called upon to manufacture a portrait in the style and manner demanded by the patron to meet the required context. The facial expression characteristic of Roman Republican portraiture was not therefore a creation of Greek artists, but the application of Roman physiognomic concepts to their portraits. Even if Greek artists were responsible for executing the portrait heads concerned, they were merely the vehicle for conveying for the Roman patron certain moral and ethical messages via the portraits.

12. Roman social structure centred on the power exercised by men (generally aged well

over the age of 30) from a narrow class within society called the *nobiles*; the literature emphasises the virtues of *severitas*, and *gravitas* as the being those considered proper for men involved in the affairs of state: as a magistrate, a senator, a general, or as a *paterfamilias* within his own domestic realm. The Latin literature reveals how precise moral virtues communicated physiognomically - particularly in the faces of the *imagines maiorum* - were utilised in terms of Roman social structure to express positive cognition of identity: i.e., as Roman citizens and as *nobiles*.

It seems that moral values and physical appearance were essentially linked during the Republican period to office holding, rank and the social standing of the individual set within the context of the *familia* and *gens*. There was also a heavy emphasis placed on the position and achievement of one's ancestors (the *maiores*) to justify the continued holding of public office by the descendants; and in this context portraits had an important role to convey the proper values of the ruling élite to justify their hold on power. Portraiture thus played an important role in both public and private life: being used in electioneering, in politics, in legal proceedings, in semi-public funerals of notable individuals, and in the private or domestic sphere of the home. The *imagines* also had an important didactic and exhortative role within Roman society. The highly political context of Roman Republican portraits also meant that the *imagines* could be used as a vehicle for propaganda, and that their appearance, context of display and inscriptions could be politically or socially manipulated and at times even fabricated.

Although the right to have a portrait made was not a legal one (which the surviving literature from the Republican period makes clear) the creation and maintenance of one's own image and that of one's ancestors was a duty and obligation for members of the *nobilitas* in order to perpetuate the honours and rank of that individual within the terms of the family as a whole. *Nobiles'* culture placed a heavy emphasis on individual members of that class to attain public office and so to maintain the control of power among their class - referred to as the *boni*. Individuals attaining public office would ensure that this was worthy of being remembered and commemorated by creation of their own portrait which would in turn be revered and utilised by their descendants as communicating the virtues associated with the family name and thereby justifying their continued involvement in the Roman state.

It is no surprise, given the close association of portraiture and the ruling élite, that the style utilised for their portraits should also be that utilised by other members of Roman society to

communicate their social aspirations and identity as Roman citizens.

13. The importance of the *severitas/gravitas* expression, its application to portraits, and the utilisation and display of portraiture at Rome, and the close association of all of these factors with the *nobiles* class at Rome, also have important implications concerning the origins and course of development of Roman Republican portraiture. It in fact suggests that its origins did not lie in Greek art and culture (despite the fact the Romans may have utilised Greek artists and Greek technical know-how) but that its true origin must be looked for within the context of Roman society. The appearance of Roman portraits was determined by their moral and ethical values which evolved in tandem with Roman social and political structure.

14. This is shown by a comparative look at surviving Hellenistic Royal portraits and Egyptian portraits from earlier periods: all of which were created within a different social and cultural context and which do not bear the characteristic *severitas/gravitas* facial expression, despite a superficial similarity between these various types of portraiture. On examining examples of Hellenistic Royal portraiture (which has been suggested as the source of Roman portraiture via its transference point in Delos) it can be shown that these did not bear the same *severitas/gravitas* facial expression, thus discounting them as a source for Roman Republican portraiture. Indeed these conveyed very different messages through their physiognomy and context which were specific to Hellenistic society. The same conclusions can be stated concerning Egyptian portraiture.

15. Given that Roman Republican portraiture is defined according to a facial expression, this demands that the origins of the style must be looked for within the social and cultural context of Roman society and in the way that Roman social structure and its ethical and moral attitudes developed within its own dynamic context within Italy. Despite the influence that Etruscan social structure and customs clearly had on early Roman social and political practices (particularly funerary), it is apparent that the true source of the *severitas/gravitas* form of Roman Republican portraiture lay within the aristocratic culture of Roman society as it emerged during the fourth and third centuries B.C. In this context the precise formulation of the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression developed as a reflection of the values of the ruling élite and was then applied to their portraiture, at first within the context of the home and the funeral (perhaps stimulated by Etruscan funerary and domestic practice), but also applied to other forms of portraiture, both public, votive and honorary.

The facial expression was the important element of a portrait to a Roman, whereas the artistic style of the portrait itself was secondary, merely being a vehicle for realising the required facial expression and thereby for communicating the required moral values.

16. It was the *severitas/gravitas* style which in turn (along with other Roman social practices and customs) were transmitted to conquered territories or states under Roman influence within Italy as Roman power expanded. Later, due to the fact that the *severitas/gravitas* form of expression was that favoured by the power elite at Rome, it was this form of expression that was subsequently utilised by other sectors of Roman society in their portraits, by Roman client rulers who were dependant on the power of Rome to maintain their own position, by the élites in other cities dependent on Roman power and money, and by no means least, at Rome in the first century B.C. among the non-élite classes, particularly for their tomb portraiture. The importance of citizenship in this context, particularly in provincial areas which Rome had conquered and for the non-élite classes, cannot be underestimated. By adopting a specific form of facial expression in their portraiture as used by the *nobiles*, they were establishing a recognisable standard by which their Roman citizenship status and their good moral values would be publicly proclaimed. Considering it was Roman citizenship that guaranteed a privileged position in terms of commerce, trade, social, legal and political rights, it is not surprising that the values transmitted by the *severitas/gravitas* facial expression should be emphasised in their portraits

12.2 Conclusion

The existence of a distinct Roman portrait style during the period of the Republic says much about Roman art and culture. The Romans were a self-identifying group - through citizenship, language (i.e., Latin), certain social customs and social organisation. This is regardless of the actual ethnic or racial origins of the individuals that made up the collective group known as *Romani* at any stage of their history. The same can be applied to any ethnic group - they are not necessarily 'racially' unified despite what they may think about themselves. Given this self-identifying consciousness, it is therefore logical to assume that the Romans had a view of themselves which they wished to communicate to other members of their group and to other non-Roman peoples, and that one way they achieved this was via their art.

Importantly the Romans spoke their own language - Latin - which was not Greek; nor were words describing moral, ethical and emotional notions easily translatable between the two

languages. This meant that when a Greek and a Roman viewed an artwork, their verbalised responses, as well as their ethical, moral and emotional responses, would have been conditioned by their cultural environment and their respective languages.

Therefore, it is concluded that Roman portraiture in the Republican period existed, can be identified both textually and archaeologically, and had a precise formula for presenting defined ethical and moral values via its physiognomy which were unique to Roman culture and society. Roman portraiture was a manifestation of specific Roman cultural values to a Roman (and non-Roman) audience in physiognomic terms. The seemingly disparate styles used within Roman Republican portraits are in fact unified by the application of a specific formulation of the facial expression which thereby communicated specific Roman values, customs and traditions, central to which were *severitas* and *gravitas*.