

- 248-60; cf. A. Guarino, 'Gli aspetti giuridici del Principato', *ANRW* II. 13 (1980), 3; L. F. Radtza, op. cit. (n. 24), 278.
88. See B. Biondi, op. cit. 252. Paulus, *Sent.* V. 26. 3 (*Acta Divi Aug.* 134): tenetur qui quem armatis hominibus possessione domo villa agrove detecerit expugnaverit, obsidorit clausit.
89. Paulus, *Sent.* V. 26. 4 (*Acta Div. Aug.* 136): 'creditor chirographarius si sine iussu praecidis per vim debitoris sui pignora, cum non haberet obligata, cepit . . .'; Dig. IV. 2. 12. 2: 'qui vim adhibuit debitori suo ut solveret'.
90. Gaius III. 78 (Rotondi, *Leges Publicae*, 451). But V. Giuffrè has rightly shown that the law concerned is Caesar's: 'Profili politici ed economici della "cessio honorum"', *Riv. studi Salernitani*, 1971, 3.
91. I refer briefly to M. Frederiksen, *JRS* 56 (1966), 127; and to the synthesis by V. Giuffrè, s.v. 'Mutuo', *Enciclopedia del diritto* XXVII (1977), 414-44.
92. Dio LV. 12. 3: *Χιλιάς τε καὶ πεντακόσιος πενηντάδας ἀρχαίων ἀτόκους τοῖς δευτέροις δαπέτοις ἐπ' ἑτη τοῖα, ἐπιπέτο παρὰ πάσιον καὶ ἐπιμνήνετο*. *Suet.* Aug. 41. 2: 'et postea, quotiens ex damnatorum bonis superflueret, usum eius gratuitum eis, qui cavere in duplum possent, ad certum tempus indulsit'. Suetonius is generalizing, as always, and is less accurate than Dio. Describing the fire and the riots of 7 BC, Dio (LV. 8. 6) writes: *καὶ τὸ μὲν τοῦ πυρὸς αἴτιον ἐς τοὺς χρονογράφους ἀνεγέγρατο*.
93. *Tac. Ann.* VI. 16-17 (17. 4): 'donec tulit opem Caesar disposito per mensas militem sestertio factaque mutandi copia sine usuris per triennium, si debitor populo in duplum praedhis cavisset'; *Suet.* Tib. 48; Dio LVIII. 21. 5.
94. Cicero, *de off.* I. 85: 'duo Platonis praecepta . . . unum, ut utilitatem civium sic tucantur ut, quaecumque agunt, ad eam referant, obliti commodorum suorum; alterum, ut totum corpus rei publicae curent, ne, dum partem aliquam tuerentur, reliquas deserant . . . qui autem parti civium consulunt, partem negligunt, rem perniciosissimam in civitatem inducunt, seditionem atque discordiam . . .'; I. 86: 'gravis et fortis civis et in republica dignus principatu . . . totamque eam sic tuebitur ut omnibus consulat . . .'; II. 83 (Aratus of Sicyon): 'At ille Graecus . . . omnibus omnibus consulendum putavit'.
95. Cicero quotes the opinion of Hecaton of Rhodes, according to whom 'neque enim solum nobis divites esse volumus, sed liberos, propinquos, amicos, maximeque republicae' (*de Off.* III. 63). Cf. G. Tozzi, op. cit. (n. 64), 294.
96. Cf. P. Brunt, 'Augustus e la repubblica', in *La rivoluzione romana* (1981), 236. For the awareness of the civil-war generation of passing through a period of revolutions (*civiles commutationes*), cf. the famous letter from Cicero to Lucretius, *Fam.* V. 12. 4 (cf. in the same volume, A. Michel, 'Cicerone e l'idea di Rivoluzione', 186-202). Augustus himself (like Bonaparte later on), was so anxious to 'close' or 'finish' these revolutions that he pardoned retrospectively those who had fought in them, or whose fathers had fought in them (cf. his retort on the subject of Cato, Macrobius, *Sat.* II. 4. 18: 'Quisque praesentem statum civitatis commutari non volet et civis et vir bonus est').

I should like to thank Erich Segal for preparing the English text of this essay.

## V. SENATORIAL SELF-REPRESENTATION: DEVELOPMENTS IN THE AUGUSTAN PERIOD

WERNER ECK

In one of his letters to Atticus Cicero stresses how grateful the provincials were that as governor he had reduced the burdens of billeting. For this they promised to honour him with statues, temples, and four-horse chariots; but he accepted only the decrees and prevented their being carried to fulfilment.<sup>1</sup> To be sure, a few days later, in another letter to Atticus, he writes that he has heard that Appius is having a gateway built at Eleusis and this gives him the idea of having something comparable built in the Academy; for he wants to leave some memorial of himself at Athens, which he loves.<sup>2</sup>

What Cicero in 50 BC merely contemplated in his letter to Atticus was undertaken, in actual reality, or carried out in practice, by many others, not only by Appius Claudius Pulcher at Eleusis. Monuments of the kind referred to by Cicero were part of the means by which senators could be given publicity, their self-esteem gratified, and the public influenced.

Very varied forms of aristocratic display were developed during the Republic.<sup>3</sup> The place was generally Rome, as the centre of politics: here there was noticeable competition from other senatorial families, here too the *populus Romanus*, as voters and as clients, could be influenced. The honouring of senators was aimed to a far lesser degree at the towns of Italy and (initially to a restricted extent only) at provincial cities.<sup>4</sup> A certain shift of emphasis in this respect appears to have set in during the last decades of the Republic. The purpose of all such measures was to display the individual and his entire family as well. None the less, in their self-advertisement senators' financial capacities and political or artistic fancies were not allowed a completely free rein. Rather, these were controlled

to a not inconsiderable extent by the Senate; so, for example, the holding of triumphs or the erection of many buildings were only permitted in the first place by *senatus consulta*.<sup>5</sup> Thereby, at least for the inner circle of ruling noble families, the principle of aristocratic equality was preserved. Competitiveness only became the prevailing ethos with the full-scale breakdown of the underlying consensus from the late second century BC.<sup>6</sup> Ruthless pushing forward of the individual was to become a decisive element. Pompey in 79 BC wanted to offer the people the spectacle of four elephants, instead of horses, drawing his triumphal car. It was only the narrowness of the *porta triumphalis* that caused the project to founder.<sup>7</sup> In the holding of his games as aedile in 58 BC Aemilius Scaurus went beyond anything hitherto seen; in particular, the luxury with which his theatre was endowed outdid all previous performances.<sup>8</sup> C. Verres could admire himself in a forest of statues erected by various communities.<sup>9</sup> Other forms of display, especially having one's portrait on coins, first became possible through Caesar; and even his republican-minded assassins did not shrink from adopting this new brand of self-advertisement.<sup>10</sup>

With Octavian's final victory in the Civil War, relative political equality was destroyed. Neither by the propagating of the *res publica restituta* nor by the description of the ruler as *princeps* could this fact be conjured away.<sup>11</sup> Tacitus in the *Annales* speaks of Augustus, after winning over the soldiers by gifts, the people by provision for the food supply, and everyone by the delights of political peace, gradually increasing in power, while he took to himself the 'munia senatus magistratum legum'.<sup>12</sup> Allied with this, however, was the outward portrayal and emphasis of his person before the public, through honours of a kind both old and new.<sup>13</sup> Nor did Augustus forget to include these, in all their details, in his *Res Gestae*: chapters 9–14 in particular present, almost in the manner of a catalogue, the broad spectrum of possibilities. Ever detectable therein, if not always explicitly spelt out, is the sense of a competition that has been won, of special quality, compared with others who had likewise obtained, or were able to obtain, honours.<sup>14</sup> Yet at the same time the avowal is also given that under him no general monopolization of such public forms of

display had been wished for by the holder of power.<sup>15</sup> That would also have been ruled out. For, however empty a disguise for the real conditions in which power was exercised the concept of the *res publica restituta* might be, yet it retained considerable significance for some time in the outward forms of public life. Hence, with the official recognition of Augustus' powers in 27 BC, immediate and radical alteration in the possibilities for self-advertisement by the senatorial aristocracy is not to be expected; not even at Rome, the centre of power, where aristocratic aspirations and the ruler's power existed side by side and could thus come into conflict.

The changes in the political structure were bound, however, to have their effects in this sphere as well, in spite of great discretion on Augustus' part.<sup>16</sup> The assumption of the *praenomen imperatoris* was already an advance signal: thereby the monopolization of *imperator* as a title was adumbrated.<sup>17</sup> A clearer sign was Octavian's refusal, in 28 BC, to let Licinius Crassus dedicate the *spolia opima* in the temple of Jupiter Feretrius. It was only possible to block the public documentation of martial excellence, in comparison with which Octavian would by no means have come off favourably, by the deployment of an underhand dodge.<sup>18</sup> Already in 27 BC a new conflict over possible modes of self-advertisement was witnessed. Objection was taken to Cornelius Gallus, first prefect of Egypt, because, according to Cassius Dio, he had had statues of himself set up practically all over Egypt, and had his deeds inscribed on the pyramids.<sup>19</sup> It is immaterial whether this was the sole, or the central, political point of the charge which finally led to his downfall.<sup>20</sup> This reproach could only have carried weight if a specific conception existed of the modes in which even so powerful a friend of the victor in the civil war was able – or was not permitted – to have himself portrayed before a provincial public.

Portraits and inscriptions were, however, a fundamental means by which individuals could be honoured in their lifetime and their memory preserved after death. To be sure, Horace mocks the people, standing wonderingly before *tituli* and *imagines*.<sup>21</sup> Yet this wonderment was matched by the value set on inscriptions by the leading members of Roman society. In 46 BC the Senate decreed that Caesar's name should be

carved on the Capitoline temple in place of that of Catulus;<sup>22</sup> in 44 BC, according to Cassius Dio, Caesar was praised for handing over to Antonius the construction of the Rostra and the building inscription associated with it.<sup>23</sup> Augustus, too, stresses in *Res Gestae* 20 his rebuilding of the Capitol and of Pompeius' theatre at his own expense 'sine ulla inscriptione nominis mei'.<sup>24</sup> So great, evidently, was the significance of having one's name on public buildings such as the Capitol that credit could still be gained even from abstinence.

Thus inscriptions, in the estimation of the Augustan age as well, could be not only a means of documentation but at the same time a way to influence public opinion, to present an individual to a public. This was so, in particular, because inscriptions were not conceived in a vacuum, but were associated with some kind of monument, set up to an individual to preserve his *memoria*.<sup>25</sup> Since some inscriptions therefore possessed the characteristics of a social and political demonstration, they could also be affected by the more or less open struggle over self-advertisement between the *princeps* and the senatorial aristocracy, above all at Rome itself.<sup>26</sup> Monument and inscription formed, for a Roman, a self-evident unity, to be sure; an inscription without the object to which it belonged was scarcely conceivable. The inscription was normally secondary, what mattered was the object. In consequence, reference will frequently be made, in the observations that follow, first to monuments and only later to inscriptions. In what follows only selected aspects of senatorial self-advertisement can be discussed; but in view of the complexity of the problem and the volume of material, this is unavoidable.

In principle, inscriptions ought to document something. They demand, in most cases, a public that can read them. Nonetheless, one cannot start from the premiss that inscriptions were all composed for the same specific purpose. Hence with senatorial self-advertisement too one must assume a variety of function and with this a differing importance of epigraphic texts: 'a provincial dedication is not the same thing as an epitaph or an elogium.'<sup>27</sup> Of course, difficulties not infrequently arise in determining what function an inscription actually had. Findspot, circumstances of discovery, and the precise description of the stone or architectural context are

often unknown or at least inadequately transmitted.<sup>28</sup> Hence in not a few cases it is impossible to determine the purpose of an inscription;<sup>29</sup> scholarly evaluation is then reduced to the text itself, which in normal prosopographical studies is generally sufficient in any case. Yet to restrict attention to the text alone, for example to the *cursum honorum*, is to overlook the fact that the text was only presented to the contemporary public and immediate posterity in association with the monument to which it belonged; this was how it was able to make its impact, how indeed it was supposed to do so. Yet it is precisely this aspect that must stand at the forefront of the complex of questions under discussion here. For it is naturally not immaterial when assessing purpose, whether an inscription belongs directly to a funerary context, i.e. was erected for someone already dead, or whether a living person was being honoured either before the general public, or within a senatorial house. Details cannot be gone into here; one can give no more than a few indications of the direction in which the material points. Inscriptions in which senators appear in their capacity as office-holders, as for example on *terminatio* stones, are omitted from consideration here. Even if the nature of the activity cannot be determined with exact precision in such texts, there can be no doubt that the context is administrative.

The overwhelming majority of all epigraphic texts from the city of Rome that were set up by senators or members of their families, or were inscribed for them, may be either actual funerary inscriptions or at any rate have been erected after their death. Out of some 260 published in *CIL VI* and about which closer precision is possible,<sup>30</sup> some 180 may be assigned to this category. As well as texts that were placed on tombs as dedicatory inscriptions, there are not a few that were carved on sarcophagi or urns.<sup>31</sup> Others are found on funerary altars<sup>32</sup> or bases which in most cases probably supported a statue of the deceased.<sup>33</sup> It is however precisely in such cases that the place where they were set up is of considerable importance, so that the exact purpose can be determined. A statue could be erected on the occasion of a person's death inside a tomb or an enclosed funerary garden. Here the sole spectators would be the family<sup>34</sup> – quite otherwise, for instance, than with the funerary monument of the Plautii near Tivoli.<sup>35</sup> There the wall with inscrip-

tions built in front of the tomb was intended, for once quite irrespective of the monumental tomb itself, to impress upon the passer-by the importance of the dead members of the family. This was doubtless the usual requirement. By contrast, the arrangement which either P. Paquius Scaeva or his descendants hit upon, understandably found no imitators: his massive sarcophagus, in which he and his wife were laid at Histonium, has no reference to the deceased on the outside; but on the inside wall of the sarcophagus the entire *curtus honorum* is engraved.<sup>36</sup>

But other inscriptions may have preserved the memory of the deceased in his house, either in the *lararium*, as we know for two of the Volusii in their villa near Lucus Feroniae,<sup>37</sup> or among statues of him in the *atrium* as well.<sup>38</sup> These were no doubt the forms which had in time somewhat changed in comparison with the *stemmata* of republican families. That statues of the dead could also be erected in *loca publica* can be seen for example with Titinius Capito. This person requested from Nerva permission to honour L. Iunius Silanus, a victim of the Pisonian conspiracy, with a statue in the Forum Romanum.<sup>39</sup> Examples of this kind can scarcely be recognized in the surviving epigraphic material;<sup>40</sup> and no doubt they will not have been all that frequent, since at least from the time of Claudius, if not indeed already from the Augustan period, the Senate – or, of course, the Emperor – had to give approval in principle.<sup>41</sup>

This applies, however, in the same way to monuments in honour of the living. Hence one must work on the assumption that many honorific inscriptions were in all probability set up on private land, often inside the house. In *CIL* VI there are about eighty examples of such inscriptions from Rome. Private individuals and cities alike paid their respects in this way.<sup>42</sup> Three texts found on the Caelian, all honouring L. Marius Maximus, *cos.* II 223, may serve as illustration. The concentration of the texts on the same spot permits the inference that the senator's house was there. While one inscription was set up by a person who cannot be closely identified, the second was put there by a *primipilus* who had served under Marius Maximus in Germania Inferior, the third probably by a centurion of III Cyrenaica. Two of the inscriptions were com-

posed many years before the death of the honorand.<sup>43</sup> P. Numicius Pica Caesianus, who was quaestor in the province of Asia, probably in the Augustan period, was honoured, by this province as well as by a set of clients, with two *trapezophora*; this too was probably inside his own house rather than anywhere else.<sup>44</sup>

By contrast, all inscriptions prompted by *princeps* or Senate, or, in most cases, by the two of them jointly, were aimed at the general public. The location of such texts was public places and buildings, and in temples too. The Forum Romanum, Forum Augusti, and Forum Traiani are mentioned, likewise, for example, the Saepta Iulia, the Basilica Iulia, the theatre of Pompeius, and the 'area Apollinis in conspectu [curiae] in Palatio', as well as various shrines.<sup>45</sup> However, texts that may be securely located are astonishingly small in number.<sup>46</sup> Restraint in granting such honours cannot be regarded as the reason, although, for example, it has been supposed on the basis of Cassius Dio LXVIII. 15. 3<sup>2</sup> and 16<sup>2</sup> that Trajan awarded this distinction to no more than four persons all told.<sup>47</sup> Far more likely an explanation is limited survival, as a result of the particularly sweeping destruction of such monuments.<sup>48</sup>

If one takes these findings seriously, considerable differentiation must be made between the various categories of inscriptions from the point of view of self-advertisement. In many cases the intended onlookers were not the general public but a smaller, circumscribed group of persons.<sup>49</sup> But if so, all these texts have a markedly reduced significance, since they could have influenced the general public either not at all or only in a limited degree.<sup>50</sup> Above all, one must stick to the point that a considerable portion of all monuments whose existence we may infer from the inscriptions were erected not for the living but for persons already dead.<sup>51</sup> This being so, such texts could not serve to advertise the persons named in them, but, at the most, their family. The fact that it is precisely in Rome that senatorial inscriptions of a funerary nature appear to a far greater extent than in the Italian regions,<sup>52</sup> not to mention the provinces, is the natural result of the legal and practical links that bound the members of the *ordo amplissimus* to the capital of the Empire.

In the *Res Gestae*, as already mentioned, Augustus prides himself on having restored the Capitol and the theatre of Pompeius 'sine ulla inscriptione nominis mei'. Tacitus stresses similar behaviour by Tiberius.<sup>53</sup> The difference from later times will be clear when one recalls, for example, the building inscription of the Pantheon. Certainly the Severan restoration of the temple retains the original lapidary text: 'M. Agrippa L. f. cos. tertium fecit'. But Septimius Severus and Caracalla are named at length as the rebuilders.<sup>54</sup> The epigraphic material of the city of Rome largely matches this latter pattern, as far as public buildings or administrative measures are concerned. The arrangements to carry out a building programme or a restoration derive from the ruler,<sup>55</sup> no differently from the way that Q. Lutatius Catulus, during his consulate in 78 BC, had the *tabularium* built.<sup>56</sup> The Emperor replaced the republican magistrate. Yet this general impression does not hold good for the Augustan period – or for that of Tiberius. The urban magistrates such as the consuls and praetors, as far as this was publicly documented at Rome by inscriptions, operate on the instructions of the senate, *ex senatus consulto*; Augustus does not make an appearance. L. Calpurnius Piso and M. Sall(u)vius, as *praetores aetarii*, in accordance with a senatorial decree had *terminatio* stones set up for a piece of land that was purchased from public funds.<sup>57</sup> Various pairs of consuls built aqueduct arches *ex s.c.*<sup>58</sup> Likewise Naevius Surdinus carried out the paving of the Forum Romanum, doubtless by decree of the senate. The bronze letters, almost 40 centimetres high, are today visible once again in the paving of the Forum.<sup>59</sup>

When Augustus himself appears in an epigraphic text engaged in similar activity, the formula is no different from that of the regular magistrates. In 8 BC the consuls C. Asinius Gallus and C. Marcus Censorinus had *terminatio* stones set up on the Tiber. The formula runs: 'C. Asinius Gallus C. Marcus Censorinus consules ex senatus consulto terminaverunt'.<sup>60</sup> An exactly identical formula had been used under the censors of 54 BC.<sup>61</sup> A year later, in 7 BC, the transaction was repeated by Augustus; the only difference in formula is that Augustus alone is named, and with the *tribunicia potestas*.<sup>62</sup> To judge from the outward form no difference existed between regular

magistrates and *princeps*. Both here portray themselves to the public in the same manner. This was certainly not the whole reality. Yet the visual impression did form a part of this reality.

Indeed, one can trace, in an impressive way, precisely in the *terminatio* stones of the Tiber bank the manner in which outward appearances shifted with the changes in substance. The second and third colleges of *curatores aivei Tiberis*, in office under Tiberius, still appear in the manner already quoted.<sup>63</sup> But at the beginning of Claudius' reign Paulus Fabius Persicus and his fellow-curators, in spite of still being named in the nominative, were already erecting 'cippi ex auctoritate Ti. Claudi Caesaris' and no longer 'ex s.c.'.<sup>64</sup> While this formula was retained under Vespasian, Trajan and Hadrian,<sup>65</sup> it finally altered completely under Antoninus Pius. The Emperor, named at the head of the text in the nominative, is the person who arranged the *terminatio*; the *curator* A. Platorius Nepos Calpurnianus, in the ablative, is the functionary who carried out the task.<sup>66</sup> The relative positions in which Emperor and senatorial office-holders were placed on public record match the actual conditions of power.<sup>67</sup>

By contrast it would be difficult to decide whether to define the inscription on the Pantheon pediment marking the restoration by Septimius Severus and Caracalla as the record of a piece of public building or as an imperial *liberalitas*. The reason is not least the entire manner in which Rome was furnished with representative public buildings and constructions in republican times.<sup>68</sup> Alongside the buildings erected by the Senate and magistrates stood others that were owed to the munificence – by no means selfless – of individual families. It was still so in AD 22, as Tacitus remarks: 'erat etiam tum in more publica munificentia'.<sup>69</sup> The examples that he is able to adduce by way of illustration are all indeed early Augustan. For he notes that Augustus did not restrain Taurus, Philippus, and Balbus from using booty or any financial resources 'ornamentum ad urbis et posterum gloriæ'. Nor would the modern scholar be in a position to produce other examples, whether from the literary sources or from epigraphic texts. To be sure, one knows positively of large buildings erected by senators at Rome in the post-Augustan period as well – such as the baths of Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus in AD 32, on the via Sacra, the

'horrea Lolliana, Galbiana, Volusiana', or the 'insula Volusiana'.<sup>70</sup> But all these structures were intended for personal use or had a commercial purpose; they were not, however, buildings for the inhabitants of Rome. Decisive evidence for the discrepancy between the Republic and the period from Augustus onwards is supplied by Suetonius and Tacitus. Every case of an individual mentioned as the builder of large buildings under Augustus concerns senators who had held a triumph.<sup>71</sup>

This is precisely where, very early on, a major element in senatorial public display was eliminated by Augustus. For it is undisputed that it was from the triumph that members of the Roman ruling stratum derived the highest kind of boost to their image and gained specific social prestige.<sup>72</sup> Of course, the title *imperator* was, for a short time only, a distinguishing factor; but victory over enemies of the Roman people and the act of ceremonial entry into the city remained bound up with the individual and his family, as demonstrated not only by the *Fasti triumphales* but also by numerous *elogia* in the Forum of Augustus.<sup>73</sup> Political pretensions within the commonwealth depended to a considerable extent on the recognition of such deeds by the community. Thus here is the sphere in which a change was most to be expected; the army was too unambiguously the basis of Augustus' power to permit free competition for influence on the army and for prestige to continue in existence. On 27 March 19 BC L. Cornelius Balbus triumphed over the Garamantes, the last *triumphator* who did not belong to the imperial family.<sup>74</sup> The honorific arch which was erected for Augustus in the Roman forum to commemorate his victory over Cleopatra and the winning back of the standards from the Parthians, probably in 19 BC, also carried the *Fasti triumphales*.<sup>75</sup> With the entry for Cornelius Balbus' triumph the fourth and last tablet was full.<sup>76</sup> No more space was left to record any further triumph – a conjunction perhaps adventitious but certainly symbolic.

How the change was carried through in detail is obscure. Victories from which the right to a triumph might have derived continued to be won in the decades following – and not merely by the legates of Augustus, who possessed no independent *imperium*. For the proconsuls of Africa, at least, still had

an army at their disposal in the last years of Augustus. Thus L. Passienus Rufus appears as *imperator* on an African inscription,<sup>77</sup> and Cossus Cornelius Lentulus, *cos. ord.* 1 BC, by his victory over the Gaetuli won the name Gaetulicus for his son.<sup>78</sup> Neither held a triumph, which indeed in the case of Lentulus was excluded, for, according to Dio LV. 28. 2, he was not appointed by lot but nominated by Augustus. This meant apparently, in spite of the title proconsul, no independent *imperium*. At any rate, on a dedication to Mars the inhabitants of Lepcis Magna stress that the province of Africa was liberated from the threat of the Gaetuli 'auspicis imp. Caesaris Aug. . . . ductu Cossi Lentuli . . . procos'.<sup>79</sup> The late descendant of the man to whose case Augustus had made appeal in 28 BC, in opposition to Licinius Crassus, would in fact have been unable to dedicate *spolia opima*. Still, it was Africa that saw in AD 22 the last proconsul who, although not a member of the *princeps'* family, gained the title *imperator*.<sup>80</sup> While if Claudius granted the conqueror of Britain, A. Plautius, an *ovatio*, as substitute for a triumph, that is to be regarded as an indication of that Emperor's well-known eccentricity, not as a reversal of the conditions created by Augustus from 19 BC onwards.<sup>81</sup>

It is certainly difficult to conceive that these conditions were created in legal fashion by the direct statutory removal of the proconsuls' rights. This would have too seriously undermined the political foundations of the *res publica restituta* when the internal situation was still unstable. Far likelier is the possibility that Agrippa's conduct set the tone. He declined a triumph in 19 BC and 14 BC, although possessed of independent *imperium*.<sup>82</sup> Furthermore, the triumph decreed for Tiberius in 12 BC was not accepted by Augustus,<sup>83</sup> for all that Tiberius, as stepson of Augustus, had been pushed into a special position after Agrippa's death. Was anyone in the Senate able or willing, when such *exempla* existed, to risk proposing, against the ruler's explicit political wishes, the grant of a triumph to, say, a proconsul of Africa? He had no greater rights than the son-in-law, or the stepson, of the *princeps*.

Thus it was very early on that Augustus deprived potential rivals of a critical means of self-enhancement. But at the same time he struck at the other means by which many *triumphatores*

had sought to prolong the recollection of their victory beyond its immediate celebration and thereby to bestow permanence on their own person: by the display of booty or the erection of buildings.<sup>84</sup> Even if the origin of this public transaction is to be seen in the fulfilment of vows to the gods, yet the decisive motive had become the display of the victor's person. Pompeius had set a high standard with his theatre on the Campus Martius and the games at its opening.<sup>85</sup> And during the triumphal period it was, precisely, the *triumphatores* who had not held back from these opportunities to influence the *populus Romanus*. Thus Munatius Plancus, for example, had the Temple of Saturn restored 'de manib'(is)', as is stated on an inscription in the Forum Romanum;<sup>86</sup> likewise Asinius Pollio the *atrium libertatis*, with the first public library in Rome.<sup>87</sup> It was probably not until after Octavian's defeat of Antonius and his political agreement with the victor that C. Sosius, resolute opponent of Octavian in 32 BC, restored the Temple of Apollo at the southern end of the Campus Martius. As the elder Pliny records, the temple was actually named after its builder, Apollo Sosianus.<sup>88</sup> Similarly the Temple of Diana on the Aventine, restored by L. Cornificius after his triumph in 33 BC, still bore the appellation Cornificia on the Severan plan of the city.<sup>89</sup> After his threefold triumph Octavian placed himself in this tradition, in that he had the Via Flaminia as far as Ariminum renewed, including all its bridges.<sup>90</sup> He invited other *triumphatores* to follow his example; but only C. Calvisius Sabinus and M. Valerius Messala Corvinus seem to have taken up his suggestion;<sup>91</sup> both renewed a portion of the Via Latina, to which milestones of Calvisius Sabinus still testify; they are the last milestones in Italy which do not name the *principes*.<sup>92</sup> The road already had a name, of course, which made it less enticing as an investment. L. Cornelius Balbus, the last to celebrate a triumph without belonging to the ruling house, is also the last to have erected a public building at Rome bearing his own name: the Theatrum Balbi.<sup>93</sup> For the Balnea Surae appear to have been built by Trajan himself to honour his closest collaborator, Licinius Sura.<sup>94</sup> This finding is not contradicted by Suetonius, *Aug.* 29. 4. f., according to which Augustus often encouraged the *principes viri* to erect new buildings or to restore or decorate old ones, in accordance with their financial

resources. All the examples that he gives concern senators who had achieved a triumph in the period up to 19 BC. This is confirmed by Tacitus in the passage already cited.<sup>95</sup> To be sure, it is clear from Tacitus that under Tiberius an obligation still positively existed, and was felt, for public buildings to be maintained by the family of the original builders. Acmius Lepidus had put to the Senate the proposal that he should be allowed to restore and decorate the 'basilica Pauli, Acmiilia monimenta', at his own expense. But at the same time it is also noted that after a fire in the theatre of Pompeius, Tiberius provided the funds for its restoration, 'eo quod nemo e familia restaurando sufficeret'.<sup>96</sup>

This on its own in no way explains, of course, why neither under Augustus nor under succeeding *principes* are there any further references to senatorially financed building activity in Rome, as had after all been normal up till the early years of the Augustan principate. Naturally, the specific category of triumphal buildings was no longer possible, with the monopolization of the triumph by the *principes* or his family;<sup>97</sup> but many senatorial families would have been perfectly capable, financially, to undertake this, as is documented by not a few epigraphic examples from Italy and, from the late first century AD, from the provinces too.<sup>98</sup> In the Augustan period large permanent theatre buildings were erected by senators at, for example, Volaterrae and Herculaneum.<sup>99</sup> M. Herennius Picenus, *suff.* AD 1, furnished the town of Veii with the funds for a large building;<sup>100</sup> at Corinth a stoa, the building of which he had paid for, was actually named after P. Memmius Regulus.<sup>101</sup> Nothing comparable is known for Rome, in spite of the voluminous epigraphic and literary source-material. It cannot, certainly, be attributed to lack of demand. For apart from the not infrequent need for restoration, numerous fires alone constantly created space for new buildings. Yet new buildings, so far as we know, were virtually without exception initiated by the Emperors, partly in collaboration with the senate.

One must therefore see the break with republican practice, still operative in the early Augustan period, in the fact that public building activity in Rome was regarded, not in a legal sense, but, doubtless, in terms of practical politics, as a prerogative of the *principes*, after Augustus, with his building

programme, for buildings both sacred and profane, proclaimed far and wide in the *Res Gestae*, had set the decisive precedent.<sup>102</sup> In so far as senators were disposed to pursue these ancient forms of public self-enhancement, the towns outside Rome were their possible field of activity; direct rivalry with the *princeps* was thereby avoided.<sup>103</sup> The effect of the monarchical position of the *princeps* was to produce in this area an equality of non-representation.<sup>104</sup>

The triumph, triumphal buildings, and the festivities linked with their completion thus already disappear at the start of the Augustan period from the repertoire of senatorial self-advertisement.<sup>105</sup> Since, however, victories were still won by senators, even if, from now on, in most cases under the emperor's auspices, a replacement had to be created for the actual victor in battle: this was the *ornamenta triumphalia*.<sup>106</sup> They were actually a substitute, but evidently soon lost this character. The frequent mentions in senatorial inscriptions testify to their high prestige value.<sup>107</sup> This prestige was of course derivative, for the grant of the *ornamenta* by the Senate in the post-Augustan period doubtless always derived from the proposal of the ruler,<sup>108</sup> even if the proposer's name were deliberately omitted, as was the case with the future Emperor Nerva, who omitted the name of the proposer of AD 65 in a building inscription from Sentinum.<sup>109</sup>

Together with the *ornamenta* there was linked, as a permanent element of public display, the *statua triumphalis*. Augustus made room in his Forum not only for past members of the *gens Iulia* as far back as Venus, Mars, Aeneas, and Romulus, but also for the *summi viri* of republican times, not exclusively, although predominantly, senators who had gained victories over enemies of the *populus Romanus*.<sup>110</sup> But along with the past so too the present and the future were to be on hand; Augustus directed, as at any rate Dio LV. 10. 3 records, that all those who had celebrated a triumph or had gained the *ornamenta triumphalia* should be honoured with a *statua aenea* in his Forum. A *titulus* on the base informed the observer of the reason for the distinction. Thus Velleius notes that the insignia were decreed for M. Vinicius on account of his deeds in Germany: 'cum speciosissima inscriptione operum'.<sup>111</sup> Augustus alone must have proposed the grant of

the *ornamenta* by the Senate well over thirty times, while at least forty further cases are attested up to the end of the Hadrianic period.<sup>112</sup>

Under Augustus the link with an actual success in war seems always to have been preserved; but later the *ornamenta* and the *statua triumphalis* associated with them, too, could be awarded as a general distinction, divorced from any military transaction. When such statues were decreed for Petronius Turpilianus, Nerva, and Tigellinus on the occasion of the unmasking of the Pisonian conspiracy in AD 65, that was no more than an extreme variant.<sup>113</sup> The particular type of the *statua triumphalis* also achieved independent existence by being used quite separately from the *ornamenta*. L. Volusius Saturninus, *suff.* AD 3 and *praefectus urbi* for more than sixteen years on end, died in AD 56. Among the nine statues decreed on this occasion were included three *statae triumphales*, which assuredly were not derived from earlier successes of Saturninus, for example as governor of Dalmatia.<sup>114</sup> The Augustan pattern was of course retained to the extent that those statues that were made of bronze got a place in the Forum of Augustus: yet two further statues were fashioned from marble and set up in the 'templum novum divi Augusti'.<sup>115</sup>

Thereby the type of statue created under Augustus, which belonged to the repertoire of substitutes for the triumph that was no longer granted, became a means for senators, above all, to distinguish themselves. *De facto*, the power of disposal lay exclusively with the Emperor, even if formally a senatorial decree was framed on each occasion. This conclusion probably applies, moreover, not only for *statae triumphales*, but for all forms of statuary in so far as they were erected in Rome in public places, in shrines or in their entrance halls. Whereas Metellus Scipio displayed on the Capitol an entire 'turma inauratam equestrum' of his forbears, about which Cicero waxes sarcastic because the inscriptions were muddled up,<sup>116</sup> from Augustus onwards this would only be possible through a senatorial decree, which meant, with the sanction of the *princeps*.<sup>117</sup> The Emperor's sanction thus became the norm, or rather functioned as a special mark of honour.<sup>118</sup> This meant a state of dependence, even for the great families, a restriction of the means of personal display.



Of course, it did not go so far as to strike out from the senatorial repertoire an entire genre of statuary. It has indeed been supposed that the equestrian statue was the preserve of the *princeps*, as being a particularly monumental variety.<sup>119</sup> Yet it is hard to see why this type of statue in particular should have been removed from senators, whereas, for example, Emperors as well as senators and knights alike could be portrayed in the *statua loricata*.<sup>120</sup> The numerous pieces of evidence in which *statuae equestres* for knights are mentioned would necessarily render such an assertion impossible.<sup>121</sup> Yet for senators as well not a few definite examples of equestrian statues are attested, although only one is preserved as direct evidence, namely the one of M. Nonius Balbus at Herculaneum.<sup>122</sup> But several inscriptions mention such honours, and other cases may be deduced from the size of the bases;<sup>123</sup> as for Celsus Polemaeanus in front of his grandiose library and tomb at Ephesus,<sup>124</sup> for T. Trebellenus Rufus at Concordia in the late Augustan period,<sup>125</sup> or for P. Memmius Regulus, governor jointly of Macedonia and Achaia, at Athens.<sup>126</sup> That it is often impossible to reach a decision whether or not an equestrian statue originally stood on a particular base is a reflex above all of the widespread absence of measurements or of the inadequate descriptions in many *corpora* of inscriptions. A systematic investigation would doubtless produce quite a large number of such monuments from the imperial period as a whole.<sup>127</sup>

But in Rome too equestrian statues were evidently not regarded by the rulers as being in competition with their own need for self-display. Nero in AD 56 had such a monument erected near the Rostra by decree of the Senate for the deceased city prefect Volusius Saturninus;<sup>128</sup> and a text from Trajan's Forum even seems to attest (for an unknown person), as well as statues 'in aede divi Iuli' and 'in saeptis Iuliiis', an equestrian statue 'in rostris'.<sup>129</sup> All the same, one should not entirely disregard the limited quantity of the evidence for this type of honour at Rome itself. It could indicate a certain reserve by the rulers as far as the area of the city itself is concerned.<sup>130</sup>

In general statues of senators were very numerous and very varied in type; the senatorial decree for Volusius Saturninus alone names five different kinds.<sup>131</sup> These types are, to be sure, distinguishable only with great difficulty, in so far as the

statues have survived at all. In few cases can they be attributed to a specific individual.<sup>132</sup> For the historian, therefore, all that can be used is what can be concluded from the epigraphic evidence for statues.<sup>133</sup> It is hardly necessary to underline what has been lost in this sphere too. This applies particularly to Rome, the central stage for senatorial self-display and competition. Of the nine statues that were erected for L. Volusius Saturninus, each of which naturally had an inscribed base, there has at last, very recently, been published a single small fragment of one base.<sup>134</sup> And of the more than eighty cases in which *ornamenta triumphalia*, which means a corresponding *statua triumphalis* as well, or the honorific statue alone, were granted at Rome, to our knowledge, up to the time of Hadrian, not a single inscription is securely attested.<sup>135</sup> In the course of the excavations in the Forum Romanum, the Forum of Augustus, and the Forum of Trajan, a series of honorific inscriptions was indeed found: but the overwhelming majority of these belong to the fourth and fifth centuries.<sup>136</sup> In so far as they refer to persons from the first three centuries AD, they seem for the most part to have been erected for senators who were already dead, as not only the example of Volusius but many references in Tacitus and other authors would suggest.<sup>137</sup> All the same, such honours from Emperor and Senate may in total have been numerous. The abundance of these honours would tend to diminish the probative value of any individual monument.<sup>138</sup>

In spite of the variety in types of statuary the monuments will have been somewhat monotonous. As far as we can tell in Rome on the basis of the surviving material, almost all permanent honours of living or dead senators consisted in the erection of a *statua pedestris* with attached base and inscription irrespective of whether the honour derived from Emperor and Senate or from private persons;<sup>139</sup> once one leaves out the rare *statuae equestres*, the monuments were thus fashioned in a substantially uniform way;<sup>140</sup> to give personal prominence to an individual was not possible in this manner, except by the agglomeration of a particularly large number of statues for a single individual.<sup>141</sup> For Rome of the imperial period there is no documentary evidence for a monument that by its proportions or even by the originality of its form, would have been

lifted above the tedium of the average public honorific monument.<sup>142</sup> All the greater alertness must therefore be provoked by two monuments that in no way conform to this general impression. The first was probably made about 20 BC, the other is undated.

In the excavations at Largo Argentina fragments of nine inscriptions came to light, which had been set up by the communities of the Carietes and Vennenses to L. Aelius Lamia.<sup>143</sup> Lamia was governor of Hispania Ulterior from about 24 to 22 BC. To these nine texts is to be added a further fragmentary inscription which has long been known.<sup>144</sup> What is out of the ordinary is not merely the number of inscriptions; rather, the editor, Marchetti Longhi, suggested that the texts were probably all inscribed on slabs that abutted against one another,<sup>145</sup> thereby producing an inscribed wall about 9 to 10 metres in length. Possibly the marble tablets were fixed to a *bathron* on which statues of the honorand, perhaps in the form of small equestrian portraits, were arranged.<sup>146</sup> The monument certainly did not resemble what we know from Rome in the later period.

Still more remarkable, however, was another monument that was once erected at Rome for a member of the senatorial ruling stratum. Transcriptions of the texts on five marble slabs – apparently lost – have been known since the second half of the sixteenth century.<sup>147</sup> The fragments, which fit together, derive from a monument to a former proconsul of Pontus-Bithynia. Of the name of this governor only the filiation, L. f., and the *cognomen* Rufus survive. Mommsen, in a comprehensive treatment of the manuscript versions of this text, thought of identifying the proconsul Rufus with a certain C. Cadius Rufus, attested as governor of Pontus-Bithynia by coins of the Julio-Claudian period.<sup>148</sup> More recent studies have properly cast doubt on the identification.<sup>149</sup>

The text of the inscription has no particularly telling characteristics, apart, perhaps, from the number of Bithynian towns which participated in erecting the monument to their former proconsul: according to the manuscript versions there were six, including Nicomedia, Apamea, Prusias ab Mare, Prusias ab Hypio, and Prusias ab Olympos. There is no specific reason for the Bithynian communities to honour the proconsul; Rufus

appears as the towns' *patronus* and *evergetes*. Hence one could include this text in a series of many other inscriptions, erected in Rome and in numerous other cities of the Empire, especially of Italy, for governors by individual communities or by the entire province. Such texts are normally inscribed on statue bases.

Yet the proconsul Rufus was not honoured in such a run-of-the-mill fashion. A few years ago a fragment of the inscription was found in the church of the Collegio Romano di Camposanto Teutonico, making it possible to calculate the size of the monument.<sup>150</sup> A measured reconstruction-drawing of the whole text produces a line of at least seven, but with great probability eight metres; and, instead of six towns, as hitherto supposed, most probably there were eight named as dedicators.<sup>151</sup> An approximately comparable length of line on an inscription may be found on the attic of the two honorific arches erected under Tiberius for Drusus and Germanicus in the Forum of Augustus, near the Temple of Mars.<sup>152</sup> The height of the letters in the present inscription is also extraordinary: the first line, which contained the name of the honorand, was about 25 centimetres high; a comparable letter-size is met with at Rome on an inscription erected by the Senate for Lucius Caesar and found in the ruins of the Basilica Aemilia in the Forum Romanum.<sup>153</sup> Both these dimensions permit the conclusion that we are dealing with an impressive monument, well above average size. Eight Bithynian cities had it erected, and dispatched at least nine ambassadors for the purpose.

No clear decision can be reached over the monument's type. All the same, some indications can be given. In spite of the size of the letters in the first line, it can hardly have involved an inscription from the attic of an honorific arch. For, apart from the fact that neither from the republican period nor from the principate do we have any evidence for the erection of such a monument at Rome by provincial cities,<sup>154</sup> the letters which form the names of the Bithynian ambassadors in the last lines are too small to have been legible at any height above the ground.<sup>155</sup> One must, rather, postulate an architectural structure in which the inscription could be viewed from more or less the eye-level of the beholder. This probably requires one

to infer that statuary was erected on the monument; at the least one would expect the proconsul's statue. But since a single statue, even if it were to have been over life size, would in no way have matched the proportions of the substructure, one has to reckon with a group of statues, including perhaps the individual cities in the guise of their city-goddesses. Such a monument was, in any case, erected for Tiberius in AD 20 by fourteen cities of Asia. The colossal statue of the Emperor was surrounded by fourteen smaller statues representing the cities.<sup>156</sup>

But however the monument may have been designed in detail, its grandiose character and the intention to honour the proconsul Rufus and bring him into prominence before the Roman public, are indisputable. If one compares this monument with everything that is known at Rome itself of monuments in honour of persons outside the *princeps'* family from the Augustan period onwards, its virtually unique character is manifest. Only for L. Aelius Lamia, from about the end of the 20s BC, can anything similar, if not fully comparable, be identified. Must one therefore conclude that the monument to the proconsul Rufus is only conceivable at latest in the early phases of the Augustan period? Subsequently, indeed, would it have been in disconcerting competition with the aspirations of Augustus or his successors?<sup>157</sup> The question cannot be answered conclusively at present, since we cannot date the proconsul. Still, our other information makes an answer in this sense rather probable.<sup>158</sup> Under the changed conditions in Rome itself, monumental forms of expression were doubtless suitable only for the *princeps* in person; this is paralleled by the observation made about public buildings.<sup>159</sup> Similarly, as regards monumental tombs, Augustus had soon established a limitation, even though imposing funerary monuments, such as the tomb of the Plautii near Tibur, the pyramid of Cestius in Rome, and the tomb of Munatius Plancus near Caieta, were entirely possible.<sup>160</sup> However we lack the comprehensive study of such funerary monuments which would permit general conclusions in this area.

The two senatorial honorific monuments just discussed exhibit comparable features in their inscriptions. Apart from the name, in each case the position of patron is given promi-

nence, further the office through which, with great probability, that role came to be undertaken in the first place, that of proconsul in the case of Rufus, of *legatus pro praetore* in that of Lamia. The latter's praetorship and membership of the college of *XVviri sacris faciundis* are also registered. If one compares inscriptions for patrons of provincial communities from the later period, it is striking that these generally mention not merely a single office, but the entire career.<sup>161</sup> Indeed the bulk of the other monuments, such as most funerary and many building inscriptions, record, in an almost stereotyped fashion, all the offices of the particular senators in question. The *cursus honorum* is the typical form in which senators displayed themselves before the public in the imperial period. This had not always been so.

The earliest examples of a complete, or at least largely complete, listing of offices are the *elogia* from the tombs of the Scipios.<sup>162</sup> It may be that the *tituli* below the wax masks of dead ancestors were the prototype. Likewise, the offices and achievements were brought before the public once more, after a senator's death, in the *laudatio funebris*.<sup>163</sup> A life that had run its course was thus summed up in its entirety. And even if no noteworthy *res gestae* were linked to the individual magistracies, the stages in the *cursus honorum* provided evidence that the *populus Romanus* had recognized the dead man by distinguishing him through election to office. The *cursus honorum*, which appeared in the funerary inscription, was, so to speak, the political life history of the dead man reduced to its essentials.<sup>164</sup>

There is a whole series of inscriptions of senators from the republican period in which the entire career of offices is set forth. In so far as their original function can be determined, we are dealing almost exclusively with funerary inscriptions.<sup>165</sup> By contrast, no unambiguously honorific inscription, in which this phenomenon may be observed, can be cited for a person who was still alive. Inscriptions on monuments in honour of the living name the office which was significant for the dedicators, that is to say, no doubt, the official position which provided the occasion for the honour.<sup>166</sup> There does not follow a recapitulation of all more or less recently held offices. This was not necessary, not least because the latest office was

generally also the highest in rank and thereby unmistakably characterized the political status of the honorand. Sulla, for example, was honoured in Rome, and at Suessa, Sutrium and Alba Fucens, only as dictator. Likewise, numerous senators were honoured at Rome and, especially, in the eastern provinces, as governors or patrons.<sup>167</sup> In the early Augustan period, too, certain cities and the *koionon* of Crete still honoured M. Nonius Balbus at Herculaneum only as proconsul.<sup>168</sup> Quite different was the case with, for instance, Q. Glitius Atilius Agricola, *cos. suff.* 97. On eleven inscriptions at Augusta Taurinorum, it was quite natural, even for a series of provincial cities, to set out his entire *cursus honorum*, not merely one office or his highest magistracy;<sup>169</sup> and the same thing occurs with the *cos.* II of the year 105, C. Antius A. Iulius Quadratus, at Pergamum, even though Greek epigraphic tradition was quite unfamiliar with this type of honour.<sup>170</sup> The *cursus honorum*, spelled out and listed in all its individual stages, became a significant means of describing to the public the rank and significance of a living person as well.

It is – almost inevitably – impossible to establish precisely when this method of putting a leading personality on display in his own lifetime first became fashionable.<sup>171</sup> The earliest absolutely certain example is L. Aquilius Florus Turcianus Gallus, to whom inscriptions were set up at Corinth and Athens as proconsul of Achaia, perhaps around 3 BC, with his full *cursus honorum*, beginning with the *vigintivirate* and going up to his latest magistracy, the proconsulship.<sup>172</sup> The honorand may well have participated in the composition of the texts himself. Likewise Augustan are, no doubt, inscriptions for Cn. Pullius Pollio from Forum Clodii, P. Tettius Rufus Tontianus from Arina, T. Trebellenus Rufus from Concordia, and P. Numicius Pica Caesianus from Rome itself.<sup>173</sup> However it remains uncertain whether all the instances just listed concern an honorific inscription for a living person. All other texts from the Augustan period in which the entire *cursus honorum* appears – and there are, after all, thirty cases – derive from tombs or were put up after the honorand's death. In the post-Augustan period, however, this type became even more customary for the living as well.

There is a possible explanation for this. Augustus had a

gallery of leading Romans set up, alongside the ancestors of the Julian family, in his Forum. Below their statues in each case, besides their noteworthy deeds, all their individual offices were set forth, as for example the texts demonstrate for Q. Fabius Maximus, C. Marius, and L. Licinius Lucullus.<sup>174</sup> Of course, it is scarcely possible to regard these as the direct prototype, since all these Romans were long since dead.<sup>175</sup> Yet Augustus also ordained that statues should be set up in his Forum to those who had the distinction of the *ornamenta triumphalia*. That this actually happened is not of course directly attested for the Augustan period, but it is at least under Claudius at the latest, if the 'statua triumphalis Cn. Senti Saturnini' recorded on wax tablets from Pompeii refers to the consul of 41.<sup>176</sup> Since it was Augustus' wish that Rome's past should be directly associated with the present through the depiction of great senators,<sup>177</sup> one may well postulate a formulation of the new inscription according to the pattern of the texts beneath the statues of the *virii antiqui*. And in so far as tangible specimens from later periods survive, they always adduce the entire *cursus honorum*, as well as a reference to the senatorial decree.<sup>178</sup> Beneath the statue which was decreed for L. Volusius Saturninus in the Forum of Augustus one can hardly assume that there would have been a less extensive text than in the *lararium* of his villa at Lucus Feroniae; in other words, at least his complete consular career.<sup>179</sup>

If this assumption is valid, it is clear that at Rome during the Augustan period not a few inscriptions will already have been on view on which, as was earlier the case only after death, all offices and duties were mentioned which had been undertaken in the service of the *res publica*, or, now, that of the *princeps* too. Thereby a new means had been invented by which members of the senatorial ruling stratum could display themselves to the world around them. Is it not probable that this model was speedily imitated and taken over in other places and situations as well?

Curiously enough, the individuals for whom this type of honour is already on record, in all probability, under Augustus,<sup>180</sup> were not members of great republican families or the leading collaborators of Augustus. For those people, if our epigraphic material as a whole is in some degree represent-

ative, the old style, in many cases in the funerary sphere, but in particular with honours from communities or individuals, remained the norm: it sufficed to mention consulate and priesthood, or simply the name alone. M. Claudius Marcellus, son-in-law of Augustus, was just called *patronus* on an honorific inscription in the Forum at Pompeii.<sup>181</sup> And for Q. Volusius Saturninus, *suffr.* 12 BC, it was sufficient to characterise him on an honorific inscription in the Forum of Lucus Feroniae as consul and *VIIvir epulonum*.<sup>182</sup> The future, however, belonged to the new style, with listing of the *cursus honorum*.<sup>183</sup>

## NOTES

For comments and criticism I am grateful to various participants in the Colloquium, but above all to Friedrich Vittinghoff and Edgar Pack who also both read a previous draft. H. Krummrey and G. Lahusen also very kindly placed at my disposal proofs of as yet unpublished works. Anthony Birley (text) and Fergus Millar (notes) took on the not inconsiderable task of the translation into English. I am grateful to them also, as to Glen Bowersock for his support.

The following abbreviations are used in this paper:

- L. Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms in der Zeit von Augustus bis zum Ausgang der Antonine*<sup>9</sup>, ed. G. Wissowa (1920) = Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte*.  
 A. E. Gordon, *Quintus Veranius consul A.D. 49*, *Univ. Calif. Publ. in Class. Arch.* 2, 5 (1952), 231 ff. = Gordon, *Veranius*.  
 D. Kienast, *Augustus. Prinzeps und Monarch* (1982) = Kienast, *Augustus*.  
 G. Lahusen, *Untersuchungen zur Ehrenstatue in Rom. Literarische und epigraphische Zeugnisse* (1983) = Lahusen, *Ehrenstatue*.  
 H. Löhken, *Ordines dignitatum. Untersuchungen zur formalen Konstituierung der spätantiken Führungsschicht* (1982) = Löhken, *Ordines dignitatum*.  
 M. Pape, *Griechische Kunstwerke aus Kriegsbeute und ihre öffentliche Aufstellung in Rom. Von der Eroberung von Syrakus bis in augusteische Zeit* (Diss. Hamburg, 1975) = Pape, *Kunstwerke aus Kriegsbeute*.  
 I. Volusii Saturnini, *Una famiglia romana della prima età imperiale (Archeologia - Materiali e problemi 6, 1982)* = Volusii.  
 K. Tuchelt, *Frühe Denkmäler Roms in Kleinasien. I: Roma und Promagistrate* (1979) = Tuchelt, *Denkmäler*.  
 O. Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik* (1941) = Vessberg, *Kunstgeschichte*.

1. *Cic. Att. V. 21. 7*: 'nullos honores mihi nisi verborum decerni sino, statuas, fana, *τέφρατα* prohibeo'. The fact that Cicero did none the less receive honorific statues is proved by a monument on Samos, Tuchelt, *Denkmäler*, 48.

2. *Cic. Att. VI. 1. 26*: 'volo esse aliquod monumentum'; he continues, significantly: 'odi falsas inscriptiones statuarum alienarum'. On the monument as the vehicle of *memoria* cf. *Cic. Verr. II. 4. 69; 79; 82*; cf. also Dio LIV. 23. 6. Cf. n. 25 below.

3. I know of no treatment of the phenomenon as a whole. There are however treatments of various aspects by different authors, see e.g. Tuchelt, *Denkmäler*,

- 45 ff. for statues, shrines, and buildings in the Greek East; Vessberg, *Kunstgeschichte*, 26 ff.; Pape, *Kunstwerke aus Kriegsbeute*, 53 ff.; on the use of coin see A. Alföldi, 'The Main Aspects of Political Propaganda in the Coinage of the Roman Republic', in *Essays in Roman Coinage presented to H. Mattingly* (1956), 63 ff.; T. P. Wiseman, 'Legendary Genealogies in Late-Republican Rome', *Greece and Rome* 21 (1974), 153 ff.; T. Hölscher, 'Die Geschichtsauffassung in der römischen Repräsentationskunst der späten römischen Republik', in *Actes du 9<sup>ème</sup> congr. int. numismat. Berne Septembre 1979 I* (1982), 269 ff.; M.-L. Vollenweider, 'Verwendung und Bedeutung der Porträtkommen für das politische Leben der römischen Republik', *Mus. Helv.* 12 (1955), 96 ff.; E. Welin, *Studien zur Topographie des Forum Romanum* (1953), 130 ff. In general on the question of representation in the Principate, and particularly in Late Antiquity, see Löhken, *Ordines dignitatum*.
4. Cf., e.g., the setting up of military trophies by L. Mummius in various Italian towns: Trebula Mutuesca (*ILLRP* 327); Cures Sabini (328); Nursia (329); Parma (330); Fabrateria Nova (*AE* 1973, 134); also in Italia in Spain (*ILLRP* 331) and in Rome itself (*ILLRP* 122). Scipio Africanus after the conquest of Carthage had items of booty restored to various cities in Sicily and re-erected there in his name (*Cic. Verr. II. 2. 3. 4. 73 ff.*).
5. e.g. *Verr. II. 4. 69*: 'Tuus enim honos illo templo senatus populique Romani beneficio, tui nominis aeterna memoria simul cum templo illo consecratur. For the honouring of Claudius Marcellus through the construction of a library and the Theatre of Marcellus see *RG 21*; Livy, *Per. 140*; Plut. *Marc. 30*; Suet. *Aug. 29*.
4. On the triumph, Mommsen, *Staatsrecht* P. 134 ff. On senatorial permission for the erection of monuments, Pape, *Kunstwerke aus Kriegsbeute*.
6. Ch. Meier, *Res Publica amissa?* (1980), 50 ff.; 116 ff.; 162 ff.
7. M. Gelzer, *Pompeius* (1949), 43; on the significance of the *porta triumphalis*, H. S. Versnel, *Triumphus* (1970), 132 ff. Cf. also the right granted to L. Cornificus, *cos.* 35 BC, to ride home from banquets on an elephant, and the remark on this point by Syme, *RR*, 238: 'a token of changed times and offensive parody of Duilius'.
8. *Cic. de off. II. 57*; Pliny, *NH VIII. 64, 96; XXIV. 36; XXXV. 127; XXXVI. 50; 113 ff.* Even Ammianus has occasion (*XXII. 15. 24*) to speak of the games.
9. *Cic. Verr. II. 2. 150*. For literary references to honorific statues and monuments during the Republic in Rome see esp. Vessberg, *Kunstgeschichte*, *passim*.
10. Vessberg, *Kunstgeschichte*, 148 ff.; M. Bieber, 'The Development of Portraiture on Roman Republican Coins', *ANRW* I. 4 (1973), 871 ff., esp. 879 ff.; J. M. C. Toynbee, *Roman Historical Portraits* (1978), 50 ff.
11. Syme, *RR*, 313 ff.; P. Sattler, *Augustus und der Senat* (1960), 58 ff. Most recently, Kienast, *Augustus*, 67 ff. with comprehensive bibliography.
12. *Tac. Ann. I. 2. 1*.
13. See e.g. A. Alföldi, *Die zwei Lorbeerbäume des Augustus* (1973); idem, *Die monarchische Repräsentation im römischen Kaiserreiche* (1970); idem, *Der Vater des Vaterlandes im römischen Denken* (1971); as regards the exceptional honours voted to Gaius and Lucius Caesar and Germanicus cf. also the new texts from near Seville, which greatly expand our knowledge of the details, hitherto based on the Tabula Hebana: see J. González and F. Fernández, 'Tabulae Saresnes', *Iura* 31 (1980), 1. For monumental self-representation in Rome itself cf. e.g. P. Zanker, *Forum Romanum. Die Neugestaltung durch Augustus* (1972); idem, *Forum Augustum* (1968); E. Buchner, *Die Sommeruhr des Augustus* (1982) = *Röm. Mitt.* 83 (1976), 319 ff. and 87 (1980), 355 ff.
14. See, e.g., *RG 12*: 'qui honos [ad hoc] tempus nemini praeter [m]e [est decretus]'. On the significance of 'primus' within the social structure see also G. Alföldy, *Die Rolle des Einzelnen in der Gesellschaft des Römischen Kaiserreiches* (1980), 22 ff.

15. The patronage of cities was by no means concentrated on the Emperor, although, or because, the institution had been emptied of political content, cf. F. Engesser, *Der Stadtpatronat in Italien und den Westprovinzen des römischen Reiches bis auf Diokletian* (Diss. Freiburg, 1957); L. Harmand, *Le Patronat sur les collectivités publiques des origines au Bas-empire* (1957) (incomplete). The Emperor was therefore never directly involved in the appointment of city patrons, *pace* J. Nichols, 'The Emperor and the Selection of the *patronus civitatis*', *Chiron* 8 (1978), 429 ff.; see W. Eck, 'Wahl von Stadtpatronen mit kaiserlicher Beteiligung?', *Chiron* 9 (1979), 489 ff.
16. Thus it is significant that, in the crucial sphere of the Roman corn-supply, from 22 BC onwards senators progressively lost all opportunities for personal publicity; see Sattler, op. cit. (n. 1), 77; G. Rickman, *The Corn Supply of Ancient Rome* (1980), 62 ff.; although the equestrian Praefectus Annonae seems to have been appointed for the first time between AD 8 and 14, see H. Pavis d'Escurac, *La Préfecture de l'annone* (1976), 29. Augustus also took steps to provide fire precautions after Egnatius Rufus, by his measures in this area, had made a great impression on the population of the City, see Dio LIII. 24. 4–6; Vell. Pat. II. 91. 3; 92. 4. Similarly, the names of the *triumviri monetales*, which had reappeared on coins minted in Rome in about 20 BC, disappear again before the end of Augustus' reign; cf. e.g. K. Kraft, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur antiken Geldgeschichte und Numismatik I* (1978), 42 ff.; for a different view A. M. Burnett, *Num. Chron.* 17 (1977), 45 ff.; Kienast, *Augustus*, 324 ff. Particular problems are created by the appearance of portraits of some governors on coin-issues of provincial cities; in Asia: M. Tullius Cicero (*BMC Lydia*, 139, 13 ff.), M. Valerius Messala Potitus (*Syll. Auloek*, 3342; Jenkins, *Br. Mus. Qu.* 22 (1960), 72), C. Asinius Gallus (*BMC Troas*, 24; Ashmole, *Mus. Coins Emp.* I, 1261 ff.), P. Cornelius Scipio (Babelon, *Inventaire Waddington*, 991), Q. Fabius Maximus (*BMC Phrygia*, 95; *Ashmole. Mus. Coins Emp.* I, 1385 ff.); in Africa: P. Quinctilius Varus, L. Volusius Saturninus, Africanus Fabius Maximus; evidence in B. Thomasson, *Die Staatshalter der römischen Provinzen Nordafrikas von Augustus bis Diokletianus II* (1960), 13 ff.; see M. Grant, *From Imperium to Auctoritas* (1946), 229; 379 ff.; idem, *Roman Imperial Money* (1954), 90 ff.; *Aspects of the Principate of Tiberius* (1950), 162 ff.; see further G. Stumpf, 'Eine Porträtmünze des A. Vibius C. f. C. n. Habitus Proconsul von Africa unter Tiberius', *Schweiz. Münzbl.* (1983) (printing); Syme, *Roman Papers* I, 293; U. Vogel-Weidemann, *Die Staatshalter von Africa und Asia in den Jahren 14–68 n. Chr.* (1982), 45 ff. Cultic honours also largely disappeared from the provinces before the end of Augustus' reign, see e.g. Chr. Habicht, in *Le Culte des souverains dans l'Empire romain* (1972), 47 ff.; according to him the latest attested case is C. Marcus Censorinus, *SEG II*, 549; see G. W. Bowersock, *HSCP* 68 (1964), 207; C. P. Jones, *Phoenix* 31 (1977), 80; Tuchelt, *Denkmäler*, 105 ff. (in his view there was also a cult for C. Vibius Postumus, *procos. Asiae* probably between AD 12 and 15; cf. U. Vogel-Weidemann, op. cit. 220 ff.). For a probable cult of T. Statilius Taurus in Thespieae cf. L. Moretti, *Athenaeum* 59 (1981), 74 ff. This gradual fading away certainly proves that it was in no way a matter of direct intervention on the part of Augustus. It is rather that a degree of caution will have developed on the part of Augustus. It is rather that a degree of voted honours which will have led steadily to an awareness of how inappropriate such things now were. Moreover there will have evolved on the part of the provincial communities a growing consciousness of how dependent the apparently all-powerful governors were.
17. R. Syme, 'Imperator Caesar: A Study in Nomenclature', *Roman Papers* I, 361 ff.
18. Dio LI. 24. 4; *PJR* L 186, on the problem of imperial acclamations see most recently R. Syme, *Phoenix* 33 (1979), 309 and E. Badian, in *Romanitas Christianitas. Festschrift J. Straub* (1982), 38.

19. Dio LIII. 23. 5; cf. *CIL* III. 14147. 5 = ILS 89895 with the proud record of his *gestae*.
20. Syme, *RR*, 309 ff.; J.-P. Boucher, *Caius Cornelius Gallus* (1966), 38 ff.; 50 ff. (rejecting the view that the erection of statues had anything to do with his fall, which is too radical). Recently, in the same sense the comprehensive discussion of L. J. Daly (with W. L. Reiter) 'The Gallus Affair and Augustus' *lex Julia maiestatis: a Study in Historical Chronology and Causality*, in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History I* (1979), 289; further S. Mazzarino, 'Un nuovo epigramma di Gallus e l'antica "lettura epigrafica"', *Quad. Catantesi* 2 (1980), 7 (with references to the preceding literature).
21. Horace, *Sat.* I. 6. 15 ff. For the relevance of honorific inscriptions for the *gloria* of the honorand cf. I. Kajanto, 'Un'analisi filologico-letteraria delle iscrizioni onorarie', *Epigraphica* 33 (1971), 3. Cf. also *AE* 1976, 677–8, in which, as late as the reign of Trajan, reference is still made to the bronze tablets on the Capitol on which the treaty with the ancestors of Iulius Agrippa was inscribed. By contrast the overturning of statues was equivalent to the abolition of a man's *memoria*, see *Cic. Pis.* 93; *Tac. Ann.* III. 14. 4.
22. Dio XLIII. 14. 6.
23. Dio XLIII. 49. 1 ff.
24. Cf. also *RG* 19: porticum ad circum Flaminium, quam sum appellari passus ex nomine eius, qui priorem eodem in solo fecerat Octaviam'; cf. *Suet. Aug.* 31. 5. But compare Dio LIV. 23. 6 attesting the opposite procedure on the part of Augustus. See A. Stein, *Römische Inschriften in der antiken Literatur* (1931), 35 ff. On the Theatre of Pompey, compare however *CIL* VI. 9404: 'theatrum Aug(ustum) Pompeianum'.
25. Cf. n. 2 above; and *RG* 35: [appell]av[it] me pat[re]m pl[ati]nae idque in vestibulo aeduum nearum inscribendum et in el[uj]ria [i]ulia e[st] in foro Aug. sub quadrig[is], quae mihi ex s.c. post[er]ae [sunt, censuit]; on the Clupeus Virtutis, *RG* 34. The concept is particularly clear in Pliny, *NH* II. 154: 'etiam monumenta ac titulos gerens nomenque proterogum nostrum et memoriam extendens contra brevitate[m] vitae' (relating, it is true, in the first instance to grave-monuments); also Pliny, *NH* XXXIV. 17; XXXVI. 42; Horace, *Carm.* IV. 8. 13 ff. Note the (exceptional) counter-instance of Sex. Iulius Frontinus, Pliny, *Ep.* IX. 19. 1 ff., with Pliny's typical reference to *gloria*. Cf. *AE* 1948, 77: 'sumis per statuum dimissum in saecula nomen'. In general also H. Häusle, *Das Denkmal als Carant des Nachruhms* (1980), 110 ff. The fact that inscriptions attracted the attention of both contemporaries and later generations is clear from, for example, *Cic. Afr.* VI.1. 17; Pliny, *NH* XXII. 13; Juvenal X. 143 ff.; *Aul. Gell.* NA IX. 11. 10; cf. esp. A. Stein, op. cit. (n. 24), *passim*.
26. For other possibilities cf. n. 16.
27. The pregnant phrase of Syme, *Roman Papers* I, 269.
28. *CIL* VI. 31705, an inscription for L. Considius Gallus, speaks of a 'titulus magni monumenti marmorei', without however making clear that the reference is to a tomb, see Lanciani, *NSc* 1883, 420; *Bull. com.* 1883, 223.
29. *PJR* L 125 regards as possible the identification of Tib. Latinus Pandusa, *IV vir viar. cur.*, *CIL* XIV. 2166 (Aricia), and Latinus Pandusa, *legatus* in Moesia in AD 19. However it is clear from the brief report in Lanciani, *NSc* 1883, 173, that it is not a matter of a building erected by Tib. Latinus Pandusa as *IV vir viar. cur.*, but of a monument in his honour. It can however hardly have been erected until after his death, since it is scarcely conceivable that so young a man could have performed during his life a service which evoked such a monument.
30. In the case of quite a few complete texts, and above all with fragmentary ones, no closer precision is possible. One criterion, accepted here, of the funerary context of an inscription is its location outside the walls and beside a *via publica*. It

is also normally indicative of a funerary inscription if the lines are significantly wider than the total height of the text (e.g. *CIL* VI. 1402-3, 1406; 1414; 1428; 1442; 1449; 1460; 1521-2). Compare also, e.g., *CIL* VI. 1541, regarded until now as a public building-inscription. In fact it is a funerary inscription for two persons, see M. G. Granino Cecere, in *Epigraphia e ordine senatorio, Roma, 1981* (printing).

31. e.g. *CIL* VI. 1337; 1381; 1537; 1544; 1487 = 31665; 31679-31682; 31715; 31746; 31754; 31769-70; Urns: VI. 1380; 1399; 1462; 1535-6; 31700; 31721 ff.; 31755. Outside Rome also many sarcophagi of senators are attested, cf. W. Eck, *ZPE* 43 (1981), 127, n. 2. See in general G. Koch and H. Sichtermann, *Handbuch der Archäologie: Römische Sarkophage* (1982), 22 ff.
32. e.g. *CIL* VI. 31721 ff.
33. *CIL* VI. 1344-5; 1376; 1413.
34. Tombs were not in general accessible for entry, not even the grave of the Scipios, although A. Degrassi, *Inscr. Ital.* XIII, 3, p. X seems to presume, in dealing with the inscriptions, that they were. But compare the tomb of the Salvi in Ferentum, where accessibility, and legibility of the inscriptions, was excluded, see A. Degrassi, *Scritti vari* III (1967), 158. Similarly, the inscriptions of the Plautii may have been placed internally, *Inscr. Ital.* IV. 1. 122 f.
35. Cf. L. R. Taylor, *MAAR* 24 (1956), 27. The same purpose was served by the accephalous *titulus Tiburtinus*, *CIL* XIV. 3613 = *ILS* 918 = *Inscr. It.* IV. 1. 130; most recently R. Syme, 'The *Titulus Tiburtinus*', *Akten des 6. Kongr. Griech. u. Lat. Epigraphik* (1973), 585.
36. *CIL* IX. 2845-6 = *ILS* 915; see H. Brandenburg, *JdAI* 93 (1978), 280. An incorrect explanation of this phenomenon is found in G. Koch and H. Sichtermann, *Handbuch der Archäologie: Römische Sarkophage* (1982), 25, with n. 3. An inscription of which the occasion was a man's death can be found in Rome also, in the case of P. Paquius Scaeva, *CIL* VI. 1483. One would normally conclude from that that he was buried in Rome!
37. *AE* 1972, 174 ff.; improvements by W. Eck, *Hermes* 100 (1972), 461 and S. Panciera, in *Volusii*, 83 ff. Also deriving from a *lararium* perhaps *CIL* VI. 31684 and 31737.
38. e.g. *CIL* VI. 1358; 1365; 1467. Cf. Pliny, *NH* XXXIV. 17; XXXV. 6; E. F. Bruck, *Über römisches Recht im Rahmen der Kulturgeschichte* (1954), 97 ff.
39. Pliny, *Ep.* I. 17. 1.
40. It does not seem possible to find an unquestionable example of this in the epigraphic material from Rome.
41. Mommsen, *Staatsrecht* I, 450 ff., esp. 451, n. 2. His remarks are ignored by J. P. Rollin, *Untersuchungen zu Rechtsfragen römischer Bildnisse* (1979), 105 ff.; cf. also R. Düll, 'Zum Recht der Bildwerke in der Antike', in *Studi E. Betti* III (1962), 129; F. Musumeci, 'Statuae in publico positae', *SDHI* 44 (1978), 191.
42. For inscriptions put up by cities see e.g. *CIL* VI. 1382; 1400-1; 1508; 1526; 1578; 31801; 37064. On statues of senators in private houses compare Lahusen, *Ehrenstatue*, 39, n. 277 (incomplete). Also probably from the private sphere *CIL* VI. 1474; 1490; 1739-41; 31632; 31685; 31752 ff.; 37094.
43. *CIL* VI. 1450 = *ILS* 2935; 1451; 1453; VI. 1452 = *ILS* 2936 probably also belongs here. The residence of the Aradii in Rome can also be securely identified by the same means, see *CIL* VI. 1687-95 (including *tabulae patronatus*). We still lack a collection of the evidence for the location of senatorial houses in Rome; it would have to be based largely on epigraphic material. The methodological problems involved are multiple, as is evidenced by the relevant remarks of G. Lugli, *Fontes ad topographiam veteris urbis Romae* (1957), libri XII ff., 95 ff.; 275 ff.; 386 ff. His conceptions are often problematic and dubious.

44. *CIL* VI. 31742; 31743 = *ILS* 911; similar *trapezophora* for L. Cassius Longinus, cos. A.D. 30, dedicated by the Sextani Arelatenses, G. Mancini, *Bull. com.* 56 (1928), 318 = *AE* 1930, 70. Similarly for P. Plautius Pulcher in Ciciliano, R. Paribeni, *NSc* 1932, 126 f. = *AE* 1933, 151. For their erection in the private sphere, compare E. Simon, in W. Helbig, *Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom* II\* (1966), 486, no. 1700.
45. Above all *AE* 1972, 174; *CIL* VI. 1377 = *ILS* 1098; *CIL* VI. 1386 = *ILS* 1023; 1599 = *ILS* 1326; 1549 = *ILS* 1100 (add VI. 1497 = *ILS* 1094); 31293 = *ILS* 984; 37087; *NSc* 1933, 508, no. 233; Suet. fr. 290, 10 ff. (Roth); *Tac. Ann.* IV. 15; XV. 72. 1; Dio LXIX. 7. 4; Suet. *Otho* 1. 3. A statue erected in the Temple of *Vesta* is probably referred to in *CIL* VI. 37090 (cf. VI. 31719, found in this temple). Uncertain: VI. 31781; 31809; 37088. For the erection of statues on the Palatine see W. Eck, *Hermes* 100 (1972), 472. M. Taliano Boatwright, in *Volusii*, 9 ff., has recently tried to explain these in all cases by the fact that the honorands had taken part in the discovery of a conspiracy. This is indeed attested for Nerva and Tigellinus and also for Otho. But this interpretation collapses in the case of Volusius Saturninus, in the light of the fact that the statue was first erected in AD 56, after his death, while the *ornamenta triumphalia* that he is supposed to have won in AD 42 for his role in the suppression of the revolt of *Furius Camillus Scribonianus* are not actually attested, but are restored without adequate grounds in the inscription, see *Hermes* 100 (1972), 464 ff. Moreover it is most unlikely that Nero would still in 56 have reverted with such an honour to the events of 42. In any case why should Claudius, who had in fact awarded Otho such an honour, not already have recorded his gratitude in the same way to Volusius also? For a text which lends in support of this critique see R. M. Sheldon in *Epigraphia e ordine senatorio, Roma, 1981* (printing).

The Capitol is never mentioned as a site for the erection of honorific statues for senators; *CIL* VI. 31748; 31791; 31818, found during the construction of the Victor Emmanuel monument, may equally have stood in private houses (VI. 31748 at any rate was erected privately - 'amico optimo'). Augustus had cleared away some statues of *virii illustres* from the *area Capitolina* (Suet. *Cal.* 34. 1), although the monument of the Claudii Marcelli remained intact (*AE*: 1978, 658). As regards finds, especially in the case of very fragmentary pieces, it is admittedly necessary to take displacement into account, since hardly a single text has been found *in situ*. Cf. e.g. E. A. Stancio in *Epigraphia e ordine senatorio* (printing) on a text possibly deriving from the Forum Traiani.

One of the statues of Volusius Saturninus was erected in the Porticus Lentulorum near the Theatre of Pompey. Although the Porticus has not been located, it is possible to surmise why this site was chosen. Saturninus was married to a Cornelia (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 1476), the daughter of an L. Cornelius Lentulus (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 1384). It is probable that the site was chosen to demonstrate the connection with this family. On the various sites for the erection of statues see now Lahusen, op. cit. 7 ff. (not quite complete). For a historically interesting special case see now the illuminating hypothesis of F. Coarelli, 'La statue de Cornélie, mère des Gracques, et la crise politique à Rome au temps de Saturninus', in *Le Dernier Siècle de la République romaine et l'époque augustéenne (Journées d'étude - Strasbourg, 15-16 février 1978)* (1978), 13.

46. From the Forum Romanum: *CIL* VI. 31293 = *ILS* 984; 31719; 31785; 37070; 37085; 37087. Forum Augusti: *NSc* 1933, 468 ff., nos. 93-4; 97-9 = *AE* 1934, 155 (belonging together, cf. G. Alföldy, *Fasti Hispanienses* (1969), 38 ff.); nos. 95; 100-1. Forum Traiani: *CIL* VI. 1377 = *ILS* 1098; 1497 + 1549 = *ILS* 1094 + 1100; 1566; *NSc* 1928, 343 = *AE* 1929, 158 (uncertain).
47. So A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny* (1966), 153.

48. It is particularly striking that late-antique inscriptions from the various Fora are more frequent than those from the first three centuries (cf. e.g. Pietrangeli, *NSc* 1933, 455 ff. and n. 136 below). We may perhaps take it as a presupposition that the numerous fires in Rome also caused the destruction of statues and inscriptions in the Fora. Moreover we can conceive of many other reasons, for example the re-use of statue-bases in Late Antiquity, e.g. *CIL* VI. 37107; 37109–10. Cf. also H. Blanck, *Wiederverwendung alter Statuen als Ehrendenkmäler bei Griechen und Römern* (1969), 65 ff. (incomplete). For an example of a statue-base, probably erected in a public place, which was later re-used as a column-capital, see *CIL* VI. 31801. G. Lahusen, 'Zur Funktion und Bedeutung der Ehrenstatue für Privatpersonen in Rom,' in *Römisches Porträt. Wege der Erforschung eines gesellschaftlichen Phänomens. Wissenschaft. Konferenz Berlin 1981. Wiss. Zeitschr. der Humb.-Univ. zu Berlin, Ges.-Sprachw. Reihe* 31 (1982), 239 ff. assumes that from Marcus Aurelius onwards only Emperors and their relatives were honoured with statues in Rome during their lives, and that even for dead persons honorific statues were erected only in exceptional cases. Both points as stated seem to me incorrect, since they do not take sufficient account of the survival-rate of inscriptions.
49. This is ignored for instance in Gordon, *Veranius*, 305.
50. This distinction is necessary although in the case of senators it is not easy to speak of 'einer eigentlichen Trennung von öffentlichem und privatem Bereich', Löhken, *Ordines dignitatum*, 19.
51. See p. 133 of the essay and n. 137 below.
52. One can demonstrate this *exempli gratia* for the inscriptions for senators in *CIL* X and XI, where the proportion of funerary inscriptions is smaller compared to honorific inscriptions for living persons, above all in comparison to Rome.
53. *Tac. Ann.* III. 72. 1. The significance attached to the naming of persons in inscriptions on public buildings is visible for instance from the relevant late-antique restrictions, Löhken, *Ordines dignitatum*, 75.
54. *CIL* VI. 896 = *ILS* 129. Similarly *CIL* VI. 1275 = *ILLRP* 377.
55. Cf. e.g. the inscriptions *aqueductum*, *CIL* VI. 1243 ff. and numerous texts among the imperial inscriptions, *CIL* VI. 872 ff.
56. *CIL* VI. 1314 = *ILLRP* 367; 1313 = 368.
57. *CIL* VI. 1265 = *ILS* 5937. Cf. also *CIL* VI. 1263; 1264 = *ILS* 5938; 1266 = *ILS* 5939; 1267a–b.
58. *CIL* VI. 1384–5. Cf. VI. 1539, the building inscription for the Carcer Mamertinus, of AD 21.
59. *CIL* VI. 37068 = *AE* 1968, 24; on this P. Romanelli, in *In Africa e a Roma* (1981), 827; perhaps of c. 10 BC. Cf. also *CIL* VI. 1278.
60. *CIL* VI. 1235; 31541; cf. J. Le Gall, *Le Tibre, fleuve de Rome dans l'Antiquité* (1953), 152 ff.; cf. *AE* 1951, 182a.
61. *CIL* VI. 1234; 31540; 37025–8; Le Gall, op. cit. 150 ff.
62. *CIL* VI. 1236; 31542; Le Gall, op. cit. 154 ff.
63. *CIL* VI. 315401; 315410 and s.; 31542s; 31543; 1237 = 31544; XIV. 4704. Le Gall, op. cit. 156 ff.
64. *CIL* VI. 31545; Le Gall, op. cit. 157.
65. *CIL* VI. 1238 = 31546; 31547–52. Le Gall, op. cit. 158 ff.
66. *CIL* VI. 31553; cf. 1241 = 31554.
67. In Late Antiquity this pattern changed, in that quite frequently *praefecti urbis* appear as 'builders' on inscriptions; cf. Löhken, *Ordines dignitatum*, 76 f.
68. E. de Ruggiero, *Lo stato e le opere pubbliche in Roma antica* (1925), 21 ff.; 112 ff.; I. Shatzman, *Senatorial Wealth and Roman Politics* (1975), 90 ff.; P. Veyne, *Le Pain et le cirque* (1976), 375 ff.; C. C. Vermeule, *Roman Imperial Art in Greece and Asia Minor* (1968), 15.

69. *Tac. Ann.* III. 72. 1. If *ēgrov* in Dio LX. 25. 3 means exclusively 'a public building' then we could reckon with the continuation of such activity under Claudius.
70. *Sen. Contr.* IX. 14. 18; the baths were probably situated in the immediate vicinity of Domitian's house (*CIL* VI. 2037 = 32352; 2039; 2041 = *ILS* 229). See G. E. Rickman, *Roman Granaries and Store Buildings* (1971), 164 ff.; Panciera, in *Volsui*, 90 ff.
71. *Tac. Ann.* III. 72. 1; *Suet. Aug.* 29. 4 ff.
72. See e.g. *Cic. de Prov.* 29; *Pis.* 56 ff.; 59; *Planc.* 61; *Marc.* 28; *Polyb.* VI. 15. 8. On the related ideology of victory, see G. Ch. Picard, *Les Trophées romains* (1957), 138 ff. Cf. also F. Coarelli, *DdA* 4/5 (1970/1), 262, speaking of 'ideologia trionfale'.
73. *Inscr. Ital.* XIII. 3, nos. 10; 12; 13; 17; 24; cf. nos. 61; 65; 71. The significance of the entry of a victorious general into Rome, even when not in the form of a triumph, is visible from the negative example in *Tac. Agric.* 40. 3.
74. *Fasti Triumphales Capitolini*, *Inscr. Ital.* XIII. 1, pp. 86 ff.
75. Cf. A. Degrossi, *Scritti vari* I (1962), 239 ff.; P. Zanker, *Forum Romanum. Die Neugestaltung durch Augustus* (1972), 15 ff.; most recently J. Johnson, *Augustan Propaganda. The Battle of Actium, Marc. Anthony's Will, The Fasti Capitolini Consulares and Early Imperial Historiography* (Diss. Univ. Calif. Los Angeles, 1976), 130 ff.
76. See *Inscr. Ital.* XIII. 1, p. 86, fr. xli.
77. *CIL* VIII. 16456 = *ILS* 120. Also a coin from Africa: L. Müller, *Nomismatique de l'ancienne Afrique* (1874; repr. 1968), Suppl. 43, no. 39.
78. *Vell. Pat.* II. 116. 2; Dio LV. 28. 4; *Syme, RR.*, 401, n. 4; on the extra name see *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 1380.
79. *AE* 1940, 68 = *IRT* 301.
80. *Tac. Ann.* III. 74. 4.
81. V. A. Maxfield, *The Military Decorations of the Roman Army* (1981), 104 ff.
82. Dio LIV. 11. 6; 24. 7 ff.
83. Dio LIV. 31. 4.
84. In general for building activity up to 44 BC see F. Coarelli, in *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien*, ed. P. Zanker, I (1976), 29 ff.; also the numerous buildings bearing the name of the senator who built them, see B. Platner-Th. Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (1929); I. Shatzman, *Senatorial Wealth and Roman Politics* (1975), 90 ff.; F. W. Shipley, 'Chronology of the Building Operations in Rome from the Death of Caesar to the Death of Augustus', *MAAR* 9 (1931), 7 ff.; *Syme, RR.*, 241; F. Bona, 'Sul concetto di "Manubiae" e sulla responsabilità del magistrato in ordine alla preda', *SDHI* 26 (1960), 105 ff.; I. Shatzman, 'The Roman General's Authority over Booty', *Historia* 21 (1972), 177; further I. Calabi Limentani, 'I fornici di Stertino e di Scipione nel racconto di Livio', in *Politica e religione nel primo secolo tra Roma e l'Oriente* (1982), 123 ff. Note the significant remark of Dio XLIV. 5. 2 that the objective was to prevent the continued attachment of the name of Sulla to the Curia. On the public exhibition of spoils see G. Waurich, 'Kunstraub der Römer: Untersuchungen zu seinen Anfängen anhand der Inschriften', *JRGZ* 22 (1975), 1 ff.; Pape, *Kunstwerke aus Kriegsheute, passim*. In general on Augustus' building activity P. Gros, *Architecture et société* (1978); idem, *Aurea templa* (1980); and Kienast, *Augustus, 336 ff.* For the significance of buildings both for the public and for those who had them erected see A. Demandt, 'Symbolfunktionen antiker Baukunst', in *Palast und Hütte* (1982), 49 ff.
85. R. Seager, *Pompey* (1979), 131; F. Coarelli, 'Il complesso pompeiano del Campo Marzio e la sua decorazione scultorea', *RPAA* 44 (1971/2), 99 ff.



86. *CIL* VI 1316 = *ILS* 41; cf. X. 6087 = *ILS* 886. According to Fittschen, *JdAI* 91 (1976), 210, the temple was first dedicated after Actium: 'Zum Dank für diese wichtige Unterstützung durfte er den ... Tempel am Forum vollenden oder überhaupt erst in Angriff nehmen.' The verb 'durfte' in this context is however too strong.  
 87. *PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 1241.  
 88. Pliny, *NH* XIII. 53; XXXVI. 28; cf. Fittschen, *JdAI* 91 (1976), 209, referring to the dedication on the birthday of Augustus.  
 89. *Suet. Aug.* 29. 5; *CIL* VI. 29844. 2. In *CIL* VI. 4305 = *ILS* 1732 an 'aedivus Dianae Cornificiae' is named. Cf. the personnel of the Amphitheatreum Statilii Tauri, *CIL* VI. 6226-8. This is closely comparable to the organization of a fire brigade by Egnatius Rufus or to the *familia* which Agrippa set up for the maintenance of the aqueducts built by him. For further examples see F. W. Shipley, *MAAR* 9 (1931), 7 ff., and T. P. Wiseman, *PBSR* 42 (1974), 7; 11.  
 90. *RG* 20; cf. *Suet. Aug.* 30. 1.  
 91. W. Eck, *Die staatliche Organisation Italiens in der Hohen Kaiserzeit* (1979), 28 ff. According to F. W. Shipley, *MAAR* 9 (1931), 36, the triumphators of 28 and 27 BC, C. Carrinas, L. Autronius Paetus, and M. Licinius Crassus, will also have participated; there is however no direct evidence. Dio LIII. 22. 2 makes this unlikely.  
 92. *CIL* X. 6895; 6897-900; 6901 = *ILS* 889; *AE* 1969/70. 89. Outside Italy there is so far as I know only one known milestone from the reign of Augustus, which was put up by the proconsul (named in the nominative) without reference to the *princeps*, *AE* 1955. 40. All other milestones, even as early as Augustus' reign, name the Emperor. Domitius Calvinus, according to E. Bormann, *Festschrift für Bennndorf* (1898), 283 ff., also dedicated the calendar in the grove of the Arvalles. *Suet. Aug.* 29. 5; Pliny, *NH* XXXVI. 60; *Tac. Ann.* III. 72. 1; Dio LIV. 25. 2; LXVI. 24. 2. On the site cf. G. Gatti, *MEFRA* 91 (1979), 237 ff.  
 94. *PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 253; E. Nash, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Rome* II (1962), 467.  
 95. *Tac. Ann.* III. 72. 1. The obligation on the part of descendants to maintain temples built by their forbears, attested in Dio LIII. 2. 4, relates to the years immediately after Actium. Cf. e.g. Cic. *Verr.* II. 4. 79.  
 96. *Tac. Ann.* III. 72. 2; cf. II. 49. 1 ff.  
 97. For this reason the explanation given by Mommsen, *Staatsrecht* I, 451, n. 3 is not adequate by itself.  
 98. See the evidence in W. Eck in *Studien zur antiken Sozialgeschichte*, *Festschrift für Vittinghoff* (1980), 295 ff.  
 99. *AE* 1957. 220; *CIL* X. 1423.  
 100. *CIL* XI. 7746.  
 101. *AE* 1939. 110 = *Cornifit* VIII. 3, 306. On competition for prestige via building in the provinces, e.g. V. M. Strocka, in *Proc. Xth Int. Congr. Class. Arch.*, 1978 II, 899.  
 102. *RG* 19-21.  
 103. Cf. the remarks in Dio LIII. 23. 3 ff. on the attitude of Agrippa, who showed no *q̄bōvōs* of Augustus. Cf. also Schmitthenner in *Augustus*, ed. W. Schmitthenner (1969), 461 ff. Moreover the outcome of the debate in the Senate in AD 70 on the rebuilding of the Capitol in the absence of the new *princeps* (*Tac. Ann.* IV. 9) is significant for the conceptions which were from now on current as regards the allocation of responsibilities in this area. On the Forum Romanum as a 'theatrum gentis luliae', see Fittschen, *JdAI* 91 (1976), 208.  
 104. There did not however develop any comprehensive formalization of types of representation, as in Late Antiquity, cf. Löhken, *Ordines dignitatum*, 73 ff.  
 105. Similarly in the sphere of the various annual games, restrictions were introduced under Augustus, which limited the hitherto unrestrained competition for pub-

- licity on the part of some senators, cf. e.g. G. Ville, *La Gladiature en Occident des origines à la mort de Domitien* (1981), 121 ff.; H. Galsterer, *Athenaeum* 59 (1981), 414; Kienast, *Augustus*, 93.  
 106. Mommsen, *Staatsrecht* I, 465 ff.; Gordon, *Verraninus*, 305 ff.; V. A. Maxfield, *The Military Decorations of the Roman Army* (1981), 105 ff.; A. Abaccherli-Boycc, 'The Origin of ornamenta triumphalia', *CP* 37 (1942), 130 ff.  
 107. List in Gordon, *Verraninus*, 305 ff. including the *statuae triumphales*.  
 108. Mommsen, *Staatsrecht* I, 466. *Dona militaria* were always granted to senators directly by the Princes as the holder of the auspices. The award of *ornamenta triumphalia* and *donna militaria* to the same senator is only once attested: *CIL* VI. 1444 = *ILS* 1022. On the identification of the person C. P. Jones, *JRS* 60 (1970), 93 ff. and recently I. Piso, *AMN* 19 (1982), 39 ff., against which see W. Eck, *ZPE* 52 (1983), 151 ff.  
 109. *CIL* XI. 5743 = *ILS* 273.  
 110. *Suet. Aug.* 31. 5. P. Zanker, *Forum Augustum* (1968), 14 ff. On the statues see most recently S. R. Tuft, *Dial. di Arch.* 3 (1981), 69. For the surviving fragments of the *elogia* see Degrassi, *Inscr. Ital.* XIII. 3, nos. 1 ff. For a new restoration of the inscription on the base for Drusus, see A. Vassileiou, *ZPE* 51 (1983), 213 ff., already correctly restored by R. Paribeni, *NS* 1933, 460 ff. There is little new in L. Braccisi, *Epigraphia e storiografia* (1981).  
 111. *Vell. Pat.* II. 104. 2; Degrassi, *Inscr. Ital.* XIII. 3, p. 8, relates this to the *decretum in acta senatus relatium*. Cf. e.g. Cic. *Phil.* XIII. 9.  
 112. *Suet. Aug.* 38. 1; Gordon, *Verraninus* 315 ff.; *AE* 1972, 174 for L. Volusius Saturninus; cf. *AE* 1969/70, 96-7 (cf. 1971. 91) and 1978, 132 and 134 for Cn. Sentius Saturninus (cf. n. 176 below).  
 113. *Tac. Ann.* XV. 72. 1; cf. on this W. Eck, *Hermes* 100 (1972), 479 ff. with references to other irregular awards of military decorations.  
 114. *AE* 1972, 174; the restoration of 'ornamenta triumphalia' in the text is improbable; cf. W. Eck, *Hermes* 100 (1972), 464 ff.  
 115. Cf. on the distinction between bronze and marble statues, Tuchelt, *Denkmäler*, 86 ff., esp. 87, n. 120.  
 116. *Cic. Att.* VI. 1. 17.  
 117. Cf. n. 41 above. For the concurrence of the Senate see also e.g. *AE* 1953, 251; 'Istatum posit equeter oIudo et populus Romanus consentente senatu.'  
 118. Cf. in this connection the references in *Tac. Ann.* IV. 15. 1 ff.; *Hist.* IV. 47; Pliny, *Ep.* II. 7. 3; *HA*, v. *Mar.* 13. 5; 22. 7; for Late Antiquity e.g. *Symm. Rel.* III; *CIL* III. 214 = *ILS* 738; VI. 1727 = *ILS* 1275; 1784 = *ILS* 1284.  
 119. H. von Roques de Maumont, *Antike Reiterstandbilder* (1958), 79, idem, 'Inschriftlich bezeugte Reiterstandbilder der römischen Kaiserzeit', in *Festschrift E. v. Mercklin* (1964), 122. Contra, e.g. H. B. Siedentopf, *Das hellenistische Reiterdenkmal* (1968), 27 ff.; W. Eck, *Hermes* 100 (1972), 471; cf. also Tuchelt, *Denkmäler*, 92 ff.  
 120. e.g. *CIL* VI. 1377 = *ILS* 1098; VI. 1540 = *ILS* 1112; cf. VI. 1599 = *ILS* 1326 for M. Bassaeus Rufus. K. Fittschen, *Bj* 170 (1970), 544; also Lahusen, *Ehrenstatue*, 51 ff.  
 121. Cf. the material collected by H. v. Roques de Maumont, in *Festschrift E. v. Mercklin* (1964), 122 ff. (often incorrectly interpreted).  
 122. H. von Roques de Maumont, *Antike Reiterstandbilder* (1958), 80; but cf. Fittschen, *Bj* 170 (1970), 543, who also draws attention to the very small number of surviving equestrian statues of Emperors. On the statue of M. Nonius Balbus see *AE* 1947, 53 and L. Schumacher, *Chiron* 6 (1976), 171 (perhaps even two such monuments).  
 123. See the examples given by W. Eck, *Hermes* 100 (1972), 471, n. 3.  
 124. *Forsch. in Ephes.* V. 1, 62, nos. 2-3.

125. *CIL* V. 1878 = *ILS* 931. Described in the Corpus just as 'basis magna'; correctly recognised by G. Alföldy, *Aquileia nostra* 51 (1980), 274. Other examples given there.
126. *IG II/III* 4174; cf. H. B. Siedentopf, *Das hellenistische Reiterdenkmal* (1968), 30, 142; on pp. 28 and 36 he refers to an equestrian statue of M. Maecius Rufus, *Inschr. v. Olympia*, 334. From around the middle of the first century BC there is a surviving group of seven equestrian statues from Lanuvium, which is to be brought into relation with the activities of L. Licinius Murena and Lucullus in the Third Mithridatic War, see Siedentopf, op. cit. 73 ff.; cf. recently M. L. Gualandi, 'Il gruppo equestre rinvenuto nell'area del santuario di Giunone Sospita a Lanuvio', *SCO* 30 (1980), 69, and in detail F. Coarelli, 'Alessandro, i Licinii e Lanuvio', in *L'Art décoratif à Rome à la fin de la République et au début du principat. Table ronde organisée par l'École Française de Rome (Rome, 10-11 mai 1979)* (1981), 229.
127. Possibly *CIL* IX. 2637 = *ILS* 894 was the base for an equestrian statue ('ings basis'), similarly IX. 414. The case is certain with *I. Cret.* IV. 292. Alföldy, *Aquileia nostra* 51 (1980), 273 ff., like Siedentopf before him, has noted that the inscriptions on the bases of equestrian monuments were normally placed on one of the shorter sides, that in front. That raises the question of what will have stood on those bases where the text occupied one of the longer sides, e.g. *CIL* XI. 1432 = *Inscr. Ital.* VII. 1. 16; X. 408 = *ILS* 1117 = *Inscr. Ital.* III. 1. 18 (according to Braeco probably an equestrian statue). Compare *CIL* VI. 1401 = *ILS* 412 = H.-G. Pfau, *Sodales Antoniniani* (1966), 94 ff.; *CIL* XII. 2452-3; *AE* 1897, 19 = *ILS* 8975 (for restorations see G. Alföldy, *Fasti Hispanienses* (1969), 81 ff., and for dimensions Chr. Hülsen, *Röm. Mitt.* II (1896), 252; and the new text from Volsimi, P. Gros, *MEFR* 92 (1980), 977 (with an overall width of c.4 m) = *AE* 1980, 426. It may be that one should suppose that the monument was a biga or quadriga. Bigae were of course erected for Sejanus, see *Juv.* X. 58 ff. Cf. also *Apul., Flor.* p. 29, 15 ff. (Helm): all provinces expressed the desire to erect four- or six-horse chariots in honour of Aemilius Aemilianus. The inscription of C. Fufius Geminus, recently published by L. Gasperini, *Ottava Misc. Greta e Romana* (1982), 285, is either a building inscription (height 0.86 m; width over 3 m) or must have belonged to a monument of which the side for display was the longer one.
128. *AE* 1972, 173.
129. Pietrangeli, *NSc* 1933, 508, no. 233: '[---]que in rostris [questrem? --- m] aede divi Iuli et [in---] saeptis Iuljis---ponen[da]s ei [c]ensuit?]. The base of an equestrian statue, reused for an inscription in honour of Sallicho, was found near the Rostra, Henzen, *Bull. Inst.* 1880, 169. On the significance of the Rostra for the erection of a statue, see Cic. *Deiot.* 34; 'nullus locus est ad statuam quidem rostris clarior'.
130. But cf. Fittschen, n. 122 above.
131. *AE* 1972, 174; W. Eck, *Hermes* 100 (1972), 469 ff. On *statuae consulares* cf. *CIL* VI. 32346 and J. Scheid, *MEFR* 92 (1980), 236. A sort of catalogue of honours in the form of statues and monuments is provided by the s.c. passed after the death of Drusus, *CIL* VI. 31200. In general on the different types of statue, Lahusen, *Ehrenstatue*, 45 ff.
132. Statues, portraits, and relief sculptures which can be related to senators whose names are known for certain are extremely rare; indeed up till now hardly any have been identified. The following examples may be listed: L. Iulius Ursus, *cos. III AD* 100, G. Daltrop, *Die stadtrömischen männlichen Privatbildnisse traianischer und hadrianischer Zeit* (1958), Abb. 11; T. Caeserius Statanus, G. Daltrop, *Münch. Jb. bildend. Kunst* 22 (1970), 7 ff. (see also n. 23 for references to a possible portrait of Sex. Veturienus Civica Pompeianus); for the possible senators on

- Trajan's Column cf. W. Gauer, *Untersuchungen zur Traianssäule* (1977), 60 ff.; also P. Zanker, in *Eikonos. Festschrift Jucker* (1980), 196 ff.; Herodes Atticus, T. Lorenz, *Galerien von griechischen Philosophen- und Dichterbildnissen bei den Römern* (1965), 30 ff.; also G. Treu, *Die Bildwerke von Olympia in Stein und Thon* (1897); 260 ff.; L. Baburius Iuvenis and C. Baburius Herculaneus, H. Manderscheid, *Die Skulpturenausstattung der kaiserzeitlichen Thermenanlagen* (1981), 121, nos. 468-9 (*AE* 1958, 137-8); Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaeanus(?); K. Stemmer, *Chronologie und Ikonographie der Panzerstatuen* (1978), 101 ff. (hardly a single one of the *statuae loricae* collected by Stemmer can be attributed to an identifiable person). For the statue of a *femina consularis* see Fr. Sartori, 'Statua di moglie o figlia di consolare', *Mem. Accad. Patavina, Cl. sc. mor., Lett. ed. art.* 70 (1957/8); for portrait busts of members of the Licinii (not individually identifiable), see V. Poulsen, *Les Portraits romains* I (1962), 101 ff., nos. 67, 73. For statues or portrait busts of M. Nonius Balbus and his wife, of Domitius Corbulo, of Seneca and of L. Iunius Rusticus see J. J. Bernoulli, *Römische Ikonographie* I (1882), 269 ff. For statues of members of the Volusii family see M. Moretti - A. M. Sgubini Moretti, *La villa dei Volusii a Lucus Feroniae* (1977), 38 ff., plates LV ff. Admittedly in quite a few of these cases an exact attribution to nameable persons is not possible.
133. Compare, for the provincial sphere, G. Alföldy, 'Bildprogramme in den römischen Städten des Conventus Tarraconensis - Das Zeugnis der Statuenpostamente', *Rev. de la Univ. Complutense Madrid* 18 (118), 1979, 177.
134. Panciera, in *Volusii*, 83 ff.
135. See the evidence collected in Gordon, *Veranius*, 305 ff.; cf. *Suet. Aug.* 38, 1. It is possible that *CIL* VI. 1386 = *ILS* 1023 derives from such a base. Some later statues conferred for this reason are attested as coming from the Forum Augusti or Traiani: *ILS* 1098; 1094 + 1100; *NSc* 1933, 468 ff. = G. Alföldy, *Fasti Hispanienses* (1969), 38 ff.
136. From this period e.g. *CIL* VI. 1658c, d; 1679; 1721; 1725; 1727; 1729; 1731; 1764; 1783; 1789; 31883f; 31886 = 37105 and n. 48 above.
137. Cf. nn. 45 ff. above. *CIL* VIII. 24583 = *ILS* 8963; *Pliny, Ep.* II. 7. 3; *Tac. Ann.* IV. 15; 2; *Hist.* IV. 47; *ILS* 984 = *CIL* VI. 31293; *Dio* XVII. 21. 3; LXVIII. 15. 3; *HA v. Marc.* 13. 5; 22. 7. cf. Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte III*\*, 73 ff.; C. Braschi, *Diz. epigr.* II. 2100 ff. Cf. also H. Jordan, *Topographie der Stadt Rom im Altertum* I. 2 (1885), 446, 465, and G. Lugli, *Fontes ad topographiam veteris urbis Romae pertinentes* VI (1965), 4 ff.; 24 ff.; 59 ff.
138. Cf. Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte III*\*, 65 ff. on the frequency of such statues; on the monotony of the types cf. e.g. those erected in the forum in Pompeii, *Mau. Pompeji in Leben und Kunst* (1908), 44 ff., showing at least eleven bases for equestrian statues on the west side of the forum. On the average size of the statue-bases see also G. Barbieri, *Epigraphica* 19 (1957), 106 ff.
139. The same applies also to the cities of the Empire. Thus for example among the very numerous inscriptions of Ephesus one can obviously establish the character only of those honours which consisted of a standard base with a *statua pedestris*. It is almost never possible to grasp the architectural context in which in many cases the statues will have been placed and on which they may in part have depended for their effect. Inscriptions on *clipei*, e.g. *CIL* V. 6977, and A. Albertini, *Commentarii dell'Ateneo di Brescia per l'anno 1971*, 88 = *Archeol. e storia a Milano e nella Lombardia*, or. (1980), 262-9; on *vascula*, *CIL* V. 6978; 6985-6. A *sella curulis* in the theatre, *AE* 1947, 53; cf. L. Schumacher, *Chiron* 6 (1976), 176 ff. On the concept of a *statua pedestris* see *CIL* VI. 31781.
140. During the Republic the monuments had been, for instance in the East, of a more variable character (see Tuchelt, *Denkmäler, passim*). In Rome a number of triumphal arches, though not many, had been erected (Kähler, *RE* VIII. 377 ff.).

- nos. 1-6). From the reign of Augustus onwards this is no longer attested for private persons, and not in the provinces either. Kähler, 470, supposes that governors were honoured with such arches in Ephesus and Patara. However the inscription in *Forsyth*, in *Eph.* III, 214, 222, is much too fragmentary to allow a definite decision; in Patara by comparison it is probable that there was originally an inscription in honour of Hadrian, as has been shown by G. W. Bowersock, *Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquium* 1982 (printing). According to G. Alföldy, *Aquileia Nostra* 51 (1980), 274, it is possible that *CIL* V, 8661 is the remains of the attic of a triumphal arch. The monumental nymphaeum in Miletus, long regarded, on the basis of the reconstructed text of *ILS* 8970, as an honour for M. Ulpius Traianus, *procos. Asiae* 79/80, was in fact built by Titus . . . [per M. Ulpium Traianum] (B. Krüger, *Die Statthalter Kleinasiens unter den Flavianern* (Diss. Munich, 1975), 32 ff.). On triumphal arches cf. Lahusen, *Ehrenstatue*, 61 ff.
141. e.g. for Volusius Saturninus after his death; compare also the large number of statues for P. Memmius Regulus in Achaia, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> M 468.
142. That naturally does not imply that there was no differentiation, perhaps corresponding to status within the Senate or to other informal criteria, in the forms of representation, cf. n. 131. That question must however be reserved for a separate investigation.
143. G. Marchetti Longhi, *Bull. com.* 71 (1943/5), 67 ff. = *AE* 1948, 93; cf. G. Alföldy, *Fasti Hispanienses* (1969), 5 ff. and Wiegels, *Gnomon* 1974, 191.
144. *NSc* 1906, 205 = *CIL* VI, 37058. Cf. Wiegels, *Gnomon* 1974, 191.
145. Marchetti Longhi, *Bull. com.* 71 (1943/5), 69. But see n. on p. 167 below.
146. It is admittedly not certain that we should imagine all the inscriptions as being laid out in a single line. They might, for example, have run round a large quadrangular base. A. Degrassi, *Scritti vari* I, 483.
147. *CIL* VI, 1508 = Moretti, *IGUR* I, 71.
148. Th. Mommsen, *Ges. Schriften* VIII, 175 ff.
149. C. Bosch, *Die kleinasiatischen Münzen der römischen Kaiserzeit* II, 1 (1935), 82, n. 60; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 6; D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* II (1950), 1400.
150. In September 1978 I was able to check the text. Proposed in the mean time by L. Moretti, 'A proposito di Pirro Ligorio e di IGUR 71', in *Φιλολογία* *καθ' ἑμ.* *Miscellanea in onore di E. Manni* V (1980), 1582 ff.
151. Cf. W. Eck, *Chiron* 14 (1984) (printing).
152. Pietrangeli, *NSc*, 1933, 462 ff.; just 6.5 m; this width approximately equals that of the monument on which the colossal inscription for L. Caesar, *CIL* VI, 36908, was placed (illustration in E. Nash, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Rome* II (1962), 244, no. 993). According to P. Zanker, *Forum Romanum* (1972), 16 ff., two inscriptions were inscribed on the attic, of which one was VI, 36908.
153. *CIL* VI, 36908 (cf. n. 152); the height of the letters in line 1 is 24.5 cm. The dimensions of the letters on the Arch of Drusus and Tiberius in the Forum Augusti: line 1, 16 or 13 cm (Pietrangeli, *NSc* 1933, 461). On the monument for one (Petronius) Persa, which according to Alföldy (cf. n. 127) may have been a triumphal arch, the letters in line 1 were 18 cm high. Particularly large letters obviously attracted attention; cf. Cic. *Verr.* II, 154: 'huic etiam Romae videmus in basis statuarum maximis litteris incisum', and *HA Trig. Tyr.* 33, 4: 'grandes litterae.'
154. Cf. Kähler, *RE* VIIA, 465 ff.
155. 3.4-3.8 cm.
156. Phlegon, *de mirab.* fr. 13 (*FCGrHist* 257, fr. 36, 13). Degrassi, *Scritti vari* I, 438; Degrassi presumes that each city erected a separate statue for the proconsul Rufus, which is unlikely. Admittedly we cannot exclude the possibility that some form of large chariot with horses, for example a *quadriga*, was erected.

- However this supposition seems less probable in view of the separate enumeration of the individual cities. See also now C. Vermeule, 'The Basis from Putcooli: Cities of Asia Minor in Julio-Claudian Italy', in *Coins, Culture and History: Studies in Honour of B. Trell* (1981), 85. On *bigeae* and *quadrigae* as honorific monuments cf. n. 127 above. There is a possible reference to a *quadriga* erected in Rome in honour of a senator in *CIL* VI, 37088.
157. So L. Moretti, *op. cit.* (n. 150), 1591.
158. That an argument could be based on the size, number, and place of erection of monuments and statues is shown for example by Tac. *Ann.* I, 74, 3: in the case against Granus Marcellus a certain Hispano gave evidence that 'statuum Marcelli altius quam Caesarum stant'; cf. Tac. *Ann.* II, 57, 4; 83, 3; Cic. *Verr.* II, 4, 90. Under Septimius Severus accusations were brought against Plautianus to the effect that his statues were larger than those of the Emperors and not only outside Rome, but in it, Dio LXXVII, 14, 6 ff. (LXXVII, 16, 2: his statues more numerous). This gives us an important pointer: outside Rome the possibilities were greater than in the capital; the effects of competition were felt much more sharply in Rome. Tac. *Ann.* XIV, 52, 2 refers to Seneca's 'ingentes et privatum modum evectas opes' and 'quodque studia civium in se verteret, hortorum quoque amoenitate et villarum magnificentia quasi principem supergrederetur.' The distinction between the Emperors and private persons could on occasion also be expressed in the location of statues, cf. those of Augustus, Claudius, Agrippina, and Nero located opposite the equestrian statues of other persons at the forum of Pompeii; see R. Eitelme, *Pompeii* (1974), 120 ff., with a plan. Compare also *Die Bildnisse des Augustus, Herrscherbild und Politik im kaiserzeitlichen Rom*, ed. K. Viermeisel, P. Zanker (1979), 34 ff. Compare also A. Cameron, *JRS* 72 (1982), 140: 'it was not prudent for a private citizen, however rich, to make the same sort of bid for popular favour in Constantinople as was customary in Rome. No emperor would tolerate that sort of competition.' Distinctive statue-bases put up by Herodes Atticus for the imperial family are to be found in the *exedra* at Olympia (*Inschriften aus Olympia*, nos. 612-28). It is possible that their type was determined by architectural considerations. For possible differentiation in the specific form of statues cf. e.g. Fittschen, *Madr. Mitt.* 15 (1974), 172 ff. Whether particular materials were reserved for statues of the Emperor remains in dispute: Th. Pekáry, 'Goldene Statuen der Kaiserzeit', *Röm. Mitt.* 75 (1968), 144 ff.; idem, 'Das Bildnis des römischen Kaisers in der schriftlichen Überlieferung', *Boreas* 5 (1982), 124 ff., esp. 129 ff.; G. Lahusen, 'Goldene und vergoldete römische Ehrenstatuen und Bildnisse', *Röm. Mitt.* 85 (1978), 385 ff.; Th. Pekáry, *Das Bildnis des römischen Kaisers in Staat, Kult und Gesellschaft, dargestellt auf Grund der schriftlichen Überlieferung* (1983) (printing) and G. Lahusen, *Ehrenstatue*, 45 ff. In general the evolution towards clear hierarchical distinctions and externally visible formalization progressed at a different pace in different spheres, cf. Löhken, *Ordines dignitatum, passim*.
160. Bibliography in W. Eck, *ZPE* 43 (1981), 127, n. 2.
161. F. Engesser, *Der Stadtpatronat in Italien und den Westprovinzen des römischen Reiches* (Diss. Freiburg, 1957), 55 ff.
162. *ILLRP* 309 ff.; the earliest entirely complete example is no. 316. See D. R. Stuart, *Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography* (1928), 201 ff. According to S. Mazzarino in *Antico, iardantino ed era costantiniana* II (1980), 289 ff. the concept of the *cursum honorum* was taken over from the Etruscans.
163. Cf. Pliny, *NH* VII, 139; see A. Lippold, *Consules* (1963), 75; W. Kierdorf, *Laudatio Funeris* (1980), 10 ff.; 71 ff. It is fully intelligible, for this reason also, that additional honorific epithets are lacking in such sepulchral inscriptions, while elsewhere they are entirely normal; cf. S. Smitt, *De defunctorum virtutibus in carminibus sepulchralibus Latinis laudatis* (1916). The *cursum* was declaration enough.

164. S. Mazzarino, op. cit. (n. 162), 289, speaks of the *curtus honorum* '... dalla biografia del defunto in funzione, per così dire, *pubblica*'.  
 165. Examples of inscriptions set up after a person's death, *ILLRP* 316; 391; 402; 436; 440; 443. No. 438 is not a sepulchral inscription, but a building-inscription from Volsini. *CIL* I<sup>2</sup> Supp. (printing) does not offer any further examples (H. Krummrey has been kind enough to place the proofs at my disposal). The same observation is valid furthermore also for inscriptions honouring municipal office-holders. The remark of J. Deininger, *ANRW* I, 1, 987, referring to Roman *curtus honorum* 'die in der späten Republik allmählich auch auf Ehreninschriften vermehrt erscheinen', is thus incorrect. In none of the examples which he cites in n. 25 is its character as an honorific inscription (for a living person) demonstrable.  
 166. e.g. *ILLRP* 324; 337; 344; 349; cf. further the numerous items of evidence in Tuchelt, *Denkmäler*, 135 ff.; *ILS* 865 ff. In isolated cases a priesthood also appeared; as it was held for an unlimited period it could be recorded as a further means of characterising the individual concerned. This is shown by a still unpublished inscription from Buthrotum, for example, set up to Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, *cos.* 16 BC, as patron of the town. His rank is defined only by mention of the consulate and pontificate (previously unknown). (Information kindly given to me by H. Freis, Saarbrücken.) For other examples see *ILS* 893a; 894; 900 (which all belong in the early Augustan period).  
 167. *ILLRP* 351-2; 354-6. Cf. n. 166. For general treatments of the evolution of honorific inscriptions (not always dealing with the exact date of any one honour) see e.g. H. Dessau, in A. Gercke - E. Norden, *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft* I (1927), 10; 12 ff.; E. Sandys, *Latin Epigraphy*<sup>2</sup> (1927), 93 ff.; I. Calabi Limentani, *Epigrafia latina* (1968), 235 ff.; I. Kajanto, *Epigraphica* 33 (1971), 3 ff.  
 168. M. Nominus Balbus *CIL* X, 1426-34; *AE* 1979, 177-8. On the dating, L. Schumacher, *Chiron* 6 (1976), 165 ff.  
 169. *CIL* V, 6974-87.  
 170. See the evidence in *PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 507. R. Harder, *Kleine Schriften* (1960), 3 ff.  
 171. Pliny, *NH* XXXIV, 17 provides what can hardly be regarded as a fully accurate account of its historical evolution.  
 172. *CIL* III, 551 = *ILS* 928; *AE* 1919, 1 = *Corinth* VIII, 2, 54. E. Groag, *Die römischen Reichsbeamten in Achaia bis auf Diokletian* (1939), 15 ff.  
 173. *CIL* XI, 7553 = *ILS* 916; see G. Paci, *Scritti in memoria di M. Zambelli* (1978), 261 ff.; *CIL* X, 5059; 5060 = *ILS* 930; 930a; *CIL* V, 1878 = *ILS* 931; *NSC* 1886, 108 = *AE* 1888, 24 = *ILS* 931a, see G. Alföldy, *Aquileia nostra* 51 (1980), 286; *CIL* VI, 3835 = *ILS* 911. It is possible that the *Ignoti* of *CIL* V, 879 and XI, 1837 are also Augustan; but this remains uncertain.  
 174. *Inscr. Ital.* XIII, 3, nos. 17 and 83; 14 and 80; 84.  
 175. So however L. Braeccesi, *Epigrafia e storiografia* (1981), 32.  
 176. *AE* 1969/70, 96-7; 1978, 132; 134. As in three texts the *praenomen* 'Cn.' seems to be preserved (although, as has been proved, many readings in the wax tablets from Murecine are very dubious), the senator should be identified with the consul of AD 41, whose role in the conquest of Britain is attested by Florus VII, 13; cf. A. R. Birley, *Fasts of Roman Britain* (1981), 360 ff.  
 177. *Suet. Aug.* 31, 5.  
 178. See n. 46 above.  
 179. Cf. Panciera in *Volusia*, 87 ff.  
 180. See nn. 172 ff. above.  
 181. *CIL* X, 832 = *ILS* 898. The extent to which the *nomen* alone, especially in the early Principate, could function as a social marker is evident from the nomenclature of many freedmen of senators, who indicate the patronage-relationship not in the normal form, by giving the *praenomen* of their *patronus*, but either with

- the latter's complete name or at least with the *cognomen*. In that way they were able to gain a share in the public standing of their *patronus*; cf. G. Fabre, *Libertus* (1981), 116 ff. and W. Eck in *Actas del coloquio 1978, Colonato y otras formas de dependencia no esclavistas (Mem. de Historia Antigua II)* (1978), 45 ff.  
 182. R. Bartoccini, *Autostrade July-August, 1963*, 12 ff. = *AE* 1978, 304. Whether this text might possibly belong to the base of an equestrian statue in the Forum cannot be decided on the basis of the reports. On this type compare also, e.g., C. Alföldy, 'Cnaeus Domitius Calvinus, Patronus von Emporiae', *AEA* 50/51 (1977/8), 47 ff.  
 183. On the changes which took place in the concept of the honorific inscription in Late Antiquity cf. e.g. R. Laqueur, 'Das Kaiserium und die Gesellschaft des Reiches', in *Probleme der Spätantike* (1930), 1 ff., esp. 33 ff.; L. Robert, *Hellenica* IV (1948), 107 ff.

For the inscriptions of L. Aelius Lamia (p. 146 above) see now I. Kajanto, *L'area sacra di Largo Argentina* (1981, app. 1983), 112 ff.